



Dog control Public Space Protection Order

Consultation responses

1. Introduction

Consultation on Canterbury City Council's (CCC) plans to create a new dog control Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) took place between Monday 11 September 2023 and Monday 6 November 2023.

The current PSPO has been in place since 2021 and sets out a standard of behaviour which all dog owners are required to follow.

It enables the council to take enforcement action against those who don't. This includes issuing a current fixed penalty fine of £100 in place or prosecution.

The purpose of the PSPO is to enable the community to address specific dog control issues in public spaces, such as dog fouling in parks or allowing a dog to enter children's play areas. It's not intended to unduly restrict dog owners from responsibly exercising their dogs across the district.

This consultation sought views on the follow areas:

- dog fouling
- dog exclusion
- dogs off lead

These activities replicate the existing Order with the removal and addition to some areas within Schedule 1 and Schedule 2.

Respondents were encouraged to comment on the specific activities listed in the PSPO. For each activity they were asked to do this by outlining:

- whether they had witnessed the activity
- how often they had witnessed the activity
- whether this was a first-hand or anecdotal sighting of the activity.

Respondents were also asked to what extent each activity had a detrimental impact on their quality of life and if the Order would unfairly impact them. They were also asked for general comments in relation to the proposed PSPO.

A total of 172 responses were received.

2. Executive summary

The main findings from the consultation are:

- Of the three main areas consulted on, dog fouling was witnessed by the highest number of people. Over 77% of respondents said that they witnessed this, 93% of which witnessed it first hand.
- The area witnessed by the lowest number of people is dogs within exclusion zones. Only 24% of respondents said that they witnessed this, 95% witnessing it first hand.
- The main location witnessed for all areas within the Order is Tankerton beach or promenade. There were also a number of comments that highlighted Bridge, Canterbury, Toddlers Cove and Whitstable, Long Rock.
- Respondents gave a number of reasons why the three activities have a detrimental effect on their quality of life. The top comments include physical inconvenience when walking (dog fouling), concern of children's safety (dogs fouling and exclusion zones), limit enjoyment of public spaces (dogs off lead).
- Respondents also cited reasons why the PSPO (or Schedule) would unfairly impact them. These included dog owners already picking up after their dogs, dogs already on leads, and dog exclusion zones being easy to avoid.
- A number of other comments were received regarding the PSPO proposal more generally.
- The most frequent of these highlighted that enforcement and signage needs improving.

3. Consultation methodology

Consultation took place between Monday 11 September 2023 and Monday 6 November 2023. The following methods were used to seek views:

- an online questionnaire, which received 167 responses
- a paper version of the questionnaire, none of which was returned
- written representations were also welcomed and five were received.

The consultation was promoted in the following ways:

- an article on the council's newsroom site
- posts on the council's social media channels
- three in-person meetings where council officers were present to answer questions and take suggestions from the public.

Additionally, the following stakeholders were emailed directly to encourage them to respond to the consultation:

- Canterbury Coastal Clinical Commissioning Group
- East Kent Hospitals University NHS Foundation Trust
- Environment Agency
- Kent and Medway CCG (engagement team)
- Kent County Council Head of Paid Service
- Kent County Council Community Wardens
- Kent Fire and Rescue Service
- Kent Police
- Police and Crime Commissioner
- South East Coastal Ambulance Service
- South East Local Enterprise Partnership
- Canterbury 4 Business
- Canterbury Connected Business Improvement District
- Visit Kent
- Canterbury Housing Advice Centre
- Citizens Advice Bureau
- Forward Trust
- Kent Savers Credit Union
- Northgate Ward Community Centre
- Plastic Free Canterbury
- Rising Sun Domestic Abuse
- Red Zebra
- Thanington Neighbourhood Resource Centre
- Active Life
- Canenco
- Canterbury Cathedral
- Canterbury Festival
- Continental Drifts
- Kent Cultural Transformation Board
- Kent Association of Local Councils (KALC)
- Kent County Council Councillors
- Kent County Council Departments
- Kent County Council Arts and Regeneration
- Kent County Council Social Services
- KCC 18+
- Local Democracy Forum - Canterbury District
- MPs
- Blean Initiative
- Canterbury Climate Action Partnership (CCAP)
- Forestry Commission
- Friends of Beverley Meadow
- Friends of Dane John and St Mary de Castro

- Friends of Duncan Down
- Friends of Dukes and Neals Meadow
- Friends of Kingsmead Field
- Friends of Mariners Field (Seasalter)
- Friends of Old Park and Chequers Wood
- Friends of Prospect Field
- Friends of Tankerton Bay
- Friends of the Riverside (Canterbury Riverside Group)
- Friends of Westgate Parks
- Kent and Medway Biological Record Centre
- Kentish Stour Countryside Partnership
- Millstrood Road Allotment Association
- Natural England
- Pilgrims Way Allotment Association
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)
- St Dunstan's Horticultural Society
- Sturry Road Allotment Association
- Thanington Allotment Association
- Wincheap Allotment Association
- Woodland Trust
- Age UK Canterbury
- Canterbury Inter-Faith Association (CANDIFA)
- Disability Advisory Panel (DAP)
- Ethnic Minority Independent Council (EMIC)
- HiKent
- Nigerian Community Association
- Polish Educational Club in Kent (PECK)
- Karibu Community Action Kent
- Kwan Ngei Chinese Association
- Canterbury and District Jewish Community
- Canterbury Muslim Cultural Centre
- Porchlight
- Canterbury Christ Church University
- Canterbury College
- Students Unions
- University for the Creative Arts at Canterbury
- Parish Councils
- Residents Associations
- Catching Lives
- Community Safety Partnership
- East Kent Spatial Development Company
- Local ward councillors
- Dogs Trust Canterbury
- Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA)

4. Findings

NB: Percentages have been rounded to the nearest decimal point

4.1. Questionnaire responses

A total of 167 completed questionnaires were submitted, all of which were submitted online.

4.1.1. Respondent profile

The majority of respondents are residents of the Canterbury district.

Respondent type	Percentage
A resident of the Canterbury district	93% (156)
A visitor to the Canterbury district	-
A worker in the Canterbury district	2% (3)
A business, organisation or community group, please provide the name below	1% (1)
A city, county, parish or town councillor, please specify below	4% (6)
An MP	-
Other, please specify below:	1% (1)
No reply	-

NB: The six responses listed as A city, county, parish or town councillor were received from Bridge Parish Council, Waltham Parish Council, a Chestfield War councillor, a city councillor for Swalecliffe Ward, and Alan Atkinson from Bridge Parish Council. A response was also received from the Friends of Duncan Down and a prospective resident.

