

REPORT FROM: Corporate Director

TO: West Craven Committee

DATE: 4 January 2022

Report Author: Tim Horsley
Tel. No: 07969 885265
E-mail: tim.horsley@pendle.gov.uk

Public Spaces Protection Orders – Parks and Sports Grounds

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To update the Committee on proposals and options for renewal of the Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPOs) in relation to Parks and to Sports Grounds.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) To, having invited comments from the public, approve the renewal of the Parks and Sports Grounds Public Spaces Protection Orders generally and to include Parks and Sports Grounds in West Craven specifically
- (2) To approve a new provision for both PSPOs that an offence is committed on failure to provide a name and address, or to give a false name and address, when requested by an authorised officer or agent of the Council on observation of another offence under the same Public Spaces Protection Order
- (3) To amend Schedule 1 of the Sports Grounds PSPO to include Birley Playing Fields Earby at the request of Earby Town Council

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) To enable the Council and its partners to respond to concerns regarding behaviour that is detrimental to the quality of life in public spaces in Pendle, including enforcement action.

ISSUE

1. A Public Spaces Protection Order each for Parks and for Sports Grounds were signed and sealed on 29 January 2019 for a period of three years. During November members of the public were encouraged to comment on the renewal of the PSPOs.
2. The consultation included a proposed amendment, requested by the Council's Environmental Crime Team and their agents, to include a provision that would mean an offence is committed on failure to provide a name and address or to give a false name and address when requested by an authorised officer or agent of the Council on observation of another offence under the same Public Spaces Protection Order.
3. As a result of the consultation with Town and Parish Councils, Earby Town Council proposes Birley Playing Fields, Earby is included in the Sports Grounds PSPO to include all the prohibitions in Schedule 2 and no more than two dogs per walker.
4. The general and West Craven specific comments from the public are attached as Appendix 1. Many of the general comments related to the proposal around names and addresses and many may not appreciate it relates only to situations where another offence under the PSPO has been observed.
5. Of the West Craven specific responses, most relate to the provisions in the Parks PSPO which treat Victory Park in a similar way to a sports ground due to a significant proportion of the Park being given over to sports pitches. The proposal in 4 above may go some way to addressing the concerns.
6. The intention of the PSPOs and their renewal is to continue to strike a balance between the needs of groups; families and individuals using the sports grounds for recreation and leisure and those using them as public open space; in particular dog walkers. Only where there is alternative provision or where there is a clear safety need do the PSPOs ban dogs altogether.

IMPLICATIONS

Policy: The legislation reinforces the continuing role of the Council in responding to anti-social behaviour

Financial: The opportunity the legislation provides and public expectation imply that these powers will be used by the Council and cost will be incurred. It is anticipated that the implementation and the enforcement of the powers described above can be dealt with within existing staffing resources.

The cost of publicising the Orders (i.e. signage at all entrances of an area covered by an order per entrance) will be managed within approved budgets.

Legal: The Council has the lead role on the use of PSPOs. Members of the public have a right of appeal on the basis the Council did not have the power to make the order or to include particular prohibitions or requirements or that one or more of the preliminaries has not been complied with (eg consultation). Appeals are heard in the High Court.

Risk Management: The legislation supports those elements of the Risk Management Plan relating to community safety; environmental crime and environmental protection.

Health and Safety: Direct intervention in the enforcement of breaches poses a risk for the staff involved which is mitigated through the Council's risk assessments, lone working policy, use of the high risk database and working in partnership with other agencies.

Sustainability: The legislation supports those elements of the Sustainable Communities Strategy relating to community safety; environmental crime and environmental protection.

Community Safety: The legislation re-enforces the continuing role of the Community Safety Partnership; the Partnership Plan and local delivery on community safety within an area and county based strategic landscape.

Equality and Diversity: The legislation was subject to a detailed government impact assessment.

Appendix 1

General	<p>Having seen the changes to our open spaces imposed to appease other local communities that do not favour my own heritage/culture recreational pass times handed down by the actual persons responsible for our beautiful parks (Mill Owners) such as dog walking I find the imposition imposed by Pendle council in breach of my heritage rights . Sneaking in the back door restrictions to dog owners unacceptable as it's the only British pass time we can enjoy and is a health beneficial to everyone who participates</p>
	<p>I support the proposals to maintain and extend the Public Spaces protection order outlined in your recent request for feedback publicity. The need to maintain clean and healthy open spaces is important to our collective wellbeing, provide areas for outdoor activities for all generations and enable sporting facilities .</p>
	<p>Being a regular user of parks and recreation grounds for walking I believe the current regulations should be maintained. There is nothing worse than finding you had trodden in dog mess. My wife is also afraid of dogs and is much more comfortable when the dogs are on leads and under control. The biggest problem is that the rules seldom seem to be enforced. A greater level of enforcement will ensure that regulations are adhered to. There should be no reduction in the current regulations.</p>
	<p>I would like to say that over the years the parks have vastly improved, less litter, more open easy maintenance, and more people friendly.</p> <p>Your dog orders are working well, most poo is picked up, the parks seem a lot safer. But remember dog walkers are a large part of parks, and they are always about at all times keeping an eye on parks, and sensible dog owners should be encouraged.</p> <p>Also old trees should have more protection in your parks, less tidying them up, leaving grass longer around them, not cutting branches just careful maintenance.</p>
	<p>I feel current protection orders should remain in place. Dogs should not be allowed on football or rugby pitches at all</p>
	<p>I respond to the consultation request for users of the boroughs parks to comment on the current orders and also the proposal of exclusion of dogs from Blacko park. My response and concern majors on the issue of dog exercise.</p> <p>On reading the details of the existing orders I agree with the content as they stand.</p> <p>I feel that any responsible dog owner would also agree; ball parks, children's play areas, bowling greens, sports pitches, cycle tracks etc are not the place for dogs to be and especially untethered dogs. Personally I feel that the measures fall short, on the areas where dogs are allowed to be untethered, with regards to the control of dangerous or aggressive dogs that may affect the dogs that are more sociable.</p> <p>However, I feel that the orders appear to be, wrongly, using the tethering of dogs as a measure of controlling dog fouling. Dog fouling is and should be treated as a completely different issue. Dogs produce waste whether they tethered or not and wherever they are.</p>

