

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Title/Subject Matter:	Public Space Protection Order- Dog Control
Meeting/Date:	Licensing and Protection Committee 20 th September 2017
Executive Portfolio:	Executive Councillor for Community Resilience, Well-Being and Regulatory Services, Cllr Angie Dickinson
Report by:	Head of Community, Chris Stopford
Ward(s) affected:	All

Executive Summary:

The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 gave powers to local authorities to introduce Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) to control a range of issues linked to anti-social behaviour, including the control of dogs. The transitional arrangements for the Act mean that all current Dog Control Orders will end in October 2017, automatically being converted to become PSPOs. This situation gives rise to the potential for confusion in enforcing controls, unless formally converted to PSPOs with the current enforcement penalty schedules.

Although the vast majority of dogs cause no problems, the control of dogs remains a significant issue to the public, consistently featuring as a significant complaints issue.

This report provides feedback from a consultation exercise which was authorised by the Committee in July 2017. The responses to this consultation were strongly in favour of the Council establishing a new PSPO to replace the current dog control measures.

As such, this report recommends replacing the current Dog Control Orders with a new single, District-wide PSPO which sets out a standard set of proportionate controls which apply across the whole District and a set of additional controls which only apply to specified locations, as detailed in the report.

Recommendation(s):

The Licensing and Public Protection Committee is recommended:-

1. to approve the making of a new Public Spaces Protection Order covering the control of dogs, as detailed in Appendix 2 to this report; and
2. to delegate authority to the Head of Community, in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Community Resilience, Well-Being and Regulatory Services, to make minor amendments to the conditions and scope of the PSPO.

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 came into effect in October 2014. Among its provisions was the replacement of a series of previously-enacted Orders, including Dog Control Orders, with a new wide-reaching order, the Public Space Protection Order (PSPO). The transitional arrangements for implementing the Act involved existing Dog Control Orders remaining in place for a period of 3 years (i.e. to October 2017) after which time they become PSPOs.
- 1.2 The automatic conversion of the former Dog Control Orders to PSPOs is beneficial in that the powers under the old system will not be lost, assuming local authorities wish to retain the powers to control dogs. However, it introduces a potential confusion in publicising and enforcing these powers, as the converted Dog Control Orders retain their original penalties, which may be different to the current PSPO system. As such, if enforcement is being undertaken, it is possible that the actual offence being committed, i.e. breach of the PSPO, carries a different penalty to the offence as stated under the originating Dog Control Order. Hence, it is best practice to convert the Dog Control Orders to PSPOs formally as this will ensure complete clarity in publicity and enforcement.

2. WHY THIS REPORT IS NECESSARY

- 2.1 Although it is recognised that the vast majority of dog owners are responsible and control their pets appropriately, the control of dogs remains an issue of concern to the public. The Council has received over 1,000 complaints related to dog control over the past 2 years, including reports of dog fouling, stray dogs, dogs off leads and dangerous dogs. This indicates that the Council requires the means to control these issues and to take appropriate enforcement action should this be necessary.
- 2.2 Best practice dictates that proposed PSPOs are proportionate to the problems being experienced and contain conditions which are likely to be effective without placing undue restrictions on the general public who are going about their legitimate business and are not causing concern or anti-social behaviour. Best practice also dictates that appropriate consultation takes place with those who may be affected.
- 2.3 This report provides feedback from the statutory consultation process which has been carried out during July and August 2017 and proposes a set of principles for a new PSPO, outlines a series of proposed control measures which are recommended for inclusion in a new PSPO.

3. OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 3.1 There are currently 4 separate Dog Control Orders in place across the District, developed to address specific concerns and including specific control conditions in specified locations. The current orders only apply to the areas for which they are specified. The current Orders impose conditions as follows:-
- A requirement to place dogs on lead upon request by an authorised officer. This applies District-wide;
 - A requirement to pick up and remove dog faeces. This applies to road carriageways and verges with speed limits of 40mph or less, footpaths and verges, parks and open spaces maintained by any local authority, burial grounds, school land and a list of specifically designated locations;