The majority of people responding are aged between 55 and 74.

Age	Percentage
Under 18	-
18 to 25	1% (2)
26 to 34	4% (7)
35 to 44	18% (30)

45 to 54	17% (28)
55 to 64	25% (41)
65 to 74	24% (40)
75 to 84	9% (15)
85 and above	-

NB: 4 respondents did not give their age

More females responded than males.

Gender	Percentage
Male	39% (65)
Female	53% (88)
Prefer to self-describe (for example, non-binary, gender fluid etc)	1% (2)
Prefer not to say	6% (10)
No reply	1% (2)

NB: 12 (7%) respondents did not give their gender

4.1.2. Dog fouling

Over three quarters of people stated that they have witnessed dog fouling in the last 12 months.

The most common places that this has been witnessed are Tankerton, specifically along the seafront and promenade, Bridge, Whitstable, and Herne Bay Memorial Park.

The frequency of dog fouling was split, however over half of people said they have witnessed dog fouling more times than they can count.

Over 95% of respondents said they have witnessed dog fouling first-hand.

Whether people have witnessed this	
Yes	77% (129)
No	20% (33)
Don't know	3% (5)

Areas witnessed:

- Tankerton, Seafront / Beach: 7 comments
- Bridge: 6 comments
- Tankerton, Promenade: 6 comments
- Whitstable, Beach and Seafront: 5 comments
- Tankerton, Streets: 5 comments
- Tankerton, Slopes: 5 comments
- Canterbury, Blean Woods: 4 comments
- Bridge, Star Hill: 4 comments
- Herne Bay, Memorial Park: 4 comments
- Whitstable, West Beach: 4 comments
- Whitstable, Long Rock, on the Path Around: 4 comments
- Canterbury, Rough Common: 3 comments
- Canterbury, Centre: 3 comments
- Bridge, High Street: 3 comments
- Bridge, Western Avenue: 3 comments
- Bridge, Recreation Ground: 3 comments
- Herne Bay, Hampton Beach: 3 comments
- Whitstable, Paths Around: 3 comments
- Canterbury, Beverley Meadow: 2 comments
- Canterbury, Royal Parade: 2 comments
- Canterbury, Littlebourne Road: 2 comments
- Canterbury, Whitehall Bridge Road Ct28be: 2 comments
- Canterbury, St Mary De Castro Park: 2 comments
- Bridge, Mill Lane: 2 comments
- Herne Bay, Seafront: 2 comments
- Whitstable, Prospect Field: 2 comments

- Whitstable, Regent Street: 2 comments
- Whitstable, Cromwell Road: 2 comments
- Tankerton, East: 2 comments
- Littlebourne, Field: 2 comments
- Seasalter, Mariners View, Jubilee Park: 1 comment
- Seasalter, Mariners View Estate: 1 comment
- Waltham, Waltham Park, Children's Play Area: 1 comment
- Chartam, Recreation Ground: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Dane John Gardens: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Lansdown Road Footpath: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Toddlers Grove (Cove?) and River Walk: 1 comment
- Canterbury, River Paths From Millers Arms to Barton Mill: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Hawkes Lane: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Barton Ward, Pavements: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Kingsmead Field: 1 comment
- Canterbury, King Street: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Puckle Lane (Just Before It Joins the Dover Road): 1 comment
- Canterbury, St Dunstan's: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Hommersham (Near the Entrance to Sullivan Close): 1 comment
- Canterbury, Pilgrim's Way: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Beverly Meadow: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Spring Lane: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Tannery Field: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Bridge to the Tannery: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Westgate Gardens: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Whitstable Road: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Stour Street: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Vauxhall Avenue: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Wincheap (Cut-through to Bingley Court): 1 comment
- Canterbury, Wincheap (Between Kings Head and Petrol Station): 1 comment
- Canterbury, Chartham Riverwalk: 1 comment
- Fordwich: 1 comment
- Chartham, Candler's Way: 1 comment
- Bridge, Footpath Leading From Churchyard: 1 comment
- Sturry: 1 comment
- Sturry, Community Park: 1 comment
- Herne Bay, Whitstable Road: 1 comment
- Herne Bay, Salisbury Road: 1 comment
- Herne Bay, Central (Park, Seaside, Main Road, Footpaths): 1 comment
- Herne Bay, Beacon Hill: 1 comment
- Herne Bay, Beacon Avenue: 1 comment
- Herne Bay, Station Road: 1 comment
- Herne Bay, Seafront Between Grand Drive and Central Avenue: 1 comment
- Bridge, to Bishops Bourne, Footpath: 1 comment
- Herne Bay, Downs: 1 comment
- Herne Bay, Hampton: 1 comment
- Herne Bay, Broomfield: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Swalecliffe: 1 comment

- Whitstable, Forge Lane: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Harbour Street: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Maydowns Road: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Joy Lane Ct5 4db: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Old Railway Line: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Beach Alley: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Gorrell Valley Reserve: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Stream's Walk: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Crab and Winkle Pathway: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Longreach, on the Grass Area Before Exiting the Beachfront to Plough Lane: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Preston Parade, Slopes: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Public Foot Paths and Stour River Path Between Chartham and Canterbury: 1 comment
- Tankerton, Seafront: 1 comment
- Tankerton, Beach: 1 comment
- Tankerton, Beach (Coast Watch Hut): 1 comment
- Tankerton, Beach Huts Grassy Areas: 1 comment
- Tankerton, to Swalecliffe, Seafront Slopes Beach Huts: 1 comment
- Swalecliffe, St John's Church, on Playing Field: 1 comment
- Chestfield, Recreation Grounds: 1 comment
- Radfall, Radfall Road: 1 comment
- Clowes Wood: 1 comment
- Bishopstone: 1 comment
- The Downs: 1 comment
- Stodmarsh: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Grove Ferry: 1 comment
- Herne Common, Curtis Wood: 1 comment
- Bishopstone, to Reculver, Coastal Path: 1 comment
- Beltinge, Seafront: 1 comment
- Reculver, the Path at the Top Between Reculver Drive Car Park and the Lees: 1 comment
- Reculver, Country Park; 1 comment
- Reculver, Sanderling Park: 1 comment
- Bishopstone, Grass Footpaths: 1 comment
- Bossingham, Behind Scout Hut: 1 comment

How often people have witnessed this	
More times than I can count	44% (57)
10+ times	19% (25)
Five to nine times	16% (21)
Two to four times	17% (22)
Once	3% (4)

Who witnessed this	
Me, this is a first-hand recollection	95% (123)
Someone else, this is hearsay/anecdotal	5% (6)

Respondents were asked to what extent dog fouling has a detrimental effect on their quality of life. This was a reasonably even split between not very much and a great deal, with 37% of respondents saying a fair amount.