	<p>I feel that any responsible person in charge of a dog would agree and not have issue with providing proof that they have the ability to clean up after the dog.</p> <p>I would like to close with my belief, parks are areas where health and wellbeing can be achieved by many different members of the community. I personally would not use my local park if it did not have the facility of exercising untethered dogs. I firmly believe that my health, and others would suffer if this facility was removed. My personal situation is, I walk with my tethered dog from my house to the park, quite a severe gradient, not only to exercise my dog but also myself, get fresh air and socialise with other park users. I know that people could say that I could do the same without a dog, but from previous experience, between dogs, this did not happen, a dog provides a reason for this activity. As was observed during the covid shutdowns, the value of parks and open spaces was widely recognised, these should be available to all including dog owners. I feel that more effort and resources should be employed to deal with the issues and not resort to unnecessary restrictions through Public Spaces Protection Orders.</p>
	<p>I feel the PSPO are unnecessary, money raising orders that do nothing to tackle the issues of dog fouling or keeping public spaces nice. Actually they penalise dog owners and make it difficult dog owners to train and exercise their dogs enough in public parks. They also take away the freedoms of common land from access by the people.</p>
	<p>Pendle Council wants to make it an offence to fail to provide a name and address or to give a false name and address when asked by an authorised officer or agent of Pendle Council.</p> <p>You are not obliged to give your details to the police, unless under arrest. This is an attempt to allow council employees to gain access to private information that officers of the law are not entitled to. Another step towards Orwell's 1984. These types of actions need to be stopped in their tracks.</p>
	<p>I generally support the principles of the PSPO's, however it seems strange that there is nothing relating to anti-social behaviour and littering which is surely more of an issue than dog walkers? Is this covered under different orders or legislation?</p>
	<p>I enjoy the local parks and open spaces. I am not a dog lover but accept I am in the minority so I am quite happy with the current regulations and would like them to remain in place.</p>
	<p>I don't have a dog, but I am fond of them and recognise that most dog owners treat them with care and respect. The two concerns of the general public will be that any dog in a public space will be properly supervised and controlled in respect of the physical safety of the animal and the general public, and the animal's natural need to piss and shit. I favour clear guidelines about both these matters, and especially in spaces which are used primarily by children. The details of the council's current policy seem appropriate and I strongly support their existence and enforcement. I think it would be a good idea to precede them with a statement of general principles underlying their purpose, as I have done so above.</p>
	<p>Fully in favour of all proposals but Enforcement Action must be taken effectively. Dog Walkers generally ignore my requests to put dogs of their leads and usually abusive. So they either aren't aware of the rules or just choose to ignore them. Better signage and publicity may help alongside the Enforcement Action.</p>
	<p>The controls seem very positive. An area of clarification might be where sports fields are not actually in use at the time of the dog walkers using them. They can</p>