- A requirement to keep dogs on leads at all times. This only applies to road carriageways and verges with speed limits of 40mph or less and a list of specifically designated locations; and
 - A dog exclusion requirement. This applies to enclosed areas designated by description, including all fenced-in children's play areas, bowling greens, croquet lawns, tennis courts, sporting or recreational facilities which are signed as dog exclusion areas and a list of specifically designated locations.
- 3.2 All current Dog Control orders will cease in October 2017, automatically being replaced by a PSPO. It would be possible for the Council to adopt a "do nothing" position and enforce on the current powers. This is not considered appropriate because it has the potential to introduce confusion in enforcement as the offences and penalties will be different under the new system to those stated in the current orders. Further, the Council would be unable to make any amendments to the transferred Orders to take account of the changing environment in Huntingdonshire arising from the continued development on new residential areas. Individuals could be enforced against for the offence of breaching a PSPO, enforceable with a fixed penalty of £100, whereas the offence which they are prohibited from committing is differently described and carries a different penalty under the originating Dog Control Order, despite its conversion to a PSPO.

4. CONSULTATION ON DOG CONTROLS

- 4.1 In order to implement a PSPO, the Council is required to carry out a consultation exercise giving a group of statutory consultees and individuals who may be affected the opportunity to make representations.
- 4.2 During July and August 2017, a consultation exercise was undertaken, largely by means of an on-line survey which asked questions about experiences with dog control issues, the underpinning principles of the proposed PSPO and the detail of the proposed controls. The survey was publicised in local media and on the Council's web site. In addition to the on-line survey, the statutory consultees (the Police and Crime Commissioner, the Police Chief Constable) and all Town and Parish Councils in the District were contacted and offered the opportunity to comment. Invitations to comment were also sent to the Kennel Club and Dogs Trust as significant interest groups.
- 4.3 The proposed PSPO was fully endorsed by both the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Police Chief Constable. Written responses were received from 18 Town or Parish Councils, all of which were strongly supportive of the proposed PSPO in terms of the retention of existing controls and the majority in favour of the additional district-wide controls. Only one Parish Council commented that, although wishing to retain the current controls, they did not favour the new measures.
- 4.4 The Kennel Club and Dogs Trust were consulted as major dog interest organisations. Both organisations accepted the need for some measures to control dogs, particularly to act against the minority of irresponsible owners. Both also commented that conditions should not unduly impact upon the activities of responsible owners and well-behaved dogs. The Kennel Club response was broadly supportive of the key measures but stated that they believe strongly that dogs should have the opportunity to exercise off-lead in appropriate locations. They also noted some concerns about enforcement practicalities, specifically whether dog owners would be enforced against if they were not able to demonstrate that they were carrying "poo bags" if there was, in fact a reasonable excuse for this. Dogs Trust responded with a supportive

message endorsing measures on dog fouling, accepting that there are some areas which dogs should be excluded from and areas where dogs should be on leads. They noted that care should be given to ensure that areas are still available for dogs to run off-lead, and supported the measure whereby dogs are required to be placed on lead under direction as they note this targets out of control dogs. A further comment was provided related to conditions setting maximum numbers of dogs being walked by one person but this is not part of the Huntingdonshire proposal.

- 4.5 The results of the on-line survey is attached as Appendix 1 to this report. A total of 355 responses were received to the on-line survey, 60% being dog owners. Views were sought on the following specific issues:-
- Whether they, a member of their family, or someone they know had experienced dog control issues in the past year. 59% stated that problems had been experienced. The most common problems noted were dog fouling (163 responses), dogs running out of control (80), dogs barking (60) and dogs off-lead in controlled areas. Dog attacks were also reported, both on people (15 responses) and on other dogs (45), as were reports of feeling threatened by a dog's behaviour, reported by 40. These problems were reported by both dog owners and non-owners.
 - Whether the Council should implement a new PSPO. 88% responding said they favoured an order covering some aspects of dog control. Asked where controls should apply, 55% felt all conditions should cover the whole district, 40% favoured controls in specified areas and 5% said that there should be no controls anywhere;
 - Whether the Council should require that dog faeces to be picked up and taken away or disposed of in a suitable bin across the whole District. 89% supported this, with a further 11% saying that this should apply to specified areas;
 - Whether persons in control of dogs should be required to carry a suitable receptacle for picking up and disposing of dog faeces, and to demonstrate this on request by an authorised officer. 90% agreed that owners should do this;
 - Whether the Council should require that dogs to be placed on a lead upon request by any authorised officer in specified locations, as per the current designation. 40% agreed with this for specified locations, 51% said this should apply to the whole district;
 - Whether dogs should be required to be on a lead at all times, supported for specified locations by 66%, and be excluded from some specified locations, as per the current designation, supported by 90% of respondents; and
 - Whether there are any other dog controls which the Council should introduce under a PSPO. Only 3% indicated additional controls would be desirable.
- 4.6 As shown in the analysis in Appendix 1, overall responses were strongly in support of the principles underpinning the PSPO and strongly in favour of all of the proposed measures.
- 4.7 When asked about requiring dogs to be on leads in certain locations, 51% of respondents replied that this restriction should apply to the whole district. However, it is considered that this would be a disproportionate measure and would impinge upon the legitimate activities of responsible dog owners so it is recommended that the requirement to have dogs placed on leads remains limited to the locations which currently have this restriction in place.

