

Public Space Protection Order Consultation 2017

Proposals for Additional Dog Control Orders and
No Smoking in Children's Play areas

Intelligence and Policy Service

Contents

Consultation	2
Overall findings.....	2
Proposal to include a requirement for an individual to carry a means by which to pick up after the dog under their control	4
Table 1: Means to pick up after their dog	4
Proposals to extend the areas where dogs are required to be on leads at all times	5
Table 2: Main comments relating to the use of leads	5
Table 3: Springfield Park, Guiseley	5
Table 4: Around the wildfowl lake at Golden Acre Park.....	6
Table 2: At Middleton community bike hub.....	6
Table 6: In the Ornamental Gardens at The Hollies and Lotherton Hall.....	7
Table 7: Additional cemeteries and closed church yards	7
Table 8: On Golf courses at Gotts Park, Roundhay and Temple Newsam	8
Proposals to extend the areas where dogs are excluded.....	9
Table 9: Main comments relating to the exclusion of dogs.....	9
Table 10: Leeds City Council owned tennis courts	10
Table 11: Leeds City Council owned Multi-Use Games Areas	10
Table 12: Swinnow Moor and Moortown play areas	11
Proposal to clarify the position with regards to the maximum number of dogs walked by Professional Dog Walkers	12
Table 13: Maximum number of dogs walked by professional dog walkers.....	12
Proposal to Prohibit Smoking in Children’s Play Areas.....	13
Table 14: Prohibiting smoking in children’s play areas.....	13
Table 15: Frequency of use of children’s play areas.....	13
Table 16: Frequency of seeing smoking in children’s play areas	13
Comments	14
Table 17: Major themes from all comments	14
Profile of respondents	15
Table 18: Profile of respondents	15

The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 introduced the powers to create Dog Control Orders. Since 2006, Leeds City Council has introduced a number of Dog Control Orders and those currently in place control a range of activities such as cleaning up after a dog or keeping a dog on a lead. Through the use of Dog Control Orders, dogs are also excluded from children's play areas, remembrance gardens, some wildlife gardens and many school grounds.

The Anti-Social Behaviour Policing and Crime Act 2014 introduced the potential to use Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) to tackle a number of issues including dog control issues. All existing Dog Control Orders in Leeds automatically became Public Space Protection Orders on 20th October 2017. However, whilst most of the existing Dog Control Orders have been working well, views on some new provisions were sought in a public consultation.

Consultation

From November 1st to December 15th 2017, Leeds City Council carried out an online public consultation on a number of proposals to be included in a Public Space Protection Order. The majority of proposals referred to dog related issues including dog walkers being required to carry a bag or have some other way to pick up and remove their dog's mess, along with a review of the places where dogs currently need to be kept on their lead or kept out of altogether, and the maximum number of dogs that professional dog walkers can take out at any one time.

In addition, views were sought on whether smoking should be banned in children's play areas. At present, smoking bans only apply to indoor public spaces. The reasoning was that such a measure would continue to reduce the number of children seeing people smoking and being exposed to their smoke.

The consultation was widely publicised including:

- Leeds City Council [press release](#);
- Advertising on social media on the main LCC Facebook page, LCC Found Dogs Facebook page, Cleaner Neighbourhoods Team Facebook page, Clean Leeds, Twitter page and a number of different Parks and countryside Facebook and Twitter pages;
- E-mails to all town and parish councils within Leeds asking that they circulate the consultation amongst residents through newsletters, meetings, social media;
- E-mails to all Environmental Champions (Councillors with a specific link to the environment) asking them to share the consultation with their constituents, residents groups, member colleagues either through newsletters, meetings or social media;
- E-mails to Council Departments including the Cleaner Neighbourhoods Team, Communities Team, Anti-social Behaviour Team, Environmental Health, Public Health and Housing asking them to circulate the consultation widely;
- Posters displayed in key parks; and
- Attendance by a Council staff member at Gotts Park and Golden Acre Park cafes to promote the consultation by giving out business cards with a link to the consultation on it.

Overall findings

The consultation received 2134 responses in total. This report presents the results of the survey for completed questions. As this was a self-completion questionnaire, not all respondents have given answers to all the questions. Where respondents were given the option of 'No opinion' on an issue, these responses have been removed from the Tables below. The overall count for each question details the valid number of responses. Indicative examples of the main comments specific to each proposal are included.