The extent to which this has a detrimental effect on people's quality of life	
A great deal	28% (47)
A fair amount	37% (62)
Not very much	25% (42)
Not at all	10% (16)

Respondents were asked why this activity has a detrimental effect on their quality of life and the following comments were received:

- Physical Inconvenience When Walking: 45 comments
- Concern For Children's Safety And Cleanliness: 34 comments
- Negative Aesthetic Impact On The Environment: 31 comments
- Health And Hygiene Concerns: 22 comments
- Nuisance At Recreational Areas (Beaches, Parks, Woods): 13 comments
- General Indifference Or Minimal Impact On An Individual's Life: 13 comments
- Emotional Distress And Mood Disruption: 9 comments
- Challenges Faced By Individuals With Disabilities: 5 comments
- Appearance And Impression To Visitors: 3 comments

Respondents were asked to what extent the PSPO schedule would unfairly impacts people's activities. Over 82% of respondents said not at all or not very much.

The extent to which the schedule will unfairly impact people's activities	
A great deal	9% (15)
A fair amount	10% (16)
Not very much	28% (46)
Not at all	54% (90)

Respondents were asked why the schedule would (or would not) unfairly impact their day-to-day activities and the following comments were received:

- Dog Owner: Already Picks Up After Dog: 28 comments
- Improve Enforcement: 13 comments
- General Support for the PSPO: 12 comments
- Not a Dog Owner: 12 comments
- Don't Remove PSPO From Bridge Recreation Ground: 8 comments
- Dog Owners Should Pickup After Their Dogs: 6 comments
- Dog Fouling Disrupts Children's Play in Restricted Areas: 4 comments
- Less Dog Fouling is Good for the Community: 3 comments
- Dogs Have Enough Walking Routes Outside of PSPO: 2 comments
- Large Number of/More Frequent Clearing of Poo Bins: 2 comments
- Dog Owner: Carries Poo Bags Already: 2 comments
- Fouling is Health Hazard: 2 comments
- Documents Are Missing From Consultation: 1 comment
- Doesn't Use Areas in Pspo: 1 comment
- Ban Extending Leads: 1 comment
- Fouling is a Problem for Other Dogs: 1 comment
- Doesn't Carry Bags if Dog Doesn't Need to Poo: 1 comment
- Visitors will Benefit from the PSPO: 1 comment
- PSPO Unnecessary: Fouling is Already an Offence: 1 comment
- Concerns About Overzealous Enforcement: 1 comment
- Many Elderly Can't Pick Up After Their Dogs: 1 comment

Respondents were asked for any other comments about the PSPO, or any suggestions on other ways to deal with dog fouling. The following comments were received:

- Enforcement improve generally: 35 comments
- Poo bins, more generally: 9 comments
- N/A or Unclear: 6 comments
- Improve signage: 6 comments
- Dogs on lead in all public spaces: 6 comments
- Enforcement, improve out of hours: 5 comments
- Introduce dog licences: 3 comments
- General support of PSPO: 3 comments
- Improve cleaning of poo: 3 comments
- Empty dog poo bins more often: 2 comments
- Bridge Recreation Ground, No Dogs on Main Body of Recreation Ground, Dogs Allowed on Other Parts of the Recreation Ground: 2 comments
- Enforcement, Publicise Prosecutions: 2 comments
- Enforcement, Improve in Non-Urban Areas (Villages, Rural Areas): 2 comments
- Elderly and Disabled Need Open Spaces Like Parks to Walk Their Dogs, as Footpaths Are Unsafe for Them: 2 comments
- Free Poo Bags at Dog Friendly Establishments, Dog Walking Routes: 2 comments
- Dogs are Dangerous: 2 comments
- Exclude Dogs in All Children's Areas: 2 comments
- PSPO Won't Change Dog Owners Behaviour: 2 comments
- Dogs Should Be Muzzled: 2 comments
- Schedule 1 and 2 Missing From Consultation: 1 comment
- Bins, Stour Way: 1 comment

- Dogs on Leads on All High Streets: 1 comment
- Dane John Gardens, No Dogs Allowed on Grass Due to Fouling: 1 comment
- Bridge, Dogs in Children's Fenced Off Play Area: 1 comment
- Proper Disposal of Poo Bags Should Be Specified in Orders: 1 comment
- Signs Too Small, Separate Maps Must Be Made Available: 1 comment
- Enforcement, Use Security Cameras: 1 comment
- Enforcement, Larger Fines: 1 comment
- More Promotion of PSPO: 1 comment
- PSO Should Cover More Areas: 1 comment
- Large Bans Are Bad for the Environment as They Increase Driving: 1 comment
- Bins, Hambrook Marshes: 1 comment
- Protection Orders Should Be Confined to Children's Play Areas: 1 comment
- Pronouns, Use They Not He: 1 comment
- Dog Fouling a Problem When Dark (Mornings Evenings): 1 comment
- Dogs on Lead Order Not Enforced: 1 comment
- Security Cameras: 1 comment
- Dogs Should Be Chipped: 1 comment
- Improve Public Messaging: 1 comment
- Only Supports Dogs on Leads Order for Small Areas: 1 comment
- Dog PSPO is a Low Priority: 1 comment
- Tankerton Slopes Pier Road, Too Many Dogs: 1 comment
- Tankerton Bay, 1st May to 30 Sept is Widely Disobeyed: 1 comment
- Keep Protection Order on Recreation Ground (Bridge?): 1 comment
- Fenced Off Dog Areas Should Be Provided: 1 comment
- Dogs Are Off Lead at Long Rock SSSI: 1 comment
- Ban Retractable Leads: 1 comment

4.1.3. Dogs off lead in a restricted area

Over half of people stated that they have witnessed dogs off lead in a restricted area in the last 12 months.

The most common places that this has been witnessed are Whitstable, specifically Long Rock, Westgate gardens in Canterbury and Tankerton beach.

Overall, 65% of respondents said that they have witnessed dogs off lead either more times than they can count or 10+ times.

The majority of respondents said that they've witnessed dogs off lead in restricted areas first-hand.

Most people think that 2 metres is an appropriate lead length with over half of respondents agreeing.

