Hi,

as a volunteer on the nature reserve, I would support the idea of a Public Space Protection Order to protect the wildlife from disturbance by dogs.

To Whom it may concern,

I have looked through the Lound Lakes PSPO Draft and would like to provide my opinion.

I appreciate the increasing pressure on dog owners finding recreational land to exercise their dogs. I am a dog owner and a member of the Suffolk Wildlife Trust. I also live in Lound and I am very privileged to enjoy Lound Lakes and the wildlife it has to offer. Frequently however my desire to enjoy the wildlife is spoilt by dogs off lead blundering into various wildlife or nearly tripping me up. Currently there is an excellent compromise of "leads on areas" and "leads off areas". This would be excellent if dog owners would abide by these rules.

We have an enormous pressure on wildlife and biodiversity, it shouldn't be too much to suggest that some areas are off limits to "dogs off leads", especially the more sensitive areas to ground nesting birds, or to reptiles and other animals. By protecting the wildlife and helping to encourage the biodiversity Lound Lakes becomes a resource to all of us, especially schools and youth organisations, where they can see the wonders of the natural world.

I think the PSPO also misses another very important area, but this maybe covered elsewhere: I spend quite a bit of time walking through the area having to pick up dog faeces which has been bagged and then left or tossed into the hedges by others. This degrades the appeal of the area and is clearly a health hazard. This should be firmly discouraged and if required should have penalties associated with this very antisocial behaviour.

We need a PSPO that considers the many and not just the narrow interest of dog owners. The current "off lead" areas coupled with "on lead areas, is a sensible compromise and considerate dog owners shouldn't have any problem complying with them.

Dear Sir,

In regard to the proposal for dogs to be on leads throughout the whole area of Lound Lakes I would like to express my concerns.

Currently there is a large field designated as 'off lead' and this allows for proper exercise for dogs to run and stretch freely. To remove this facility would be very detrimental to dogs health and well being.

You say East Suffolk Council is dog friendly, making changes to ensure dogs can only be walked at heel in a popular dog walking area cannot support this ethos. Dogs need to be exercised properly with off lead time and this currently designated field fully supports this in a safe environment not adjacent to roads or housing. Where would you suggest dogs can be properly exercised close to this locality if this option is removed? Policing this would be quite difficult too, time and money could be spent to better benefit elsewhere!

I therefore do not support this proposal.

6th January, 2020

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Re: Dog control order consultation

I understand that dogs have an important place in many people's lives and provide significant benefits to both physical and mental health but I believe that this should not be to the detriment of other people's quality of life.

I enjoy the local countryside, parks and beaches for walking, running and observing nature. This includes, occasionally, Lound Lakes and Herringfleet Hills. However my enjoyment is lessened when having to worry about and suffer the unwanted attention of dogs. Often dogs will run towards me and this causes anxiety as to their intentions. Sometimes they sniff around and drool on hands and clothing. Sometimes they jump up and scratch at clothing and may dirty it with their muddy paws. There is always the fear that they might actually attack. Occasionally I have observed dogs chasing wildlife.

I therefore wholeheartedly support these dog control orders (and wish there were more of these) as I feel strongly that we should all be entitled to enjoy our open spaces without fear of interference from dogs. Equally importantly wildlife should not have to suffer disturbance by dogs.

Yours faithfully, A Lowestoft resident

Please note that I wish to advise that I support the proposed PSPO for dogs to be kept on leads at the Suffolk Wildlife Trust site at Lound Lakes.

Please find attached The Kennel Club's response to the East Suffolk's PSPO consultation.

Dog access

The Kennel Club can support reasonable "dogs on lead" orders, which can - when used in a proportionate and evidenced-based way – include areas such as cemeteries, picnic areas, or on pavements in proximity to cars and other road traffic.

However, we will oppose PSPOs which introduce blanket restrictions on dog walkers accessing public open spaces without specific and reasonable justification. Dog owners are

required to provide their dogs with appropriate daily exercise, including "regular opportunities to walk and run", which in most cases will be off lead while still under control.

Their ability to meet this requirement is greatly affected by the amount of publicly accessible parks and other public places in their area where dogs can exercise without restrictions. This section of the Animal Welfare Act was included in the statutory guidance produced for local authorities by the Home Office on the use of PSPOs.

Accordingly, the underlying principle we seek to see applied is that dog controls should be the least restrictive to achieve a given defined and measurable outcome; this is the approach used by Natural England. In many cases, a seasonal or time of day restriction will be effective and the least restrictive approach, rather than a blanket year-round restriction. For instance, a "dogs on lead" order for a picnic area is unlikely to be necessary in mid-winter. We suggest the council considers whether a time limited restriction could be introduced at the Herringfleet Hills and Lound Lakes sites. Such that dog walkers still have the ability to let their dogs off lead for some period of the day and there is also an opportunity for people to avoid off lead dogs at other times during the day, when the restriction is in force.

The Government provided clear instructions to local authorities that they must provide restriction free sites for dog walkers to exercise their dogs. This message was contained in the guidance document for DCOs, and has been retained in both the Defra/Welsh Government and Home Office PSPO guidance documents, with the Defra guidance for PSPOs stating 'local authorities should ensure there are suitable alternatives for dogs to be exercised without restrictions'.

Dogs on lead by direction

The Kennel Club welcomes 'dogs on lead by direction' orders, as these allow responsible dog owners to exercise their dogs off lead without restriction providing their dogs are under control, whilst allowing the local authority powers to restrict dogs not under control. We would also recommend local authorities make use of the other more flexible and targeted measures at their disposal such as Acceptable Behavioural Contracts and Community Protection Notices. Kennel Club Good Citizen Training Clubs and our accredited trainers can also help those people whose dogs run out of control due to them not having the ability to train a good recall.