Headline findings show:

- A high level of agreement with over nine in ten respondents, 93%, agreeing to the requirement that dog walkers should carry a means for clearing up after their dog.
- Responses to the proposals extending the areas where dogs are required to be on leads at all times showed four in five or above, 79% to 88%, of all respondents agreeing to the majority of sites.
 - However, lower levels of agreement are shown in response to the proposal relating to the golf courses at Gotts Park, Roundhay and Temple Newsam. Respondents living in LS12, LS5 or LS13 were equally for the proposal as against it, 47% agree / 47% disagree. Where these respondents own a dog, 58% disagree. Comments referring to Gotts Park argue that it is a special case as it is land held in trust for the recreational use of people of Leeds.
 - Responses for dog owners regarding the wildfowl lake at Golden Acre Park also show higher levels of disagreement with 21% disagreeing.
- Responses to the three proposals to extend the areas where dogs are excluded showed four in five or above, 79% to 84%, of all respondents agreeing.
 - Prompted by proposals to exclude dogs from certain sites, a significant proportion of comments wanted to see specific areas dedicated to off lead exercise for dogs.
- Three quarters of all respondents, 74%, agreed with the proposal to clarify the position with regards to the maximum number of dogs walked by professional dog walkers.
 - However, where respondents owned a dog, two thirds agreed and 22% disagreed. This figure rises to 33% disagreement where respondents were professional dog walkers.
- Nine in ten, 90%, of all respondents agreed with the proposal to prohibit smoking in children's play areas.
- 754 comments were received covering a wide range of issues. The main themes emerging showed agreement with the proposals, concerns about how the PSPO would be enforced effectively, and requests for dedicated areas for dogs to be off lead.
- The profile of respondents shows almost three in five, 57%, own a dog; 3% are professional dog walkers; 69% are female; 75% are aged between 30 and 64; 93% are White British; and the highest proportion of respondents by postcode live in LS16, LS6, LS15, LS12 and LS8.

Proposal to include a requirement for an individual to carry a means by which to pick up after the dog under their control

Table 1: Means to pick up after their dog

To what extent would you agree or disagree with the introduction of a new offence under the Public Space Protection Order, which would require dog walkers to carry a poo bag or other means for clearing up after their dog?	
Response	All respondents
Strongly agree	76%
Agree	17%
Neither agree nor disagree	2%
Disagree	2%
Strongly disagree	2%
Number of responses	2122
Summary: All respondents, 93% agree	
Main comments relating to 'means to pick up' and dog fouling 142 comments overall	
Theme	Indicative examples
More dog poo bins needed (32 comments)	<p>"As a dog owner who uses many of the excellent parks Leeds for walking my dog, I would urge the Council to increase the provision of dog litter bins in some of the parks (like Golden Acre, for instance), where they are few and far between. Otherwise, I applaud the present initiative."</p> <p>"It is imperative that there are plenty of frequently emptied dog poo bins."</p>
How can this be enforced? (30 comments)	<p>"Although I think it is a good idea that dog walkers should be expected to carry bags at all times to dispose of poo, how can this be enforced? What happens if someone runs out of bags while out on a walk?"</p> <p>"There should be an easy way for members of the public to report people not cleaning up after their dogs, including photos of the offender and their dog."</p>
Agree (25 comments)	<p>"As a dog owner I strongly agree with all proposals found within this survey. I also feel that far more stringent fines should be in place for dog owners who allow their dogs to foul the pavements AND grassed verges in residential areas."</p> <p>"Dog poo is out of hand and we need solutions"</p>
Prosecute those who leave poo bags too (17 comments)	<p>"Anyone seen to discard poo bags in hedgerows or inappropriate places should be prosecuted. In some ways it is worse to put poo in a bag that is not biodegradable than to leave the poo on the ground."</p> <p>"Can it be made an offence to hang poop bags on bushes and trees - this seems to be on the increase."</p>

Proposals to extend the areas where dogs are required to be on leads at all times

The consultation included six proposals where dogs would be required to be on leads at all times. Tables 3 to 8 detail the extent of agreement or disagreement to each proposal, and indicative comments relating to each proposal. In addition, the consultation generated many comments in relation to the use of leads. These are highlighted in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Main comments relating to the use of leads