	<p>still foul causing problems for when the facilities are subsequently used. Therefore maybe a comment needs including making it clear that these rules are effective even if the facility is not in use at the time dog walkers are using it.</p> <p>Also, are these rules in place for facilities open for official use by the public but not owned by the Council eg Barrowford Road Playing Fields? If it is good practice for the rules outlined to be in place for Council owned land, then it would seem sensible to apply to other land available for use by the public.</p>
	<p>What about people sitting on benches dumping all their rubbish near the bench. Drug dealing and smoking of weed in the parks are increasing. Quick to have a go at dog owners but some members of society are worse than dogs</p>
	<p>Everything in the parks and sports ground protection order seems sensible and correct and should continue.</p> <p>On a personal note I am aware of dog owners using the MUGA and grassed area around the park on Cemetery road Earby to exercise dogs off a lead. I have also seen individuals with dogs off a lead in the play area.</p> <p>Youths regularly smash glass on to the MUGA surface also.</p> <p>My children use the MUGA regularly for fun, football etc and have used the play area regularly when younger. I would like more done to ensure these areas are not vandalised and soiled by individuals who do not possess an ounce of public decency and clearly have no respect for others who enjoy using these amenities.</p>
	<p>To even suggest exploring the possibility of making it a legal obligation to provide your name and address shows a breathtaking arrogance and ignorance of British law. One of our most sacred inalienable rights in this country is our right to silence. Do you (Pendle borough) seriously aim to rewrite English law to make your "Agents" more powerful than warranted officers of the law ??.</p> <p>Please raise my enquiry at any consultation process.</p>
	<p>I am against restrictions on walking dogs in Pendle Parks.</p> <p>Any responsible dog owner knows you should not let your dog into play areas and to pick up after dog fouling.</p> <p>It is sad that sensible dog owners have to suffer for irresponsible ones.</p> <p>I have a large dog and the secure areas are not big enough or suitable for him to exercise.</p> <p>Please give this more sensible consideration.</p>
Victory Park	<p>I strongly object to bringing in a law to make it an offence to refuse to give your name or a false one. On discussing this to a policeman even he said "unless you are being arrested, you don't even give your name to a policeman". Considering the recent portrayal of policeman and their antics I think this is quite appropriate. Rather than punish us dog owners constantly why not sort the youths out leaving litter, and smoking dope over all the parks. Those who don't pick up after their dog, still won't if they're on a lead.</p> <p>Personally has a responsible dog owner who has her dogs under control, I feel victimised</p>
	<p>I write with reference to the current PSPO for the parks within Barnoldswick. I strongly object to the PSPO being renewed & also the heavy handed tactics of the 'District Enforcement' company for which PBC are receiving commissions which</p>

are based on the profiteering tactics of the 'District Enforcement'. This company's heavy handed approach is done by targeting dog owners & in particular 'women'. There have been several incidents of women being harassed & with some feeling threatened & some even being left in tears by this company's employees overstepping the mark within the limitations of their employ. In fact, only last week a male member of public had to step in & help a very distressed young mother with a 3yr old child & a dog on the lead only for the Enforcement officer to 'offer to take his bodycam off & he would meet him behind the pavillion building to sort it out' then continued to goad the male member of the public. This member of the public also had a dog but did not receive a warning or fine for having its dog originally off lead which goes to prove that women are being targeted. This is highly unprofessional behaviour.

In February I also emailed PBC several questions under the 'Freedom of Information Act' pertaining to the PSPO & The District Enforcement company as yet I have still not had a response & therefore I have no alternative but report this matter to the Ombudsman. I find it quite arrogant that PBC does not feel that my email does not require a reply.

With regard to PBC trying to amend a 'byelaw' to include making it illegal not to give your details. I do not understand how PBC think they can actually make this a criminal offence. It is my understanding that we live in a country where we have a right to be silent, a right to have an opinion, free speech & I do not recall, this ever being a criminal offence. I believe that we live in a democracy but PBC appear to think otherwise. I will take this matter up with my MP to see if what you are trying to do is legal as I do not believe it is.

During the pandemic according to research conducted by RCVS dog ownership increased by 50%. I myself have volunteered with rescue centres for many years & many dogs are relinquished because the owners are struggling with their dog's behaviours. The mental welfare of a dog is just as important as the physical welfare. Dogs need to be able to run, sniff, dig its what inherently makes a dog a dog. They are sentient beings that have feelings & form memories & are just as social as we are but there are still people out there that see them as just animals. They are not just animals to me or the rest of the dog owning community, they are part of their family or they maybe the kids to the people that can't have kids, they are saviours & lifelines to people with mental health problems or the older generation that may have lost their husbands or wives. The park brings these people together, they all talk & to some people with dogs the park is their lifeline to interact with other people & dogs. But PBC appear to be hell bent on taking this 'PUBLIC SPACE' from those who need it most in favour of sport people who want to play a bit of sport on a weekend only & then leave us dog owners to pick up all their rubbish that they cannot seem to place in the various amount of bins located around the parks. Not only that we put up with the anti social behaviour, the drug taking, the young drivers using it as an area to practice their latest wheel spinning techniques, empty alcohol bottles, broken glass but hey let's not bother fining these people we will just focus on the decent dog owners with well behaved dogs because it's 'easy pickings' if you are going to penalise people then do it for everything that is listed on your signs & not just one part of society just because they own a dog.

The enclosure that has been erected in Victory Park, Barnoldswick is sub standard & not fit for purpose. Upon stating that the enclosure was not secure I was informed by a Councillor that if I wanted a secure area for my dog there was a business down the road I could use. Yes I have used the facilities of that business BUT why should I have to? Do I not pay my council tax? Im pretty sure that I have a direct debit set up so should I not be able to use the facilities of my local park?

But I have digressed as I want to talk about the enclosure, as I have stated it is sub standard. The enclosure needs to be quite a bit larger than the current size, the fence should be of a height of at least 6ft & the fence should also be at least 1ft into the ground. There are large gaps under the gate making it quite easy for a dog to escape. The dog enclosure would also benefit from enrichment activities for the dogs to encourage sniffing or an area where they can dig. By the dog being able to perform these activities it releases dopamine from the brain which are the happy chemicals this encourages Calmness in the dog & also works their brain which is vitally important to a dog's mental health. So as you can see this area is totally inadequate & not fit for purpose. The dog owning community again where not consulted on this. Neither PBC nor BTC sought professional advice. To my knowledge some person came along & just popped up a quick fix fence but for an astronomical price. If you care to search for my email from February I also had questions pertaining to this area that are still unanswered. For your information the dog enclosure is being used from 8.30am till 10am by a local dog walking business making it impossible for general dog owning members of the public unable to use. Isn't that on your signs as things that the park shouldn't be used for & can be fined?? Yet another double standard, this is just yet another example of how you are DISCRIMINATING against the dog owning community.