4.8 Having considered the responses to the consultation exercise, it is clear that both the public and the statutory agencies consulted are of the view that dog control is an ongoing issue and that the formal introduction of a PSPO to help control problems caused by the minority of irresponsible owners and badly behaved dogs is strongly supported. The views expressed by the dog interest groups do not contradict this position but provide reminders that the controls issued must be proportionate and not unduly interfere with the legitimate activities of the law-abiding majority of responsible dog owners.

5. PROPOSED PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER

5.1 It is evident that the vast majority of dog owners are responsible individuals who control their pets and behave in a law abiding manner. It is essential that, in developing dog controls, that the impact upon the majority is minimised and that the irresponsible minority are targeted in a fair and proportionate manner.

5.2 As such, in the light of the consultation exercise and considering the history of dog controls already in place in the District, it is recommended that the following conditions be applied under a new PSPO:-

- The PSPO apply to the whole of Huntingdonshire, with general conditions covering the whole District and additional conditions to apply only in specified locations, similar to the arrangements under the current Dog Control Orders;
- The conditions of the PSPO will not apply to guide dogs or assistance dogs, within defined criteria, the definition being updated to take account of new definitions within the Equality Act 2010. This is largely the same as the current situation;
- A District-wide condition requiring dog faeces to be picked up and taken away or disposed of in a suitable bin (this is more restrictive than the current arrangement, as some parts of the District are not currently covered);
- A District-wide condition requiring persons in control of dogs to be required to carry a suitable receptacle for picking up and disposing of dog faeces, and to demonstrate this on request by an authorised officer (this is an additional condition);
- A District-wide condition requiring dogs to be placed on a lead upon request by any authorised officer (this is the same as the current situation);
- A condition requiring dogs to be kept on a lead at all times in specified locations (this is the same as the current situation- no change is proposed to the specified locations); and
- A condition stating that dogs are not allowed in specified locations (this is the same as the current situation- no change is proposed to the specified locations).

5.3 The proposed wording of the PSPO is attached as Appendix 2 to this report. This lists all locations to which specific controls, i.e. those over and above the general District-wide conditions.

5.4 If deemed necessary, this order can be supplemented at a later time by placing additional conditions on specified areas or by adding new designated areas, should these be required in response to locally evidenced issues, subject to a formal consultation. The PSPO lasts for a maximum of 3 years, so a full review will be required at that time.

6. KEY IMPACTS / RISKS

- 6.1 The key risk relating to this issue relates to the fact that, under the transitional arrangements for the implementation of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, all existing Dog Control Orders convert to PSPOs which continue to hold the current prohibitions and penalties in October 2017 unless replaced by an appropriate PSPO with current penalties. The making of a new PSPO will mitigate this risk.

7. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 7.1 As required under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, if the Committee agrees to the implementation of a new PSPO, it will have to be publicised for a period of 20 days before it comes into force. As such, the proposed PSPO has been drafted to come into effect on 20th October 2017.

8. LINK TO THE CORPORATE PLAN, STRATEGIC PRIORITIES AND / OR CORPORATE OBJECTIVES

- 8.1 Placing effective controls on dogs an irresponsible dog owners links to the strategic priority of Enabling Communities, specifically to the work programme objectives of “ensuring that our streets and open spaces are clean and safe”, “working closely with partners to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour” and providing and protecting quality green space and community facilities within new developments”.