Main comments relating to the use of leads - 102 comments overall	
Theme	Indicative examples
Short leads near the public (34 comments)	"All dogs should be leashed in public areas, on main roads and paths. Open parks are there for all to enjoy a dog can still enjoy while on leash and a child and parent can enjoy knowing they won't get harassed by a out of controlled dog or dogs."
	"Dogs should be on a lead at all times in public places"
	"Dogs should be confined to certain areas only in public parks and should be kept on the lead at all times."
Other spaces where these controls needed (24 comments)	"I believe dogs should be on leads in Kirkstall Abbey grounds, particularly near the river walks for dog safety but also to protect aquatic wildlife."
	"I think Yeadon tarn should be included as a lot of people let their dogs run free and fowl where they like."
Dogs need off lead exercise (12 comments)	"Dog walkers need to be able to exercise their dogs off lead - any steps to deter that is detrimental to the dog's health and will result in out of control dogs, noises dogs and other undesirable behaviour."
	"It is very important that you do not extend any restrictions on dog owners or dogs in public open spaces/parks, other than issues relating to poo bags and dog waste. Dogs should be allowed to run free in these areas and enjoy the open space. There are many human activities in such areas, such as cyclists, waste and rubbish left behind from bbqs, picnics and plastic bottles which are equally as offensive and damaging to the park as dog waste, so I hope at some point this too will be addressed."
Agree (12 comments)	"I am a dog owner, but would like to see rules in place regarding being on a lead and clearing up their mess..."
	"The proposals seem fair to both dog owners (I own dogs) and other public space users. Particularly where dogs are to be kept on leads in certain areas in most proposals there is also provisions for dogs to be allowed off lead in areas away from the restriction."

Table 3: Springfield Park, Guiseley

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the introduction of a requirement to keep dogs on leads at all times in the play area in Springfield Park, Guiseley?		
Response	All respondents	Live in LS19 or LS20
Strongly agree	61%	65%
Agree	23%	23%
Neither agree nor disagree	8%	3%
Disagree	5%	5%
Strongly disagree	4%	5%
Number of responses	2056	133
Summary: All respondents, 84% agree Living in LS19 or LS20, 88% agree		

Table 4: Around the wildfowl lake at Golden Acre Park

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the introduction of a requirement to keep dogs on leads at all times in the area immediately adjacent to the wildfowl lake around Golden Acre Park?					
Response	All respondents	Dog owners	Not a dog owner	Professional dog walker	Live in LS16,LS17, LS18, LS19
Strongly agree	55%	40%	76%	35%	59%
Agree	25%	30%	17%	37%	21%
Neither agree nor disagree	7%	9%	3%	14%	7%
Disagree	8%	12%	3%	4%	7%
Strongly disagree	6%	9%	2%	10%	5%
Number of responses	2105	1204	890	71	550
<p>Summary: All respondents, 79% agree, 14% disagree Dog owners, 70% agree, 21% disagree Not a dog owner, 92% agree, 5% disagree Professional dog walker, 72% agree, 14% disagree Living in LS16, LS17, LS18 or LS19, 81% agree, 12% disagree</p>					
Main comments relating to Golden Acre Park - 13 comments overall					
Theme	Indicative examples				
Disagree (4 comments)	"I think dogs should be allowed off lead near the lake as long as they behave! Not all dogs off leads chase the birds..."				
	"I use Golden Acre park frequently with my children and without a dog - I think it is an excellent space for people and dogs and I have never seen a dog bothering wildfowl. On the occasion that I have been annoyed by the behaviour of a dog jumping up and me/my child, it was on an extendable lead anyway. Restricting use of the area due to poor behaviour of a few dog owners at the expense of the many who are there with well trained dogs is an unreasonable measure..."				
Target offenders, not all users (3 comments)	"It seems that provisions are made for virtually all tax payers and interest groups except dog owners who are constantly penalised and have no facilities provided. We deserve to have as much access to public land as every other tax payer and the vast number of responsible owners should not be penalised for a minority. I have no issue with special orders for cemeteries playgrounds etc but other public space should be just that. In particular an area like Golden Acre."				