Barnoldswick town I lovingly refer to as having 'a village mentality', this is because we are a tight knit semi rural community & by PBC trying to penalise approximately 75% of said community will only spread anger & distrust. I believe the way forward would be of a compromise between the dog owning community who use the parks of Barnoldswick on a daily basis & the families who use the ground for football at only the weekends. As I have already stated Barnoldswick is a semi rural community & we are fortunate to be surrounded by beautiful countryside & with that comes livestock. Livestock a farmer's livelihood. So, by driving dog owners from the parks you are driving them out into the fields were currently there are sheep that are in lamb, does PBC want to be responsible for dogs being shot, farmers losing their livelihoods due to irresponsible dog owners being driven into the fields. Does PBC not think that the communities of Pendle have been through enough with COVID-19, having everything taken away due to lockdowns. People have lost their jobs, are struggling to pay ever rising fuel bills, cost of fuel & general day to day living costs without suffering £100 for not having a well behaved dog on a lead? As you are really fining tge ones that are letting their dog foul, this PSPO will jot ever stop that behaviour, that is just down to bad dog ownership & you unfortunately never resolve that by fining decent dog owners!

All I ask you now is to please bear in mind that it is WOMEN that are currently being targeted by the company you are allowing into our parks & considering what

has been happening across the whole of the country with women being attacked, in fact only last week a female dog walker was hospitalised after an attack, I think you may find yourselves on very thin ice & on the brink of a very newspaper worthy story.

In view of the PSPO order up for renewal in Barnoldswick. I would like to forward my objection to dogs not being allowed off leads.

At present the Enforcement Officers are targeting women , I have evidence of this as 2 gentlemen were approached and asked to put their dogs on leads. Another was a lady on her own approached by 2 men in a very intimidating situation and was fined on the very same day!

Furthermore, the PSPO Order covers all aspects of Park usage none of which are policed by your Enforcement Officer just targeting women, just dogs off leads! Victory is a very large area which is utilised for around 10 % of the week for sporting activities, the dog area is not utilised as it is not fit for purpose and the size of it is laughable even for a small dog. It is not secure at all and dogs can get out of it, it is constantly boggy and has large pot holes in it which could cause severe damage to dogs' legs.

If policing of the PSPO Order is to take place then surely, we shouldn't see debris after football matches and training, SPEEDING CARS driving to the park play area for kids, Adults smoking cigarettes and children/ teenagers smoking joints. Skate Park trashed and damaged, toilet block vandalised smoke bombs let off, fires started !!

I agree all Dog Owners should pick up their dogs Poo! However, a dog off a lead does not equate to owners picking up Poo.

There is no signage which is legible on the park. A A4 POSTER POSTED ON 1 DOG BIN on the parks entrance is not good enough.

There are no light on the main entrance footpath to the park.

There is no signage for speed, and the areas where cars can actually PARK.

I have photographic evidence of cars parked next to the play area parked on the football pitches, parents sat in cars watching kids train at football.

I would say that Victory Park is mainly used 12 months of the year by dog owners most of whom know each other as frequent visitors to the Park.

The PSPO order needs reviewing as Policing of all aspects of the order are not undertaken,

The Enforcement Officers are ADHOCK in their approach I would definitely-not tell any strangers my address !!

The only Officer I would tell would be a Police Officer upon evidence of his badge/collar number as this is lawful.

I would ask that a compromise at the very least is drawn up, allowing all park users to enjoy the park, at varied times so all can enjoy

We, speaking for dog owners would not walk through a football match or children playing /training football.

The fact that 80% of the park's usage is with dog owners I feel this situation is intolerable and would ask for this order to be refused.

Respect comes from the people regardless of the bye law or PSPO order, there will always be people who don't do the right thing and it is for the people to police it to ensure the order does not return.

Victory Park is for all!!

We are council tax paying dog walker in Barnoldswick and have heard PSPO victory park is up for renewal.

The majority of people who use Victory park are dog walkers who pay their council tax. Since the PSPO relating to dogs was put in place we have kept our dog on the lead even though our dog is dying to have a run because we are law abiding citizens. The dog exercise that has been provided is too small and is usually full of people from the dog walking business so there isn't enough space. If you are going to have a hope in making this work the space needs to be fit for purpose. It needs to be as big as the one in Earby.

We know of one lady who has been caught by enforcement officers and talking to other dog walkers it seems these officers are only challenging older females because they are an easy target. We regularly see men with their dogs running wild but they would just tell the enforcement to get lost. The signs are also rubbish and not prominent enough, people can't see them and the writing is too small. Why can't dog owners be allowed to let their dogs run off the lead at certain times in the daytime in the week? There aren't school children about then, it's just dog walkers.

As a council tax payer we feel we should have the right to exercise our dog properly in the park that we pay for. The drug dealers and drug users of an evening are far more of a nuisance than dog walkers, maybe you should focus on sorting that problem out. But we doubt you will when dog walkers are a soft touch.