9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The power to issue PSPOs is contained in the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. The Act requires consultation with parties likely to be affected by a new PSPO. The Act includes the Police and Police Authority as statutory consultees.
- 9.2 If a new PSPO is enacted, it will remain in place for a period of up to three years, after which time it will lapse unless renewed. There is no limit to the number of times a PSPO can be renewed. Each renewal will require consultation and formal approval.
- 9.3 If a new PSPO is not enacted, the current Dog Control Orders will convert to being PSPOs but will continue to carry the previous conditions and penalties. These PSPOs will also last for a period of up to three years and lapse if not formally renewed at that time.

10. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 Best practice requires that PSPO conditions are advertised by means of signage in the controlled areas. All areas which are currently subject to the specified controls of the proposed PSPO, namely either the requirement to have dogs on leads or the exclusion of dogs, are already signed to that effect, albeit under the extant Dog Control Orders. Should the proposed PSPO be approved, a programme will be drawn up to replace these with new signs advertising the current conditions and the penalties for breach of the PSPO. This will then be put forward as a funding proposal for 2018-19. It is estimated that the programme of signage installation will involve approx. 250 aluminium/plastic composite signs being manufactured and installed in designated sites with controls which require dogs to be on leads or where dogs are excluded, at a cost of approx. £12,000. This should be a one-off cost, as the signage will be durable and should not require replacement for a significant period.

- 10.2 The District-wide restrictions can be advertised, as currently, by the use of sticker signs displayed on lamp columns under an ongoing agreement with Balfour Beatty. Existing stickers are in stock advertising the controls of the requirement to remove faeces, the requirement to have dogs on leads and the exclusion of dogs. Stocks of these will continue to be maintained from existing Community budgets.
- 10.3 The PSPO, if approved, will be advertised across the District by means of media campaigns and on-line advertising. It is planned to provide generic publicity images which can be made available on demand to Town and Parish Councils for local use. These can be accommodated within existing budgets.
- 10.4 Targeted, intelligence-led enforcement activity will be carried out by officers from the Community Protection and Enforcement team, which was set up last year to deal with a wide range of environmental enforcement issues. The officers in this team are specifically trained in carrying out enforcement activities in a sensitive and proportionate manner and are fully briefed on the need to enforce against wilful anti-social behaviour rather than accidental or justifiable breaches.

11. EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 11.1 In drafting the proposed PSPO, equalities issues have been considered and an Equalities Impact Assessment undertaken. No data exists on the proportion of dog owning residents locally who fall within the protected characteristics of the Equality Act 2010. However, it is considered that the PSPO will have no negative impact on all but one of the protected characteristics. It is considered that the conditions have the possibility to impact adversely on people with disabilities who rely upon assistance dogs. This possibility has been mitigated by the specific exclusion of persons in control of assistance dogs from the scope of the order.

12. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED DECISIONS

- 12.1 The proposed PSPO is considered to be an appropriate and proportionate response to the dog control issues which are being experienced in the District. The proposals have been strongly supported in the statutory consultation. Implementing this PSPO will give a robust framework for future enforcement in this priority area.

13. LIST OF APPENDICES INCLUDED

1. Analysis of the consultation exercise.
2. Proposed Dog Control Public Space Protection Order.

14. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

CONTACT OFFICER

Finlay Flett, Operational Manager, People.
Tel No: 01480 388377
Email: finlay.flett@huntingdonshire.gov.uk

Huntingdonshire District Council Dog Control PSPO Survey**In what capacity are you replying to this consultation?**

Private individual	95.49%	339
Representing a business	0.28%	1
Representing an organisation	4.23%	15

Are you a dog owner?

Yes	59.60%	211
No	40.40%	143

Are you any of the following?

Veterinary professional (any capacity)	1.41%	5
Dog Walker	9.60%	34
Kennel owner	0.28%	1
None of these	88.70%	314

Have you, or a member of your family, or someone you know had any problems regarding dog control in the past year?

Yes (me)	49.30%	175
Yes (a member of my family)	13.80%	49
Yes (someone I know)	20.56%	73
No	40.56%	144

If you answered Yes, was this related to any of the following?