Table 2: At Middleton community bike hub

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the introduction of a requirement to keep dogs on leads at all times at Middleton community bike hub?	
Response	All respondents
Strongly agree	55%
Agree	26%
Neither agree nor disagree	10%
Disagree	5%
Strongly disagree	4%
Number of responses	2030
<p>Summary: All respondents, 81% agree</p>	

Table 6: In the Ornamental Gardens at The Hollies and Lotherton Hall

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the introduction of a requirement to keep dogs on leads at all times in the ornamental gardens at the Hollies and Lotherton Hall?		
Response	All respondents	Live in LS6, LS16 or LS17
Strongly agree	53%	56%
Agree	26%	24%
Neither agree nor disagree	8%	7%
Disagree	8%	7%
Strongly disagree	5%	6%
Number of responses	2084	522
Summary: All respondents, 79% agree Living in LS6, LS16 or LS17, 80% agree		
Main comments relating to the Hollies and Lotherton Hall - 5 comments overall		
Theme	Indicative examples	
Agree (1 comment)	"I think dogs should be on leads when in areas which are designated for a particular purpose, for example ornamental gardens, wild life areas, children's play areas etc. I think that in other open spaces they could be let off their leads."	
Disagree (1 comment)	"I am a dog owner and have a small child. The Hollies and Lotherton are quite different spaces. Lotherton gardens are adjacent to the house, smaller and popular with children so I'd definitely support use of leads there. The Hollies is bigger, much less used and directly linked to other woodland areas, so I think leads there are less critical (if I'm thinking of the right place, around the tennis courts)..."	

Table 7: Additional cemeteries and closed church yards

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the addition of cemeteries at Whinmoor, Kippax and Elmete, and church yards at Kippax, Yeadon and Holy Trinity Rothwell to be included as dogs on leads at all times areas?	
Response	All respondents
Strongly agree	60%
Agree	28%
Neither agree nor disagree	6%
Disagree	4%
Strongly disagree	3%
Number of responses	2086
Summary: All respondents, 88% agree	

Table 8: On Golf courses at Gotts Park, Roundhay and Temple Newsam

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the introduction of a requirement to keep dogs on leads at all times on Gotts Park, Roundhay and Temple Newsam golf courses?				
Response	All respondents	Live in LS12,LS5 or LS13		
		All respondents living in these postcodes	Dog owners in these postcodes	Non dog owners in these postcodes
Strongly agree	48%	33%	23%	56%
Agree	24%	14%	13%	17%
Neither agree nor disagree	9%	5%	7%	2%
Disagree	9%	11%	15%	3%
Strongly disagree	10%	36%	43%	22%
Number of responses	2084	192	131	59
<p style="text-align: center;">Summary: All respondents, 72% agree, 19% disagree All respondents living in LS12, LS5 or LS13, 47% agree, 47% disagree All respondents living in LS12, LS5 or LS13 who are a dog owner, 36% agree, 58% disagree All respondents living in LS12, LS5 or LS13 who are not a dog owner, 73% agree, 25% disagree</p>				
Main comments relating to Gotts Park - 32 comments overall				
Theme	Indicative examples			
Disagree re Gotts Park (26 comments)	“Gotts park is not owned by the council it is held in trust for the recreational use of the people of Leeds on a thousand year lease. The council have no power to stop the public using this land. I personally walk every day on Gotts Park. I have seen three golfers in three days. And I managed quite easily to keep out of their way. It's land for all and manners to stand aside when they are playing shots. It's worked well for many years like this. Land for all to use.”			
	“Gotts Park really doesn't need to be a dog on lead location. I use the park several times a week as a dog walker and occasionally as a golfer, both parties get along very harmoniously almost all the time and any complaints to the contrary are much ado about nothing. The course is only busy at certain times and dog walkers respect the golfers at those times, when the course is emptier it would be very unfair not to allow dogs the full run of this beautiful park (and I do not agree that there is ample space in the rest of the park not including the golf course, as is the case at Roundhay and Temple Newsam).”			
Other comments on Gotts Park (6 comments)	“I have played golf at Gotts Park for more than 40 years but in the last few years the number of dog walkers meandering across fairways/greens during play has grown to a terrifying extent. Sometimes dog walkers pop out from trees onto fairways and greens after a shot has left a players club and it is inevitable that someone will eventually be seriously hurt. The problem is made worse because if we ask dog walkers to stick to paths for their own safety we are sometimes met with verbal threats or abuse because the dog walkers believe that they have priority on the golf course. The result of this situation is that a large number of former Gotts Park golf regulars have been driven away or indeed given up playing. There is room for both dog walkers and golfers at Gotts Park but only if dog walkers stick to the designated paths but unfortunately some dog walkers don't care.”			