Pendle council like every councils within the UK cannot over right UK law. As UK citizens we do NOT have to carry ID or HAVE TO prove our identification to anyone, so I fail to see how you feel you can make it an offence not to. Local parks are not your parks they are for all of us.

You placed a PSPO that covers several things you class as anti social however you choose to only police one of these, dogs off lead. Not the fireworks being set off at night, neither are you policing the litter left by players and fans after football matches. You are not policing the dangerous driving or speed limits and certainly not the smoking and openly selling marijuana within Victory park.

You may feel with your councillors that your approach is justified however having requested under the FOI requests for information & a copy of the contract the council have with the enforcement company, also all evidence you have that prove dogs off lead is a cause of anti social behaviour. Having spoken to you, you fail to prove that the PSPO guidelines have been followed or are justified. There is absolutely no correlation between dogs on or off lead & fouling. Plus most dog fouling is on the streets of Barnoldswick and not within the park.

Police the actual crimes being committed and not your nazi style dog hating made up crimes.

Personally I will not be complying with these stupid rules regarding dogs especially whilst you are failing to protect us the people & the grounds from actual crimes. I personally suffer from a spinal disease & there are plenty of days that holding a lead is extremely painful, so where do people like me fall in with your rules, funded for being disabled?

I hope you ensure your comrades read the PSPO act and also remind them UK law stands above council rules.

Not sure how this so called public consultation works but I can only seem to find this email link, (once again let's make it as hard as possible for people to complain).

I'm a frequent user of victory park in Barnoldswick, at least twice daily.

	<p>Overall the park is very good, however the problems that do arise don't actually seem to get dealt with, the dog fouling issue doesn't actually seem to get dealt with, the rules changed to no dogs off leads to prevent this but actually the majority of people with dogs off the lead clean up after their dogs. The perpetrators of dog fouling do so whether dog on or off lead. To me it seems obvious, just clamp down harder on the people actually being bad dog owners instead of taking the easy option and persecuting the good dog owners who just wish to exercise dogs in a natural way.</p> <p>Also fine some of the youths who constantly litter the park, of which most the dog owners spend time picking it up to protect dogs.</p> <p>Can you inform me of the public consultation dates as we would like to attend.</p>
	<p>I am emailing to register my unhappiness and disgust at the penalty for having dogs off lead in victory park fields.</p> <p>I think it's absolutely disgusting to penalise certain dog walkers when the problem down there clearly lies with teenagers and kids littering, drinking and smoking. Even without walking my dog I can't take my own children into the play parks usually for the amount of rubbish in there and vandalism. The dog walkers you want - the ones with dogs on leads are often the ones leaving dog muck on the paths (I have witnessed this myself).</p> <p>The space you have created for letting dogs off the lead is far too small- and for my own mental health dog walks are needed for me.</p> <p>I would like you to reconsider your position on the penalties for off lead dogs in the fields of victory park. And perhaps focus your attention and funds and fines on the teenagers that litter, vandalise and misuse the space.</p>
	<p>Absolutely no point wasting time giving feedback.</p> <p>The council has not listened in the past and will not listen in the future. It will simply do what it wants yet pretend that it has consulted Pendle residents.</p> <p>Just in case anyone does listen:</p> <p>The health and wellbeing benefits of owning a dog seem to be considered insignificant alongside sports facilities, even though it could be argued many more people own a dog than play football or cricket. Millions are spent on sports facilities but dog owners are expected to "exercise" their animals on a lead in a ridiculously small and totally inadequate "exercise pen". What a waste of taxpayers' money that was, down at Victory Park, Barnoldswick.</p> <p>And the wardens are so unprofessional when they choose who they speak to, probably on the basis of easy pickings. The real culprits who let their dogs run about uncontrolled and never pick up poo are simply left alone. Most poo offences occur at night anyway when there are no wardens around. The overflowing dog bins are proof that most responsible owners do pick up after their dogs.</p> <p>There needs to be a much, much larger area designated for dog exercising. A small pen is not in the interests of animal welfare and restricts people from enjoying time with their pets. The one at Victory Park is poorly maintained and could injure animals. Restricting dogs to a 2 metre lead also introduces potential problems with dogs which have not been able to run off their energy, perhaps resulting excessive barking at home or even aggressive behaviour.</p>