Dog fouling	75.81%	163
Dog running out of control	37.67%	81
Dog barking	31.16%	67
Dog off lead in a controlled area	27.91%	60
Dog attack on a dog or other pet animal	20.93%	45
Dog loose in children's play area	19.53%	42
Threatened by a dog's behaviour	18.60%	40
Stray dog	10.23%	22
Dog attack on a person	6.98%	15
Other	4.65%	10

Do you think that Huntingdonshire should implement an order covering some aspects of dog control?

Yes	88.35%	311
No	11.65%	41

Do you think an order controlling dogs should cover the whole of Huntingdonshire or be limited to specific areas?

All conditions to cover the whole of Huntingdonshire District	55.49%	197
Some conditions everywhere, others in specific areas	23.10%	82
Conditions only in specified areas	15.77%	56
No controls in any areas	5.63%	20

Do you think that dog owners should be required to pick up and remove their dog's faeces (poo)?

Yes, everywhere in Huntingdonshire	88.95%	314
Only in specified areas	10.76%	38
No	0.28%	1

Do you think that dog owners should have to carry something with them to pick up their dog's faeces (poo) at all times?

Yes, everywhere in Huntingdonshire	89.83%	318
Only in specified areas	6.78%	24
No	3.39%	12

Do you think that dogs should be on a lead at all times?

Yes, everywhere in Huntingdonshire	23.10%	82
Only in specified places	65.63%	233
No	11.27%	40

Do you think that dogs should be banned from some places, like enclosed children's play areas?

Yes	90.40%	320
No	9.60%	34

Do you think that Council officers should be able to instruct dog owners to put their dog on a lead?

Yes, everywhere in Huntingdonshire	52.39%	186
Only in specified places	39.44%	140
No	8.17%	29

Do you think that the Council should introduce any other dog control measures?

Yes	3.25%	11
No	74.85%	253

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER (Dog Control) 2017

The Order

Huntingdonshire District Council ('the Council') in exercise of its powers pursuant to Section 59 and 72 of the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 ('the Act') hereby makes the following Order ('the Order') :

1. This Order shall come into operation on **20 October 2017** and shall have effect for a period of 3 years from that date.

The areas to which the Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) applies;

2. This Order relates to the areas (land to which this Order applies) within the administrative District of Huntingdonshire, as shown on the attached maps, and applies to all the land which is open to the air and to which the public are entitled or permitted to have access (with or without payment).
3. For the purposes of this Order, any land which is covered is deemed to be land which is "open to the air" if it is open to the air on at least one side.

Persons who the order applies to

4. For the purposes of this Order a person who habitually has a dog in his possession shall be taken to be in charge of the dog at any time unless at that time some other person is in charge of the dog.
5. Nothing in this Order applies to a person who is in charge of:
 - a. an assistance dog which has been trained to guide a blind person;
 - b. an assistance dog which has been trained to assist a deaf person;
 - c. an assistance dog which has been trained to assist a person who has a disability who has a disability of epilepsy or otherwise affects his mobility, manual dexterity, physical co-ordination or ability to lift, carry or otherwise move everyday objects; or
 - d. an assistance dog which has been trained to assist a person who has a disability (other than one described above) of a prescribed kind.
6. For the purposes of the Order, a "disability" means a condition that qualifies as a disability for the purposes of the Equality Act 2010 and an "assistance dog" has the meaning given by the Equality Act 2010
7. In this Order an 'authorised person' and 'an authorised officer of the Council' means any person authorised in writing for the purposes of this Order by Huntingdonshire District Council (the Council).

Impact of the Order

8. The effect of this Order is to impose the following prohibitions and requirements on land to which this Order applies, specified as follows:

Dog faeces to be picked up and taken away or disposed of in a suitable bin

9. In all land to which this Order applies, specified in Schedule 1 to the Order, if a dog defecates at any time on any part of the land, a person who is in charge of the dog at that time and who fails to remove the faeces from the land forthwith, shall be guilty of an offence unless:
- a. he has a reasonable excuse for failing to do so; or
 - b. the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.
10. For the purposes of this Order:
- a. placing the faeces in a receptacle on the land which is provided for the purpose, or for the disposal of waste, shall be a sufficient removal from the land;
 - b. being unaware of the defecation (whether by reason of not being in the vicinity or otherwise), or not having a device for or other suitable means of removing the faeces shall not be a reasonable excuse for failing to remove the faeces.