Proposals to extend the areas where dogs are excluded

The consultation included three proposals where dogs would be excluded at all times. Tables 10 to 12 detail the extent of agreement or disagreement to each proposal, and indicative comments relating to each proposal.

In addition, the consultation generated comments in relation to excluding dogs. Prompted by proposals to exclude dogs from certain sites, the majority of comments wanted to see specific areas dedicated to off lead exercise for dogs. These are highlighted in Table 9 below and link to comments in Table 2 about off lead exercise, and Table 10 about excluding dogs from Leeds City Council owned tennis courts.

Table 9: Main comments relating to the exclusion of dogs

Main comments relating to the exclusion of dogs - 74 comments overall	
Theme	Indicative examples
Dedicated areas for dogs to be off lead (58 comments)	“As I am aware of the risks which loose dogs may have on public spaces I believe that for the public's safety and the dogs’ safety they should be on leads and under control. However there should be plenty of alternative spaces where dogs are allowed to be securely off lead and able to exhibit natural behaviours, complying with animal welfare act.”
	“Can you create fenced off areas with a gate that can be shut for dogs, where they can be let off lead. Like a dog play parks, clearly signposted that dogs will be off lead, all dog poo to be picked up and people banned from the areas if they cannot control their dogs or show anti-social behaviours to other dogs. People would not then need to use tennis courts, and if the area is concreted with a small grassed area would be accessible to all different levels of dog owners.”
	“You are putting forward a large number of propositions limiting where dogs can be exercised freely. Perhaps you could also find some enclosed areas where dogs can be trained and exercised safely...”
	“I would like to see some fenced off lead dog areas where dog owners could safely allow their dogs off lead in a confined area. This would provide a safe space for dog owners to train and socialise their dogs without causing anxiety or concerns to other members of the public.”
More exclusions needed e.g. sport pitches (9 comments)	“All sports fields at should be included”
	“Whilst strongly supporting the proposals which generally strengthen/extend the protection of public space areas they do not go far enough. Dogs should be restricted from all of the Councils sports pitches where dog fouling currently presents a serious risk to public health, particularly to children who use these pitches in large numbers. Similarly, in the parks in the city should have designated dog free areas where families can have health risk free areas in which to picnic, play with children etc. If the Council is serious about creating a real child friendly city, my further proposals to protect children and indeed all residents from the current situation of disgusting and dangerous dog fouling in public spaces is a very obvious measure to take and would be entirely consistent with being a modern international city that encourages our young people to live a healthy lifestyle and to do so in a clean and safe environment.”

Table 10: Leeds City Council owned tennis courts

To what extent would you agree or disagree with the introduction of a dog exclusion area for all Leeds City Council owned tennis courts within the Leeds area?	
Response	All respondents
Strongly agree	55%
Agree	24%
Neither agree nor disagree	8%
Disagree	8%
Strongly disagree	6%
Number of responses	2097
Summary: All respondents, 79% agree, 14% disagree	
Main comments relating to Leeds City Council owned tennis courts - 17 comments overall	
Theme	Indicative examples
Dedicated areas for dogs to be off lead (11 comments)	“Create safe enclosed dog parks so dog owners do not need to use tennis courts. Fine those who allow fouling a huge amount of money. Most dog owners are responsible and hate dog mess too!”
	“If you are going to close all of the tennis courts to dogs, what areas are you going to provide for people to train their dogs/puppies recall in a safe area? In other countries they have dog parks where dogs can run free in safety and people who don’t like dogs can stay out. We need this on our parks as currently the tennis courts are the only facilities available to train dogs recall. I completely understand the Dog poo issue in tennis courts but it’s still the same in the parks! If people have an area in parks where dogs can run free, socialise and burn off excess energy (and it has been proven they walk further off lead than on lead) you may have dogs behaving better in local parks!”
Disagree (4 comments)	“The tennis court ban could be seasonal. It seems a big waste to deny dog owners access to safe enclosed spaces for off lead exercise when these spaces would otherwise not be being used.”