Whether people have witnessed this	
Yes	53% (89)
No	35% (59)
Don't know	11% (19)

Areas witnessed:

- Whitstable, Long Rock: 25 comments
- Canterbury, Westgate Gardens: 7 comments
- Tankerton, Beach: 6 comments
- Canterbury, Toddler's Cove: 6 comments
- Tankerton, Promenade Restricted Area: 4 comments
- Canterbury, Dane John Gardens: 4 comments
- Bridge, Recreation Ground: 3 comments
- Tankerton: 2 comments
- Herne Bay, Beach Between Lane End And Pier: 2 comments
- Herne Bay, Reculver Sea Front: 2 comments
- Herne Bay, Pier: 2 comments
- Canterbury, High Street: 2 comments
- Canterbury, Dane John Mews: 2 comments
- Bridge: 1 comment
- Bridge, Star Hill: 1 comment
- Bridge, roads: 1 comment
- Tankerton, Promenade: 1 comment
- Tankerton, Coast watch hut: 1 comment
- Tankerton, Bay Summer Dog Free Areas: 1 comment
- Tankerton, Beach Between The Street And Pier Avenue: 1 comment
- Whitstable, seafront: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Cromwell Road: 1 comment

- Whitstable, Regent Street: 1 comment
- Herne Bay, Promenade: 1 comment
- Herne Bay, Reculver Towers: 1 comment
- Herne Bay, Seafront: 1 comment
- Canterbury, St Peters Street: 1 comment
- Canterbury, City Walls: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Saint George's Tower/clock Tower, Underpass: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Tyler Hill, Summer Lane Playing Field: 1 comment
- Canterbury, City Centre, Near Police Station: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Spring Lane, King George Playing Field: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Longport, Old Graveyard: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Cromwell Road: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Garden Of St Mary De Castro: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Church Lane, St Mildred's: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Stour Street: 1 comment

How often people have witnessed this	
More times than I can count	38% (34)
10+ times	27% (24)
Five to nine times	15% (13)
Two to four times	17% (15)
Once	3% (3)

Who witnessed this	
Me, this is a first-hand recollection	100% (89)
Someone else, this is hearsay/anecdotal	-

Do you think that two metres is an appropriate lead length?	
Yes	62% (104)
No	23% (39)
Don't know	14% (24)

Respondents were asked to elaborate on this question by providing reasons or other suggestions for dog lead length. The following comments were received:

- 2 Metres Ok: 22 comments
- Less Than 2 Metres: 12 comments
- More Than 2 Metres: 9 comments
- Extending/long Leads Are a Physical Hazard: 6 comments
- Depends on Size or Nature of Dog: 6 comments
- 1 Metre: 4 comments

- Leads Unnecessary for Under Control Dogs: 4 comments
- Use Muzzles, Leads Alone Aren't Enough: 4 comments
- There Are Too Many Restricted Areas: 3 comments
- Extending Leads: Ban in Restricted Areas: 3 comments
- Extending Leads Don't Control Dogs: 3 comments
- 3 Metres: 2 comments
- Extending Leads Are Ok: 2 comments
- Extending Leads: Do They Comply in Restricted Areas?: 2 comments
- 1.5 Metres: 1 comment
- More Than 3 Metres: 1 comment
- Extending Leads Only in Large Spaces: 1 comment
- Context Dependent: Whatever Length Stops Harm: 1 comment

Respondents were asked if dogs off lead had an impact on their quality of life. All in all, under half of people said not at all or not very much.

The extent to which this has a detrimental effect on people's quality of life	
A great deal	25% (28)
A fair amount	26% (29)
Not very much	29% (33)
Not at all	20% (23)

Respondents were asked why this activity has a detrimental effect on their quality of life and the following comments were received:

- Causes Mental Distress/limit Enjoyment of Public Spaces: 32 comments
- No/limited Issues From Dogs Off Lead: 28 comments
- Difficulty for Dogs on Leads: 15 comments
- Frightening or Dangerous for Children: 15 comments
- Disturbance to Wildlife/Long Rock: 12 comments
- Physical Hazard/threat: 8 comments
- Many Dogs Are Poorly Trained: 8 comments
- Fouling More likely to be Cleared up if Dogs On Lead: 5 comments
- Danger to the Elderly: 3 comments
- Dogs Off Lead Are Good for Quality of Life: 3 comments
- Dog Owner: Avoids Restricted Areas: 2 comments
- Dogs Should Be on Leads in All Public Areas: 2 comments
- Improve Signage: 2 comments
- Keeping Dogs on Leads Limits Their Ability to Exercise: 1 comment
- Dislike of Dogs for Cultural Reasons: 1 comment
- Use Time Limits With Zones, Late at Night Ok Off Lead: 1 comment

Respondents were asked to what extent the PSPO schedule would unfairly impacts people's activities. The vast majority said not at all, or not very much.

The extent to which the schedule will unfairly impact people's activities	
A great deal	14% (24)
A fair amount	14% (24)
Not very much	23% (38)
Not at all	49% (81)

Respondents were asked why the schedule would (or would not) unfairly impact their day-to-day activities and the following comments were received:

- Dog Already on Lead: 10 comments
- Dogs Will Have Less Exercise: 8 comments
- General Support for Rules: 7 comments
- Using Leads Isn't Hard: 6 comments
- Not a Dog Owner: 6 comments
- Objection to Controls on Dog Owners: 5 comments
- Dog Owners Should Expect to Obey the Rules: 4 comments
- Lead Unnecessary Dog is Well Controlled Off the Lead: 3 comments
- Improve Enforcement: 2 comments
- Already Plenty of Land Without Restrictions: 2 comments
- Restricted Areas Are Already Avoided: 2 comments
- Dogs Should Not Be Allowed on Bridge Recreation Ground: 2 comments
- Dogs Off Lead Disturb Wildlife: 2 comments
- Allow Dogs Off Leads Prior to 9am and After 6pm So Those With a Dog in the City Centre: 1 comment
- Dogs Are Good for Well-being: 1 comment
- Families With Dogs Can't Use Children's Play Areas: 1 comment
- Dog Owner, Uses Extender Lead: 1 comment
- Canterbury City, All Parks Dogs on Lead, and More Dedicated Off Lead Areas: 1 comment
- Dogs on Leads is Commonplace in Some Countries: 1 comment
- Dog Owners Should Choose a Lead: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Toddler's Cove Path is Ok for Dogs Off Lead: 1 comment
- Dogs and Non Dog Owners Can Share the Space: 1 comment
- Introduction of Rules Would Cause Friction: 1 comment
- Improve Signage: 1 comment

Respondents were asked for any other comments about the PSPO, or any suggestions on other ways to deal with dogs off lead. The following comments were received:

- Improve Enforcement Improve Signage: 20 comments
- N/A or Unclear: 12 comments
- Create Fenced Parks for Dogs Off Leads/More Dedicated Dog Friendly Areas: 9 comments
- Concerns about Over-zealous or Incorrect Enforcement: 6 comments
- Remove PSPO: 3 comments
- More Poo Bins: 2 comments

- Signage, Use More Polite Notices for Long Rock, Be aware of Elderly and Children
Dog Licence: 2 comments
- Make the Riverside path between Morrisons and Toddlers Cove a bike free area. Divert bike users and those that do not wish to encounter dogs to Whitehall road from the car park behind Toddlers cove People in Cities as Very Reliant on Off Lead Parks: 2 comments
- This Consultation is Unclear Publicise Enforcement: 2 comments
- Improve Early and Late Hours Enforcement Bridge Parish Council Don't Understand Where the Current PSPO is Tankerton, Can May-Oct order be lessened by using a time restriction (not all day?) e.g. restricted from 9am to 5pm: 1 comment
- Multitask Enforcement (Parking and Dogs): 1 comment
- Dogs on Lead at Beach: 1 comment
- Dogs Are Becoming a Threat to Children: 1 comment
- Remove River Walk From PSPO: 1 comment
- General Supportive Comments: 1 comment
- Mandatory Dog Training: 1 comment
- Free Poo Bags: 1 comment
- Do not employ private contractors: 1 comment
- Bridge Recreation Ground, create a designated area for dogs: 1 comment
- Dogs Don't need to be on Leads to be Under Control: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Protect Long Rock SSSI from Dogs: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Long Rock, Create Fenced Off Area For Dogs: 1 comment
- Dogs on leads on all High Streets: 1 comment
- Riverside Walk Zones Are Unclear: 1 comment
- Toddlers Cove Zones are unclear: Whole Park or Just Children's Play Area?: 1 comment

4.1.4. Dog exclusion

Over half of people stated that they have not witnessed dogs in an exclusion zone, however nearly a quarter of people have.

The most common places that this has been witnessed are Bridge Recreation Ground and Toddlers Cove in Canterbury.

In total, 34% of people said that they have witnessed dogs in an exclusion zone between 2 and 4 times. The vast majority of people have witnessed this first-hand.

Whether people have witnessed this	
Yes	24% (40)
No	60% (100)
Don't know	16% (27)

Areas witnessed:

- Bridge, Recreation Ground: 13 comments
- Canterbury, Toddler's Cove: 2 comments
- Whitstable, Mariner's View, Jubilee Park: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Westmead, Recreation Ground Children's Play Area 1
- Reculver, Country Park In The Play Area: 1 comment
- Herne Bay, Hampton Play Park: 1 comment
- Canterbury, CT2 7DL, Hales Place Playground: 1 comment
- Tankerton, Beach: 1 comment
- Tankerton, Beach In Summer: 1 comment
- Canterbury, Toddlers Cove: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Plough Lane Park: 1 comment
- Herne Bay, CT6 6SU, Reculver Country Park: 1 comment
- Herne Bay, Reculver: 1 comment
- Whitstable, Long Rock: 1 comment
- Tankerton, Bay: 1 comment
- Between Herne Bay And Reculver: 1 comment

How often people have witnessed this	
More times than I can count	20% (8)
10+ times	20% (8)
Five to nine times	13% (5)
Two to four times	35% (14)
Once	13% (5)

Who witnessed this	
Me, this is a first-hand recollection	95% (38)
Someone else, this is hearsay/anecdotal	5% (2)

Respondents were asked if dog exclusion zones have an effect on their quality of life. A clear majority said either not at all or not very much. Only 19% said a great deal.

The extent to which this has a detrimental effect on people's quality of life	
A great deal	19% (32)
A fair amount	10% (17)
Not very much	23% (38)
Not at all	48% (80)

Respondents were asked why this activity has a detrimental effect on their quality of life and the following comments were received:

- Exclusion Zones Are Easily Avoided/Have Minimal Impact: 19 comments
- Dogs Prohibit Use Of Children's Play Areas/Concerns About Children And Dogs: 11 comments
- Dogs Are A Problem For People Using Recreational Areas: 10 comments
- Dogs Increase Fouling Which Is A Health Risk: 3 comments
- No Problem Seen With Dogs In Exclusion Zones: 3 comments
- Does Not Support Exclusion Zones: 3 comments
- Difficult For Families/Single Parents Who Can't Take Dogs To Children's Play Areas: 2 comments
- Dogs are Distressing: 2 comments
- Dog Exclusion Zones Are A Limited Issue: 2 comments
- People Can Walk Their Dogs Elsewhere: 2 comments
- Dogs In Exclusion Zones Affect Daily Activities: 1 comment
- Dogs Within Exclusion Zones Are Well Behaved: 1 comment
- Improve Enforcement: 1 comment
- Dogs Won't Be Able To Exercise: 1 comment

Respondents were asked to what extent the PSPO schedule would unfairly impacts people's activities. Over half of respondents said not at all, with only 15% saying it would unfairly impact them a great deal.

The extent to which the schedule will unfairly impact people's activities	
A great deal	15% (25)

A fair amount	11% (18)
Not very much	17% (28)
Not at all	58% (96)

Respondents were asked why the schedule would (or would not) unfairly impact their day-to-day activities and the following comments were received:

- Exclusion Zones Are Easy To Avoid: 14 comments
- Removal Of Area Will Limit Use Of Recreational Areas By Non Dog Owners: 10 comments
- Dogs Limits Use Of Children's Play Areas/Concerns About Children And Dogs: 8 comments
- Dog Owner Avoid the Zones: 6 comments
- Difficult For Families With Dogs To Use Children's Play Areas: 3 comments
- Dogs In Exclusion Zones Not A Problem: 3 comments
- Against Restrictions On Dog Owners: 3 comments
- Concerns Over Ability To Exercise Dogs: 2 comments
- Difficulty Finding Places To Walk Dog: 2 comments
- Dogs Can Be Walked Elsewhere: 2 comments
- General Support For Rules: 1 comment
- Poor Enforcement: 1 comment

Respondents were asked for any other comments about the PSPO, or any suggestions on other ways to deal with dogs in restricted areas. The following comments were received:

- N/A Unclear: 9 comments
- Improve Enforcement Improve Signage: 10 comments
- Bridge, Zone Should Remain In Place: 5 comments
- Promote Awareness Of PSPO: 2 comments
- Reculver, Better Signage: 2 comments
- Zones Are Difficult For Families With Dogs Use Children's Play Areas: 2 comments
- General Support For PSPO: 2 comments
- Bridge, Include Recreation Ground In Zone Introduce Dog Licences: 2 comments
- Fix Gates On Children's Play Areas Bridge, Parish Council Should Have Been Asked About This Consultation: 2 comments
- Bridge, Park Signage Should State That The Ban Only Applies To The Children's Area Improve Signage, Whitstable, Long Rock: 1 comment
- Herne Cemetery, Allow Dogs On Leads: 1 comment
- Toddlers Cove, Delineate Zones Better: 1 comment
- Improve Education: 1 comment
- Allow Dogs On Leads Passing Through Exclusion Zones: 1 comment
- Create Designated Areas For Dog Walkers: 1 comment
- Concerns About Children: 1 comment
- Tankerton, Extend Zone In The Summer Months From To Beach Level With Tankerton Sailing Club To The Street. Dogs Should Not Be Allowed From Pier Avenue To The Tankerton Sailing Club During The Summer Months: 1 comment

4.2 Evidence on specific locations within Schedule 1

The following locations were listed within the consultation to be removed from Schedule 1. Below is a summary of all the comments specifically mentioning these locations

Paths of the Riverside Walk, St Radigund's

- Disagree to remove this location from Schedule 1: 3 comments
- Approve to remove this location Schedule 1: 2 comments
- Witnessed dogs off lead within Riverside Walk: 1 comment

The public footpath within Whitstable Cemetery, Whitstable

There were 0 comments relating specifically to this location

Westgate Gardens

- Disagree to remove this location from Schedule 1: 2 comments
- Approve to remove this location from Schedule 1: 1 comment

Toddlers Cove

- Disagree to remove this location from Schedule 1: 2 comments
- Approve to remove this location from Schedule 1: 1 comment

Reculver Towers Heritage Area

- Disagree to remove this location from Schedule 1: 5 comments
- Approve to remove this location from Schedule 1: 0 comments

Sturry Green, Mill Road

- Witnessed dog fouling in this location: 1 comment

Promenade Herne Bay Pier to Land End

Evidence on this location from respondents comments is not possible to include as the area is too specific

Promenade from Neptune Jetty westwards to Herne Bay Pier

Evidence on this location from respondents comments is not possible to include as the area is too specific

4.3 Evidence on specific locations within Schedule 2

The following locations were listed within the consultation to be removed from Schedule 2. Below is a summary of all the comments specifically mentioning these locations

Play area The Maltings, Enclosed, Littlebourne

- Disagree to remove this location from Schedule 2: 1 comment
- Approve to remove this location from Schedule 2: 0 comments

Play area Black Griffin Lane Enclosed

0 comments were made on this location specifically

Play area Toddlers Cove

- To include within Schedule 2: 2 comments

Sturry Road Community Park Garden Area Northgate

0 comments were made on this location specifically relating to schedule 2

Bridge Recreation Ground

- Allow dog walkers on the recreational ground: 1 comment
- Do not allow dog walkers on the recreational ground: 4 comments

4.4. Written representations

A total of five written representations were received.

4.4.1. Kent Police & Crime Commissioner

The Commissioning Project Officer to the Kent Police & Crime Commissioner submitted the following comments on the PCC's behalf via email:

[...]Thank you for your email concerning the review of the Public Space Protection Orders (PSPO) in Canterbury.

I have asked my office to make contact with the Canterbury District Commander regarding their views and potential involvement. The update has been positive. I trust that the order will have a minimal impact on front line policing and predominately be supported through Canterbury City Council.

The public consultation is due to finish on 6th November 2023, and I am happy to provide my provisional support to the proposed order.
I look forward to hearing an update in due course.

4.4.2. A resident

A resident submitted the following comments via email:

[...]Currently there is a seasonal control order (a person in charge of a dog shall at all times keep that dog on a lead of no more than two metres in length) in place in Tankerton at promenade level covering the stretch from Pier Ave west to The Street. I would like to see this extended at the eastern end so that it runs an additional couple of hundred metres up to Tankerton Bay Sailing Club ("TBSC") i.e. TBSC to The Street.

The reason is that when dog walkers head easterly along the promenade the responsible ones adhere to the Order but unleash the dog in line with Pier Avenue just before passing the beach huts. Young families visiting the huts don't appreciate it when a dog tries to play and use it's pent up energy with them on the beach. It can be very scary for children who do not have a dog in the family to encounter what is to them a large unknown animal running directly at them.

I'm fine with the seasonality of the existing order given greater public use during warmer months. It is the protection afforded to youngsters at beach huts near The Street that I seek parity with for my family.

4.4.3. A resident

A resident submitted the following comments via email:

[...]I understand that the effect of this proposed Order in the village of Bridge would be that dogs

would be banned only from the fenced off children's play area on the recreation ground. Currently, dogs are banned from the whole area of Bridge rec.

I don't see a need, in Bridge, to extend dog access on the rec. There are many well used alternative walks in our semi rural parish. There is no need to increase the risk of adverse human/dog interactions, nor increase the potential for zoonotic disease exposure via dog faeces contamination in children and people playing sports on the recreation ground. I do think that the differing community needs should be balanced and I have seen provision of dog parks in urban areas (albeit, mainly abroad) where ability to let pets run around freely is more limited. They seem to work very well. However, I don't really see that this is essential in our current local environment.

4.4.4. A resident

A resident submitted the following comments via email:

[...]with reference to previous correspondence, I am enclosing an article in which I recently came across in an edition of the local NET magazine. Please could the important points made in this article be raised when the order is being reviewed.

4.4.5. Dogs Trust

The Dogs Trust submitted the following comments via email:

[...]Dogs Trust has been made aware that Canterbury City Council is currently consulting on the extension of its series of Public Space Protection Orders. As the UK's largest dog welfare charity, we would like to make some comments for consideration.

Dogs Trust's Comments

1. Re; Fouling of Land by Dogs Order:

- Dogs Trust consider 'scooping the poop' to be an integral element of responsible dog ownership and would fully support a well-implemented order on fouling. We urge the Council to enforce any such order rigorously. In order to maximise compliance, we urge the Council to consider whether an adequate number of disposal points have been provided for responsible owners to use, to consider providing free disposal bags and to ensure that there is sufficient signage in place.
- We question the effectiveness of issuing on-the-spot fines for not being in possession of a poo bag and whether this is practical to enforce.