	<p>Notably there are no restrictions on cats (cats can roam free causing danger on roads, killing songbirds, crapping in gardens where children play, etc) so the rules cannot be said to be in the interest of health and safety.</p> <p>But all this is ignored by penpushing officials who cite the law or whatever excuse they need.</p> <p>If you've read this far then may I say Thank You – but I don't expect anything to change.</p>
	<p>Harassment by private contractors to dog owners is not acceptable and unlawful. These individuals are nowhere to be seen when kids are vandalising the park equipment, drinking alcohol or selling/smoking weed. Targeting dog owners is obviously a way of making easy money and as a law abiding dog owner myself, I will not be providing my details to these individuals for safety reasons.</p>
	<p>I am a resident of Barnoldswick and also a dog owner. I am concerned regarding the PSPO imposed on Victory Park and all other parks in the Pendle area. A PSPO should only be used where there is a genuine problem that needs resolving. The use of such measures in Victory Park is “using a sledgehammer to crack a walnut”. It is simply not proportionate to the issues in the park.</p> <p>I have noticed on community forums recently that dog owners in particular are being targeted by “enforcement officers” employed by a private company. I have also been made aware of instances where lone females with dogs have been intimidated by these “enforcement officers”.</p> <p>The parks in Pendle are public spaces, funded by local taxes and I am concerned that local taxes are being used to enforce PSPOs. These PSPOs are stirring up a lot of unrest and dissatisfaction within the local community and I urge PBC to rethink their use to avoid causing distress and unhappiness to local people. Parks are, by design, supposed to be places where people can go to enjoy open spaces, relax and have fun; these PSPOs are undermining this ethos.</p> <p>I understand that PBC are seeking to make it an offence to fail to disclose name and address to an “enforcement officer”, which I believe would be an abuse of process and at the very least disproportionate to any non-criminal “offences” that may be committed in public parks. I urge PBC to oppose the introduction of such measures.</p> <p>I would also like to raise my concerns regarding the enclosed “dog run” in Victory Park. It is not fit for purpose. It is too small for a community the size of Barnoldswick and cannot afford sufficient space for numerous dogs to run freely and have sufficient exercise. A high proportion of houses in the town do not have open spaces attached to them, so having a large expanse of open space in this town is particularly important for the health and well-being of dogs. The current enclosed exercise area causes loose dogs a great deal of stress and anxiety to be “penned in” with other dogs and can lead to unnecessary attacks on dogs and their owners, not to mention the health hazard with so many dogs defecating in a confined space whilst others dogs are running around (and often through piles of dog faeces before the owner can pick it up).</p>

	<p>It would be prudent of PBC to have a public vote on the use of PSPOs at individual locations. Let local people decide if they want these measures, instead of imposing them based on minority views without public consultation.</p> <p>If PBC are to continue with the use of PSPOs in local parks then the signage needs to be improved. The current signs are difficult for people with poor eyesight to read; they are unlit so cannot be seen during the hours of darkness; and they are not prominent at every entrance to the parks.</p> <p>Failure to listen to the public can lead to resentment and distrust, so please listen to the views of the community and act solely in their interests as it is they that pay PBC to provide services.</p>
	<p>I hope this email finds you well. I am writing this email to you to try to understand the logistics behind the parks in Barnoldswick. Recently I have heard that dog walkers are being fined a phenomenal amount for not having their dog on a lead when walking on victory park. With everything going on in the world this is just another added stress at the moment which is not necessary.</p> <p>There has been a poor dog pen erected towards the rugby pitch. It gets filthy with mud and is nowhere near big enough for my medium sized energetic dog who needs a substantial field to run around for approximately 30 - 60 minutes, let alone a bigger dog. We use a dog ball thrower when taking our dog out and the ball is thrown beyond the perimeter in the pen.</p> <p>Also, my dog is disabled. She is partially blind due to an eye condition she was born with. This condition is incurable and something she will live with for the rest of her life, therefore walking my dog has to be done in a specific way and the pen does not support my disabled dog. When taking her out she is afraid to walk along the canal and her favourite park is victory park because it is so open for her. We have to use a whistle ball for her so she can have a good run out and so she can find the ball. We have occasionally taken her up to Letcliffe Park but due to the more enclosed area and trees she usually loses the ball and there has again had needles and drug paraphernalia found on the car park. This can be fatal for any dog and should not be an added concern.</p> <p>Victory park is the only park she enjoys playing on and is comfortable, I can always control my dog and she has amazing recall. I understand we have to keep the community safe but when the community is being intimidated by members of the council and people you privately get to arrange fines I do not feel comfortable being approached in this way, as well as trying to enforce an offence to not provide information, how do I know this person is not acting as someone they are not and then I am asked to provide personal information. The Sarah Everard case is still very apparent and as a young woman who often walks her dog alone, I have increased anxiety about this. I should not be made to feel this way and dread taking my dog down to the local park. My partner is a retained firefighter at Barnoldswick fire station and therefore victory park is the only place we can take our dog on the off chance he gets called out. You cannot expect dogs and their owner to use the poor attempt of a play area it's an embarrassment to the town.</p>