Persons in control of dogs to be required to carry a suitable receptacle for picking up and disposing of dog faeces, and to demonstrate this on request by an authorised officer

11. In all land to which this Order applies, specified in Schedule 1, a person who is in charge of the dog shall, on instruction by a constable or authorised officer of the Council, demonstrate to the satisfaction of the constable or authorised officer that he has in his possession a device for or other suitable means of removing the dog's faeces.

Dogs to be placed on a lead upon request by any authorised officer

12. In all land to which this Order applies, specified in Schedule 1, a person in charge of a dog shall be guilty of an offence if, at any time, he does not comply with a direction given to him by a constable or authorised officer of the Council to put and keep the dog on a lead of not more than 2 metres in length unless:
- a. he has a reasonable excuse for failing to do so; or
 - b. the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.
13. A constable or authorised officer of the Council may only give a direction under this Order to put and keep a dog on a lead if such restraint is reasonably necessary to prevent a nuisance or behaviour by the dog likely to cause annoyance or disturbance to any other person on any land to which this Order applies or the worrying or disturbance of any animal or bird.

Dogs to be kept on a lead at all times in specified areas

14. In any land to which this Order applies, as specified in Schedule 2, a person in charge of a dog shall be guilty of an offence if, at any time, he does not keep the dog on a lead of not more than 2 metres in length, unless:
 - a. he has a reasonable excuse for doing so; or
 - b. the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his doing so.

Dogs to be excluded at all times in specified areas

15. In any land to which this Order applies, as specified in Schedule 3, a person in charge of a dog shall be guilty of an offence if, at any time, he takes the dog onto, or permits the dog to enter or to remain on to any part of the land unless:
 - a. he has a reasonable excuse for doing so; or
 - b. the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his doing so.

Enforcement of the conditions of this Order

16. It is an offence for a person without reasonable excuse to do anything prohibited by this Order, or to fail to comply with a prohibition or requirement to which a person is subject to pursuant to this Order.
17. A Police Constable, a Police Community Support Officer or an 'authorised person' may issue a Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) to anyone he or she has reason to believe has committed an offence under this Order.
18. A person found to be in breach of this Order is liable upon summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale (currently £1000.00); or to be made subject to a FPN of £100.00.
19. The Council is satisfied that the conditions set out in Sections 59 and 72 of 'the Act' have been met: that activities carried on in a public place within the authority's area have had a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality; and that the effect, or likely effect, of the activities is, or is likely to be, of a persistent or continuing nature, is, or is likely to be, such as to make the activities unreasonable, and justifies the restrictions imposed by this notice. The Council believe that it is reasonable to impose the above prohibitions and requirements in order to prevent the detrimental effect from continuing, occurring or recurring, and to reduce that detrimental effect or to reduce the risk of its continuance, occurrence or recurrence.
20. Any interested person (an individual who lives or regularly visits or works) in land to which this Order applies who desires to question the validity of this Order on the grounds that the Council had no power to make it or that any requirement of the Act has not been complied with in relation to this Order, may apply to the High Court within six weeks from the date upon which this Order is made.

[Date] Sealed as Deed on behalf of Huntingdonshire District Council

the Common Seal being affixed in the presence of and signed by:

Authorised Signatory

Schedule 1 - the areas subject to the conditions: (1) Dog faeces to be picked up and taken away or disposed of in a suitable bin; (2) Persons in control of dogs to be required to carry a suitable receptacle for picking up and disposing of dog faeces, and to demonstrate this on request by an authorised officer; (3) Dogs to be placed on a lead upon request by any authorised officer.

The entire administrative district of Huntingdonshire.

Schedule 2 - the areas subject to the Dogs On Leads condition

Land Designated by Description

All road carriageways with a speed limit of 40 mph or less and adjoining footpaths and verges.

AND

Land Designated Specifically

Eaton Ford- Riverside Park, St Neots Road, Eaton Ford, St Neots: That part of the lands situated to the south of St Neots Road and west of the River Great Ouse and excluding those fenced areas which contain children's play equipment.

Eaton Ford- Sudbury Meadow, Crosshall Road, Eaton Ford, St Neots: That part of the lands situated to the north of Cavendish Court which abuts Crosshall Road and with the north and west boundary being dense tree/fence lined.