2. Re; Dog Exclusion Order:

- Dogs Trust accepts that there are some areas where it is desirable that dogs should be excluded, such as children's play areas, however we would recommend that exclusion areas are kept to a minimum and that, for enforcement reasons, they are restricted to enclosed areas. We would consider it more difficult to enforce an exclusion order in areas that lack clear boundaries.
- Dogs Trust would highlight the need to provide plenty of signage to direct owners to alternative areas nearby in which to exercise dogs.

3. Re; Dog Exclusion Order and beaches:

- With phone calls often being made to the RSPCA and Police alerting to dogs being left in hot cars in coastal areas, we would urge you to consider the danger animals may be put in, and the difficult decisions owners have to make, by not being allowed to take their dogs onto the beach.
- If the Council does choose to implement this order, Dogs Trust would encourage looking into a compromise between beach goers and dog owners, e.g. allowing dogs onto the beach in the evenings or early mornings, or having dog friendly sections on the beaches.
- Strict dog exclusion restrictions can also lead to a decrease in dog friendly tourism for businesses along the coast, which in turn could have a negative impact on the local economy.

4. Re; Dog Exclusion and sport pitches

- Excluding dogs from areas that are not enclosed could pose enforcement problems - we would consider it more difficult to enforce an exclusion order in areas that lack clear boundaries.
- We feel that exclusion zones should be kept to a minimum, and that excluding dogs from all sports pitches for long stretches of the year is unnecessary. In some cases sports pitches may account for a large part of the open space available in a public park, and therefore excluding dogs could significantly reduce available dog walking space for owners.
- We would urge the Council to consider focusing its efforts on reducing dog fouling in these areas, rather than excluding dogs entirely, with adequate provision of bins and provision of free disposal bags

5. Re; Dogs on Leads Order:

- Dogs Trust accept that there are some areas where it is desirable that dogs should be kept on a lead.
- Dogs Trust would urge the Council to consider the Animal Welfare Act 2006 section 9 requirements (the 'duty of care') that include the dog's need to exhibit normal behaviour patterns – this includes the need for sufficient exercise including the need to run off lead in appropriate areas. Dog Control Orders should not restrict the ability of dog keepers to comply with the requirements of this Act.
- The Council should ensure that there is an adequate number, and a variety of, well sign-posted areas locally for owners to exercise their dog off-lead.

6. Re; Dogs on Lead by Direction Order:

- Dogs Trust enthusiastically support Dogs on Leads by Direction orders (for dogs that are considered to be out of control or causing alarm or distress to members of the public to be put on and kept on a lead when directed to do so by an authorised official).
- We consider that this order is by far the most useful, other than the fouling order, because it allows enforcement officers to target the owners of dogs that are allowing them to cause a nuisance without restricting the responsible owner and their dog. As none of the other orders, less fouling, are likely to be effective without proper enforcement we would be content if the others were dropped in favour of this order.

*the full response has not been included within this document

4.5. Public meeting

A total of three public meetings was held in the following locations:

- South Quay Shed, Harbour, Whitstable CT5 1AB, on Wednesday 11 October, 5pm to 7pm
- Herne Bay Baptist Church, High St, Herne Bay CT6 5LA, on Wednesday 18 October, 5pm to 7pm
- Tower House, Westgate Gardens, Canterbury, CT1 2DB, on Wednesday 1 November, 5pm to 7pm.

These events were promoted via email to a wide array of stakeholders on the council's newsroom website as well as social media channels.

4.5.1. Whitstable event

The following comments were raised at this event:

Signage

- E-bikes on pathways in Tankerton are dangerous, there should be more signage to stop offenders
- clearer shared pathways needed
- In order to make it less arguable that someone isn't aware of the band, paint a bold yellow line all the way along the dog ban space.
- Signage needed
- Protected site at the bottom of tankerton slopes needs better signage as dogs walk along there

Enforcement

- cameras could pick up some of these offenders
- The West end of Tankerton has a set of orders and the Eastern end doesn't, there are minimal enforcement measures taken along there. Often find dog fouling. Signage can be improved, even if this is timed to certain points in the day.
- Enforcement is needed in Tankerton (2 comments)
- Do officers have flexibility to attend the coast when it gets busy?
- Other residents informing visitors that are breaking PSPO rules
- Whitstable residents feel that the attention is based on the City and not the coast. If the city is going to continue to be prioritised to the coast, there needs to be time and money to reflect that

Evidence based comments

- bike riders are dangerous along the seafront
- some dogs you see are out of control but not often
- The issue of reckless cycling was raised and proposed to go into the coastal order, unfortunately we had councillors who didn't want this and for that reason it was shelved.
- Dogs are not in control of extendable leads, often dogs are out of control, approaching groups of people and sea swimmers left vulnerable.

- On part of the beach when orders didn't apply, there were dogs going around and urinating on clothes left by swimmers on the beach
- People often do not pick up after their dog
- Extendable leads often means the dog is still out of control, dogs can get to full speed after 2m, this means the lead will be out of the owner's hand
- People have been attacked by dog walkers on Lock Rock not abiding by the rule

Suggestions

- Say that the dogs are must be on the lead on the path, ban them from the shingle
- Ban people from bringing their dogs to the beach in the Summer, especially when it's too hot. Educate them on the dangers.
- Blanket ban from May - Sept in Tankerton. It's not fair on dog walkers, could it be timed to certain busy points in the day. It's the irresponsible owners that are causing the issues.
- It states from the high tide mark, this map is very linear, it doesn't match the hightide mark

Questions

All questions were answered during the event, the answers were not recorded.

- There is an increase in commercial dog walkers who have multiple dogs, you can't watch this many dogs at a time. Is there a requirement if you can't walk anywhere in a public place with more than 4 dogs?
- Do you have licence for commercial dog walkers, this is different to boarding care?
- Long Rock, what is the current order there? Is it being dealt with separately because of it's status
- If all the dog owners got together and disagreed with the consultation, at what point would you ignore these comments?
- Can we put signs up on posts that are owned by KCC?
- What is the format of the next level of consultation?
- Is there any feedback on the Long Rock dog control order?
- Coastal management plan, will this be reviewed?