	<p>This needs sorting, we should be allowed to have our dogs walked freely on the pitch areas on victory park, you should be more concerned about the drug abuse that is happening down at the park and anti social behaviour by the youths.</p> <p>I am hoping this will be taken seriously and we'll behaved dog walkers are taking into account.</p> <p>Further to my other email I have just seen a picture of the proposed public space protection order.</p> <p>How can you justify all that space and not even a quarter of it be allocated to dogs to be able to run freely. Baring in mind the football pitch is not used 24/7, 365 days of the year but yet dog will always need walking and a good run on a safe open area. It's just ridiculous and clearly this has been devised by someone who does not have a dog or care to use it, but for majority of citizens in the local area that use it, it's a lifeline. There's minimal dog fouling that goes on down at victory park and the dog walking community are always friendly.</p> <p>This needs serious further consideration, there's no reason the football pitch area cannot be used for dogs.</p>
	<p>Dogs are part of the family and should be allowed on parks, in the summer months they need cool areas such as the becks, young parents have to juggle pets with children and both need supervising ,parents are needed to interact with their children so dogs should be allowed in under control, the dog play areas are not secure enough, and the one on Victory Park too near a house and too open for the passing public, dogs run to the fence barking etc, they need maintaining in wet weather with sand as they get churned up very quickly, they are well used and more needed ,as people are queuing up to use them, roaming around on the pitches is not fair to the players as nobody wants to fall into an area where dog muck has been, enforcement officers often get the wrong people and are very nasty, causing more harm, pendle council should be supporting their residents not making life harder and causing more distress</p>
	<p>I would like to put forward comments opposing the current PSPO at Victory Park, Barnoldswick and the proposed future changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Harrassment and aggressive tactics undertaken by the enforcing agency. These tactics have been targeted at women, children & immigrants. There have been accounts reported where he has lied about the rules in order to force the victim to pay a fine. Due to this I FIRMLY OPPOSE the proposal to make it an offence if a person fails to give personal details. These agents are not entitled to our personal information in particular where they resort to underhand tactics and aggressive behaviour without any repercussions. Their incentive is monetary. 2. The maps currently detailing the red/amber/green areas do not correctly reflect the true size. The 'green' area where dogs are allowed off-lead is grossly overdrawn in the maps compared to its real size. <p>Following up from the above point, the current 'green' area is:</p>

	<p>4. Not secure, dogs can easily escape</p> <p>5. Woefully undersized for two reasons: 1. dogs need a much larger space to be exercised if all they have access to is an enclosure. 2. The pen is so small that it can't be used by multiple dogs since it could lead to a dangerous situation where a dog may feel cornered in. This is a HUGE problem and the PRIMARY reason many dog-owners can't use the enclosure. If you insist on continuing with this ridiculous PSPO then at least the dog-exercising facility should meet the park user's needs without creating unnecessary hazards.</p> <p>6. The location of the enclosure is the worst in the park. It is where it floods the most, rendering the area unusable for a large portion of the year. L secure nor sufficiently big to allow for the correct exercising of dogs.</p> <p>7. The enforcing agency would best spend their time giving fines to people doing real offences such as littering or failing to pick up their dog-foul, rather than hounding people responsibly exercising their dogs. Since this is the whole premise behind the PSPO correct fining of people not picking dog-foul would resolve the true issue.</p> <p>8. The vast majority of people pick up their dog poo, and the ones who do not generally exercise their dogs late at night when there is never going to be an enforcing agent. Therefore the dog-foul on the pitches will continue and the PSPO solves nothing. The only ones who benefit are the enforcing company since they can harrass people for exercising dogs of lead, and activity that in itself is not harming anyone.</p> <p>To sum it up, as long as the PSPO remains a monetising activity instead of actually addressing the anti-social behaviours that happen in the park then only good people will be affected and absolutely nothing will change. The poo will still be on the pitches and the trash will still be left all over the park, but the enforcing company will have a nice bit of money in their pocket.</p> <p>Please use the resources wasted on this activity to fund improvements in our recreational areas (better lighting for winter months for example) rather than punishing the local citizens.</p>
	<p>I would like to comment on dog walking rules on Victory Park Barnoldswick. The newly placed sign is not comprehensive and ambiguous. The green area is totally out of scale appearing much larger than it really is. The green area is really insufficient for the exercise of all but the smallest of dogs. Does the rule that dogs must be on a lead no more than 2 mtr in length still apply ? If so this even more restricts the exercise of dogs, especially for older dog walkers who are unable to walk at a quicker pace for their dogs.</p> <p>In my personal observation when in Victory Park dog fouling is no way as bad as the littering and utterly bad anti social behaviour of young people. It also seems that the wardens target older people with dogs, reports are widespread on social media that this is happening.</p> <p>It would be acceptable to keep dogs from football areas if games were in progress but ridiculous to prevent them exercising when empty. By all means prosecute if</p>