Table 11: Leeds City Council owned Multi-Use Games Areas

To what extent would you agree or disagree with the implementation of dog exclusion areas on Leeds City Council owned multi-use games areas?	
Response	All respondents
Strongly agree	56%
Agree	24%
Neither agree nor disagree	8%
Disagree	7%
Strongly disagree	6%
Number of responses	2107
Summary: All respondents, 80% agree	

Table 12: Swinnow Moor and Moortown play areas

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the addition of Swinnow Moor and Moortown play areas as dog exclusion areas?			
Response	All respondents	Live in LS17	Live in LS13
Strongly agree	59%	60%	43%
Agree	26%	34%	41%
Neither agree nor disagree	8%	1%	7%
Disagree	4%	5%	4%
Strongly disagree	3%	0%	5%
Number of responses	2055	82	56
<p>Summary: All respondents, 84% agree Living in LS17, 94% agree Living in LS13, 84% agree</p>			

Proposal to clarify the position with regards to the maximum number of dogs walked by Professional Dog Walkers

Table 13: Maximum number of dogs walked by professional dog walkers

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the clarification in the Order that allows a suitably insured dog walker to walk up to 6 dogs at any time, on the condition that they do not walk accompanied by or alongside other professional dog walkers? Dog walkers who did not comply with these conditions would lose the privilege to walk more than 4 dogs				
Response	All respondents	Dog owners	Not a dog owner	Professional dog walker
Strongly agree	51%	40%	66%	37%
Agree	23%	26%	18%	24%
Neither agree nor disagree	10%	11%	9%	7%
Disagree	8%	10%	4%	13%
Strongly disagree	8%	12%	3%	20%
Number of responses	2097	1199	888	71
Summary: All respondents, 74% agree, 16% disagree Dog owners, 67% agree, 22% disagree Not a dog owner, 84% agree, 7% disagree Professional dog walker, 61% agree, 33% disagree				
Main comments relating to Professional dog walkers - 81 comments overall				
Theme	Indicative examples			
4 dogs maximum (21 comments)	"I feel that all professional dog walkers should be limited to 4 dogs. I don't believe any person can control more than that, regardless of the dog's temperament. The public, including most dog owners, are so unaware of the laws surrounding dog walking and dog legalities. An awareness campaign would be useful..."			
	"I have a dog and I think professional dog walkers cannot control 6 dogs. There should be a maximum of 4 dogs under their control. I have been on Bedquilts in Adel and surrounded with a dog walkers dogs which can be distressing to young children who are not used to dogs in such numbers."			
Improve engagement with professional dog walkers (14 comments)	"As a professional dog walker, I feel that the changes to orders affecting us should be communicated better. However I do agree that dog walkers shouldn't be able to join together and form huge "packs" in public spaces. My colleague and I often travel in the same vehicle but then take different routes in the woods to ensure we don't bump in to each other and our groups re 3-6 in size. Currently, Leeds city council does not communicate well or control dog walkers. I think councils such as Harrogate engage with professional dog walkers better. They have a "contract" approach whereby pro dog walkers have to agree to their code of conduct and are then listed on their approved dog walker list. This means members of the public can be encouraged to check this list and pick a dog walker from it, encouraging dog walkers to sign up and agree to all terms stated by the council. This would give the council a lot more power over dog walkers and ensure that the bad ones could be struck off the list."			
Agree (12 comments)	"I am a professional dog walker and wholeheartedly agree with everything being proposed."			

Proposal to Prohibit Smoking in Children’s Play Areas

Table 14: Prohibiting smoking in children’s play areas

To what extent would you agree or disagree with the inclusion of prohibiting smoking in children’s play areas in the PSPO?	
Response	All respondents
Strongly agree	75%
Agree	14%
Neither agree nor disagree	5%
Disagree	3%
Strongly disagree	2%
Number of responses	2104
Summary: All respondents, 90% agree	
Main comments relating to children’s play areas – 54 comments overall	
Theme	Indicative examples
Agree (16 comments)	“I have two young children we regularly use parks and play grounds. I strongly agree to make playgrounds no smoking areas. I strongly agree to keep dogs on leads in the areas mentioned.”
	“I agree with the protection of children's play areas. Inappropriate places to walk dogs. Agree with banning smoking in play areas - I would not want to encourage my grandchildren to smoke or be close enough to inhale smoke (or other children)...”
Disagree (7 comments)	“It's ridiculous to ban smoking in any outdoor areas including playgrounds.”