Other

- schedules aren't clear to see when filling in the consultation online
- The stretch from toilet block to the skate park, this is a very busy part of the beach and a high dog population.
- This won't impact visitors, it will impact locals.
- This all needs to be balanced, we have only less than half of a mile of restrictions, the rest is unrestricted. There are people that do want to come to the beach and don't want dogs there. The beach is a blue flag beach.
- Dog Trust do dog education in schools too

4.5.2. Herne Bay event

The following comments were raised at this event:

- No map included in the schedule within the consultation
- No mention of Bridge at all unless you fill in the survey and you don't get any information
- It's a busy recreation ground with various users throughout the year, including regular sports activities.
- The last thing we want on the recreation ground is dogs being able to run free on there
- One single person is making a fuss at wanting to allow dogs on the field
- Locals came to a Parish council meeting asking us to not allow dogs on the field
- The restrictions are poor and we strongly disagree
- By any consultation process you would have contacted the Parish, no one was contacted, we only found out by hearing about it through another Parish
- We ask you enforce the ban over the entire recreation ground
- Other local recreational grounds that allow dogs can no longer play sports on there due to dog fouling
- There are other spaces to walk your dog within Bridge, we need to protect this area
- Strong message about the enforcement order needs to be in place across the entire recreation ground
- There needs to be more signage and more enforcement

4.5.3. Canterbury event

The following comments were raised at this event:

Signage

- Signs were repeatedly removed at Long Rock, we need better signage
- Signs at Pegwell Bay work well
- Paths of the riverside walk in Canterbury, can this be made clearer as to what area you mean?
- There is very clear signage in Minnis Bay, this was clearly dog owners split with dog free zones.
- As you walk into the tannery field it says dogs must be under control but it isn't specific, some signage with other antisocial behaviours, first signage you get to dogs on lead it when you get to westgate gardens. Moving forward i'd hope the signs around the city would be clearer

Enforcement

- Long Rock area needs monitoring to see the amount of misbehaving dog owners
- Council would instal fencing around the paths at Long Rock if the reports of offenders go up
- Fences need to be there to protect the birds at Long Rock
- Bridge PC last Oct, we voted we wished for the ban on the rec to continue, there is one individual for the ban to be removed. We're a democracy, if the results show they want the rec to be lifted then fair play, but if the majority want the ban supported then we should enforce it.

Evidence based comments

- Some of the areas of exclusion on the coast protect the nesting birds, understandable that there is conflicting interest with biodiversity.
- I have experienced where the government guidelines for enforcement were not followed with that order
- You need to prioritise wildlife protection
- Are you aware Whitstable is unusual and there is a high population of dogs present?
- It needs to be looked at in a special way
- Worried about the amount of dog mess on the rec in Bridge
- The officers could be vulnerable, the officer we met was vile, if we had not been nice people she could have ended up in a horrible situation. They need to be careful how they approach people
- Dog foul bins are not emptied often enough

Suggestions

- Dogs allow people to go outside and are a lifeline to some people, you need a public space if you live in flat or small garden courtyards. It would be good to have areas where you can have a dog only zone
- Suggestion to Rebecca Booth regarding a dog friendly location. Direct cyclers up Whitehall Road so that the bath between Toddlers Cove and Morrisons can be a dog zone without cyclists.
- Visited Pegwell Bay, they have a dog specific area, fenced off, the only issue is people leaving their dog fouling but this does work well. Can the same be duplicated at Long Rock, where there is a large recreation green to allow dogs to run free
- Do not agree with the wording of the consultation, this needs to be changed to not be leading
- In responded the questionnaire doesn't capture many details on the person filling it out
- Laminate a QR code and put it in a park
- If the majority of the village want access to dogs on the rec, could we have a time of monitoring this to ensure it is working
- KCC has a process where they take in the comments and proposals, then come up with their proposals and residents can then react to these before being decided.
- Timed zones where dogs are allowed and not allowed

Questions

All questions were answered during the event, the answers were not recorded.

- How much of a nuisance is dog control, do you receive many complaints?
- How would you advise members of the public to engage with people that are in breach of the order?
- In the last 3 years, how many fixed penalties have been sanctioned?
- When you have national enforcement services, how often do you quality control their approach?
- Does the camera footage mean that if someone puts the dog on the lead but they are repeat offenders they can be sanctioned?
- Why is there a rise of dog fouling in the winter?
- Is there a place for a dog zone where they can be exercised off their leads?
- Could the map include areas which are more dog friendly?

- How do you advertise that there is a survey to complete? I randomly read the local magazine come through the door
- Are there any advertisements in libraries?
- When the consultation has finished will there be any liaison with the Parish Council on what the council will do in response before we see a sign?
- The evidence presented to the councillors, the long rock and bird disturbances how will this be presented?
- Would it be worth residents feeding their day to day experiences into the evidence Martin Hall is gathering?
- When did the consultation process begin?
- When can we find out the results of the consultation?

Other

- Long Rock - Attended a Bird Wise East Kent talk, there was a public consultation last year, the result was overwhelming resistance from dog owners, the result was they have to keep the majority vote and they said that signs were repeatedly removed and they couldn't enforce due to no signs. Agreement that new signs will go up, over 2 years they will monitor if the number of complaints on dogs off lead goes up or down. Compare total numbers of dogs causing disturbances to previous years, if number has gone down and dog owners are behaving, the council will then take no further steps protecting wildlife at the site.
- Surprised that people destroy enforcement notices, people are now used to picking up dog fouling and thought majority of dog owners are compliant
- There are some people that won't look at nature and the bigger picture
- Bridge - recreation with fenced off children's play area, in the 80s there was a bylaw to stop dogs from being on the rec. At some point where the fencing was put in something has got through allowing dogs, this was not done with the knowledge of the parish council.
- There are plenty of areas in the countryside around Bridge for dogs to exercise, we have our rec which is widely used, next to the school, children use it for events and walk across. The whole of the rec is a children's play area, the reason for the fenced off area is because of the safety of children climbing into the river.
- There is a pavilion in the rec, we have football teams, weekly toddler groups who use the outside space in Summer months, we have parties with outside space. This area is nice for children and adults to have a space to be able to play without dog fouling
- People respect the current control, dogs don't come into the rec, those that do ignore the order they do so knowing they are not welcome there. It doesn't stop, but the order works well currently.
- It's the wish of the PC representing the village to be frustrated that one person is making a fuss, which is a minority.
- We're disappointed as a PC that it wasn't made clear to us when we were sent the consultation. It was more of a Canterbury based city centre control order or review, not that is mentioned any specific on Bridge. It took us a while the consultation picked up a change in Bridge

5. Conclusions

Overall, the survey results show that there is general support for the Dog Control PSPO.

This report provides a range of information about when, where and how frequently dog fouling, dogs off lead, and dogs in restricted areas have been witnessed by respondents.

While respondents expressed that dog exclusion zones don't have an impact on their quality of life and offences haven't been witnessed very often, these figures should be considered in conjunction with other evidence within the report.

Given the response rate and overall engagement during the consultation period, residents seem engaged with the control of dogs within Canterbury district.

It is hoped that the findings from this consultation provide useful insight as to how the council will proceed during its review of the dog control PSPO.