	<p>dog fouling is not removed, but prosecute littering and anti social behaviour as well.</p> <p>It does appear to me that whoever made the rules for Victory Park does not like dogs!</p>
	<p>With regards to the PSPO Order being up for renewal in Barnoldswick, in January 2022. I would like to forward my objection to dogs not being allowed off leads in the majority of the park.</p> <p>I myself was targeted by the enforcement officers in which I appealed and got the fixed penalty cancelled, as I sent photographic evidence in. At the time though, I felt very intimidated being a lone female. The PSPO Order covers all aspects of park usage but the enforcement officers seem to be just targeting lone women with dogs.</p> <p>Victory Park covers a very large area and it is also situated in the middle of farmland which restricts surrounding areas where dogs can be off lead because of livestock.</p> <p>The only green area in the park is not fit for purpose to let dogs run. It is full of holes around the side and is constantly boggy (I have photos showing this).</p> <p>Myself and my family have used this park for over 20 years with our pet dogs and have never felt like this until now.</p> <p>I myself have had issues with mental health and walking my dogs daily helps me enormously with this. My older dog is going blind and he needs to stick to the park routes which he knows and my 8 month old puppy just follows him.</p> <p>I do understand that the minority of people spoil things for the majority of responsible dog walkers who use the park, by not picking up after their dogs. However, there are a lot of other issues at the park which are not being policed and this is totally unfair to dog walkers.</p> <p>This PSPO Order needs to be removed or a compromise made at least to suit everyone.</p> <p>Victory Park is for all to use.</p>
	<p>I am a Barnoldswick dog owner who until recently enjoyed the use of the park playing fields to responsibly exercise my pet. The small muddy fenced area now provided for such is totally inadequate for such a purpose. I therefore ask if it would be possible to lift restrictions on the lower half of the rugby pitch adjacent to the current doggy area which is not currently used for games to allow dogs to run off the lead in a safe environment.</p> <p>Please give this due consideration</p>
	<p>I regularly exercise my dog in Victory Park and have noticed recently that a number of £100 fines had been given to dog walkers with their dogs off the lead. I have also noted that some of these fines have been withdrawn after appeals/protests and new signage has recently appeared.</p> <p>I welcome new signage although these particular signs are both difficult to read in most of the places they have been placed and enshrine some compulsions on users of the park that are not entirely reasonable and some that are plain unreasonable. More importantly, it appears to focus heavily on people who take their dogs to the park leaving other actual and potential miscreants who use the PARK alone! This seems somewhat discriminatory to me</p> <p>I would like to make a number of points relevant to this PSPO Order Review:</p> <p>.</p>

First, it is important to note that Victory Park is a PARK - not a recreation ground or playing field area. What is a park? A park is an area of natural or semi-natural planted space set aside for human enjoyment or for the protection of wildlife or natural habitats. The council appears to regard Victory Park largely as a series of sports pitches. Yet these are used at most less than 5% of one week's duration - probably much less. In the case of the rugby league pitch hardly ever used at all. Large areas of the PARK suitable for allowing dogs to exercise via off the leash running are simply not available for this purpose, Should dog owners seek to give their dogs the absolutely necessary, off the leash running exercise that is essential for their pet's health then they could invite large fines. Why?.

Second, I assume that this is to protect the public from dogs' excrement and from dogs who are out of control. In many years of using this park I have only once seen a dog owner not pick up their dog's mess. I told them to pick it up and they did so. As for dogs out of control there are general laws to protect the public from this which apply in all public places - and responsible owners know when they have a difficult animal and will keep them on leashes.

Third, there seems little attention in your signage and in your "policing" of the park to other, often far more offensive, activities that might trouble park users. Please go to the PARK after there has been football matches and see the litter all around that the players leave. OR the cars that randomly park on these nearby pitches to watch their mates or children play. OR the exceptional speed that some cars use to drive the narrow pathways in the park. This latter offence is potentially harmful to human life. OR the vandalism that regularly happens in Victory PARK. Where are the attempts to "police" this type of behaviour - and where is the signage?

You might want to suggest that there is an area for dogs to exercise off the lead in Victory PARK. Yet, you must realise, is far, far too small and inadequate. If all the dogs in the PARK at any time went into it - , it would be overcrowded. Moreover, it is not large enough for medium and big dogs to run in. Why cannot much larger areas of the PARK be set aside for free running by dogs. They can hardly run free in the streets of Barnoldswick can they? Dogs need to run freely - it is essential to their health - not always just to walk on the lead. Or why not allow certain times of the day when dogs can run freely - morning, midday and early evening after work?

Fourth, present enforcement activity in Victory PARK appears to be at best arbitrary, and at worst, discriminatory. I was present when a woman was fined a £100 for having no leash on her dog but 3 other dogs off the lead were either ignored or simply warned. I have never seen any enforcement activity in regard to other anti-social activities.

Finally dog owners are the largest serial daily users of this park and dogs need open space for their dogs to free run in. It is not much to ask that local councils facilitate owners being able to responsibly exercise their dogs in a larger space than the paltry one presently set aside in Victory PARK

I do hope this review results in dogs being able to properly exercise in their local urban park

Earby Recreation Ground	<p>Firstly, I wasn't aware of the consultation in 2017, otherwise I would have made my comments known earlier.</p> <p>I understood Earby Recreation Ground has been bequeathed to the residents of Earby in perpetuity - to this end the whole of the recreation ground should be available to all residents, including those wishing to exercise their dogs (who are also residents of Earby), rather than, as seems to be the case, the majority of the area being earmarked for the use of the local football team who use pitch area once per week, if that, during the football season and many of whom are not Earby residents.</p> <p>The issue of dog fouling is a separate issue and should be dealt with appropriately by the council's civil enforcement officer or dog warden.</p> <p>Once again the responsible dog owners are penalised and we find ourselves with fewer areas to exercise our dogs - the area allocated within Earby Recreation Ground is wholly inadequate and often littered with drug paraphernalia or broken glass.</p> <p>Let's have some CCTV up there so that we can all use all of the facilities and deal with all the antisocial elements appropriately rather than a blanket ban on considerate dog owners.</p> <p>On the subject of antisocial behaviour, it's high time something was done to address the disgraceful language used by football players using the pitch at Sough park. Young children and families using the play area should not have to tolerate persistent shouting or expletives just a few yards from the play area. This needs some urgent attention.</p>
-------------------------	---