Table 15: Frequency of use of children’s play areas

How often do you currently use / enter children’s play areas?	
Response	All respondents
Often	26%
Sometimes	28%
Rarely	24%
Never	22%
Number of responses	2121

Table 16: Frequency of seeing smoking in children’s play areas

In the last year, when you have visited children’s play areas, how often have you seen someone smoking there?	
Response	All respondents
Often	18%
Sometimes	32%
Rarely	25%
Never	24%
Number of responses	2002

Comments

The consultation included one open box for respondents to add any comments in relation to the existing or proposed Public Space Protection Orders. 754 respondents commented on the proposals. Many comments related to a specific proposal whereas others combined a range of issues. For the purpose of the analysis, these have been grouped according to the dominant theme.

The majority of the comments are referred to in the Tables above in relation to their main theme. In addition, over 200 comments made general statements about the proposals. Table 17 below highlights the top ten major themes emerging from all comments.

Table 17: Major themes from all comments

Major themes from all comments – 754 comments	
Theme	Indicative example
Agree (126 comments)	“As a dog owner and dog lover I think that the proposed restrictions seem reasonable. I feel that a few irresponsible dog owners give all dog owners a bad name. I think Leeds has some wonderful parks and I enjoy walking my dog in these parks.”
How enforce? (91 comments)	“Fully agree with the concept. But wonder how it is going to be policed or monitored?”
Dedicated areas for dogs to be off lead (72 comments)	“Protected areas (with fences/walls) where dogs would be able to exercise freely should be made available.”
Disagree (48 comments)	“Stop trying to fine people for everything it’s a joke. 99% of dog owners are responsible but it’ll be these people getting hassled not the people who aren’t responsible. It’s ridiculous.”
Other spaces where controls needed (36 comments)	“Dog owners should be reminded that they should not exercise dogs on any sport or play area. The cricket pitch in Cookridge which is privately owned is often used for dog exercises. Owners when challenged seem to think they have the right to exercise dogs in any open space without cleaning up after then.”
Target offenders, not all users (35 comments)	“Deal with problem dog owners. For the most part, dogs are part of the family and the majority of children love them. We shouldn’t be teaching children that dogs are messy and dangerous, we should be teaching uneducated adults that dogs are a responsibility and should be trained and cleaned up after!”
Short leads near the public (34 comments)	“Dogs should be on a lead at all times in public places.”
More dog poo bins needed (32 comments)	“It is imperative that there are plenty of frequently emptied dog poo bins.”
Disagree re Gotts Park (26 comments)	“Gotts Park is held in trust for the people of Armley. They should be allowed to walk their dogs.”
4 dogs maximum dog walkers (21 comments)	“I feel six dogs is too many even for professional walker and should be 4 whether they are alone or not.”

Profile of respondents

Table 18: Profile of respondents

Profile of respondents					
	Count	%		Count	%
Dog owner			Postcode		
Yes	1219	57%	LS1	12	1%
No	904	43%	LS4	14	1%
Total	2123		LS5	15	1%
Professional dog walker			LS6	135	7%
Yes	71	3%	LS7	73	4%
No	2045	97%	LS8	100	5%
Total	2116		LS9	28	1%
Gender			LS10	63	3%
Male	635	31%	LS11	30	2%
Female	1394	69%	LS12	122	6%
Total	2029		LS13	56	3%
Age			LS14	66	3%
18 - 29	153	7%	LS15	121	6%
30 - 44	688	33%	LS16	313	17%
45 - 64	879	42%	LS17	84	4%
65 +	353	17%	LS18	69	4%
Total	2073		LS19	88	5%
Ethnicity			LS20	46	2%
White - British	1857	93%	LS21	41	2%
Any other White background	53	3%	LS22	24	1%
White - Irish	27	1%	LS23	9	0%
Any other Mixed background	10	1%	LS24	7	0%
Asian - Indian	8	0%	LS25	85	4%
Asian - Pakistani	8	0%	LS26	55	3%
Mixed - White and Asian	8	0%	LS27	57	3%
Mixed - White and Black Caribbean	5	0%	LS28	52	3%
Black - Caribbean	4	0%	LS29	9	0%
Other - Any other background	4	0%	WF3	45	2%
Black - Any other Black background	3	0%	WF10	11	1%
Asian - Chinese	2	0%	Other WF	13	1%
Asian - Kashmiri	2	0%	BD	24	1%
Mixed - White and Black African	1	0%	HG	8	0%
Total	1992		HD	3	0%
			YO	3	0%
			Other	26	1%
			Total	1908	