Hartford- Hartford Meadow, Church Lane, Hartford, Huntingdon: That part of the lands known as Hartford Meadow situated between Church Lane and the River Great Ouse, Huntingdon.

Hartford- Marylands Avenue, Hartford, Huntingdon: The whole of the park excluding the area which is fenced and contains children's play equipment.

Houghton- Houghton and Wyton Playing Fields, Houghton. All of the area of land known as Houghton and Wyton Playing Fields, bounded by St Ives Road, Victoria Crescent, Laughtons Lane and the A1123.

Huntingdon- Riverside Park, Riverside Road, Huntingdon: That part of the lands situated to the south of the tree/fence line commencing from a point opposite East Street, leading from Hartford Road to the River Great Ouse and with the southern boundary being opposite the Bridge Hotel with the River Great Ouse to one side and River Road/Hartford Road to the north-west, excluding those fenced areas which contain children's play equipment.

Huntingdon- Hinchbrook Country Park, Hinchbrook Park Road, Huntingdon: That part of the park known as the Wildlife Area consisting of the western part of Bob's Wood and including the triangular plantation to the south of the area. This area lies to the west of a track running north-north-east from a point 250 metres to the west of the Visitors Centre. It is bounded on the north by a housing estate and on the west by a fence.

St Ives- Wilhorn Meadow, London Road, St Ives: The land situated to the east of Bridge Terrace and west of the River Great Ouse, St Ives.

Little Paxton- Playing Fields, High Street, Little Paxton: The whole of the playing field including the access road and car park, excluding the area which is fenced and contains children's play equipment.

Schedule 3 - the areas subject to the Dogs Exclusion condition

Land Designated by Description

All lands within the Council's administrative area that is fenced and/or hedged and/or walled and signed at the entrance as a "dogs exclusion area" (whether the sign uses these particular words or words and/or symbols having like effect) and comprises of: children's play areas; bowling greens; croquet lawns; tennis courts; sporting or recreational facilities; skateboard parks; cycle enclosures; putting greens; or parks.

AND

Land Designated Specifically

Bluntisham- The Bluntisham Recreation Field:- All land within the area bounded by Colne Road and Mill Lane, known as the Bluntisham Recreation Field but not including that part of the playing field which is fenced and contains children's play equipment or the fenced and/or hedged area designated as a dog walking area.

Eaton Ford- Playground, River Road, Eaton Ford, St Neots: That part of the park situated to the south of the Indoor Bowling Club, off River Road, which is fenced and contains children's play equipment.

Eaton Ford- Playground, Riverside Park, St Neots Road, Eaton Ford, St Neots: That part of the park adjoining the main St Neots Road which is fenced and contains children's play equipment.

Eynesbury- Playground, Coneygeare Park, Hardwick Road, Eynesbury, St Neots: That part of the park situated to the north east of the car park which is fenced and contains children's play equipment.

Hartford- Playground, Marylands Avenue, Hartford, Huntingdon: That part of the park which is fenced and contains children's play equipment.

Hartford- Playground, Sapley Road, Hartford, Huntingdon: That part of the park which is fenced and contains children's play equipment.

Huntingdon- Town Park, Brookside, Huntingdon.

Huntingdon - Playground, Nursery Road, Huntingdon: That part of the park which is fenced and contains children's play equipment.

Huntingdon – St John's Churchyard, High Street, Huntingdon.

Huntingdon - Playground, Riverside Park, Riverside Road, Huntingdon: That part of the park adjoining the main car park off Harford Road which is fenced and contains children's play equipment.

Somersham- The Millennium Sports Field, The Trundle, Somersham.

Somersham- Norwood Playing Field: All land within the area bounded by Parkhall Road, The Trundle, Ditchfields, The Green, Green End Walk and Coronation Avenue

known as the Norwood Playing Field but not including that part of the playing field which is fenced and contains children's play equipment.

St Ives- Holt Island, Church Street, St Ives: That part of the island lying south of the Sea Scouts Headquarters facing towards the bridge, St Ives.

St Neots - Playground, Priory Hill Park, Priory Hill Road, St Neots: That part of the park adjoining the southern boundary of the park which is fenced and contains children's play equipment.

Warboys- Adam Lyons Playing Field, Church Road, Warboys