Assistance dogs

We welcome the intent to include exemptions for those who rely on assistance dogs, however we would suggest further consideration of the wording contained within the draft Order, specifically with reference to how "Assistance Dog" is defined.

A number of well-known assistance dog providers are members of Assistance Dogs UK. This umbrella group, currently has eight member organisations which can be viewed here - <u>http://www.assistancedogs.org.uk/</u>. However, it is important to note that the membership of Assistance Dogs UK is not a definitive list of all UK assistance dog organisations, and may change during the currency of the PSPO, it also does not provide for owner trained assistance dogs. We would therefore encourage the Council to allow some flexibility when considering whether a disabled person's dog is acting as an assistance dog.

The Council could consider adopting the definitions of assistance dogs as used by We would encourage the Council to adopt the definitions of assistance dogs as used by Northumberland Country Council which can be found on page 2 of the attached document;

"(4) The term "Assistance Dog" shall mean a dog which has been trained to assist a person with a disability.

(5) The expression "disability" shall have the meaning prescribed in section 6 of the Equality Act 2010 or as may be defined in any subsequent amendment or re-enactment of that legislation"

Good afternoon,

I have nothing to say on the tree new proposals coming in, however, I do feel that these so called dog walkers, infact this morning I saw a lady in Allenby Park with six dogs.

Surely there should be a law that all dog walkers are registered and the maximum dogs you are allowed to walk at any one time should be three.

This law is up held in other counties.

I took a call today who wished to register her objection to the proposed PSPO for Lound Lakes.

She is objecting because she believes it would mean that dogs would no longer socialise and become more aggressive protecting their owner due to being kept on a leash.

Hope this is ok and makes sense!

Thanks,

I would like to strongly object to the proposal to keep dogs on leads at lound lakes. I am a responsible dog owner of 2 labradoodles. I frequently walk my dogs over lound lakes and take full use of the off lead areas. There are plenty of areas for people to walk where dogs have to be on lead but the dogs also need space to run around. Our nation love our dogs and more should be done to encourage people to exercise them thus reducing obesity in dogs.

I walk my dogs during the day and at night by torchlight and make sure that all rules are met and all mess cleaned up.

Please also consider the owners who are not able to walk for miles but enjoy the company of their dogs, lound is essential to them as being responsible owners they want to still give the dog the exercise it deserves but would ot be able to if the enforcements would take place.

PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER Anti Social Behaviour Crime & Policing Act 2014 2019/## – Dogs on Leads at Lound Lakes Nature Reserve

I only heard about this by chance yesterday, January 4th just 5 days before your deadline. I have not seen any notices about this in the area and it seems unfair that the timing for commenting covered the Christmas period making it less likely that anyone would be aware.

According to the proposal, allowing dogs off lead in the area...' has a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality'. As the area is totally of an undeveloped rural nature, I do not see how this wording of the act can possibly be applied.

In fact, having to keep my dogs on a lead in that area will have a detrimental effect on my quality of life. I am widowed, I have two 7 year old rescue dogs who make me feel safe and enable me to get out and get exercise daily. I have back and knee issues, mostly caused from years of working as a nurse and midwife in the local NHS so I have to be careful. They can pull when on a lead particularly when we first get start a walk so I always drive them to the area of Lound Lakes because I know it is a safe place for me to let them off lead which enables me to walk safely with them. If this law is enforced I don't know how I will manage as there are so few safe places to take dogs to. Most people I see on my daily visits to the area are responsible dog walkers so I really don't understand how allowing dogs off lead has any detrimental effect. Please, please do not pass this law.

Please find attached my comments to the consultation about the introduction of PSPOs at the above sites.

Kindly acknowledge receipt.

PSPO Consultation, c/o Environmental Protection, East Suffolk Council, East Suffolk House, Station Road, Melton, Suffolk IP12 1RT

4 January 2020

Dear Sirs,

PROPOSED PSPOS AT LOUND LAKES AND HERRINGFLEET HILLS

I would like to strongly disagree with the proposed imposition of blanket PSPOs regarding "Dogs on Leads" at Lound Lakes Nature Reserve and Herringfleet Hills Walks.

It would be helpful to know the origin of the request for these constraints, ie do they come solely from the land owners/managers, or from members of the public using these facilities? In the absence of this information I would make the following general points:

In the case of Lound Lakes, there is in existence a "rule" that states that dogs must be on leads, except for one marked field that is exempt. This is not unreasonable as the area is primarily a nature reserve and wildlife, particularly birds, could be affected by dogs running free. However a blanket ban to the entire area would be unreasonable. I use this area fairly regularly and rarely see abuse of the "rule". Indeed most of the people that I see there have dogs and behave perfectly reasonably.

The land to the north of Hall Road is basically open fields and footpaths through to Hobland Road, with an area to the west around the lake and water company facilities, that I have always thought was not open to the public. These fields and footpaths are regularly used for exercising dogs off leads and I can see no valid reason why this shouldn't be permitted. I therefore suggest that the reserve in general should be dogs on leads, with the existing exempted field to the south and the fields to the north of Hall Road designated permitted areas for off lead. This would seem to be a reasonable compromise.

In the case of Herringfleet Hills, again I quite often walk here with my dog, accessing by local footpaths. Most of the people that I see here are dog walkers, usually with dogs off leads and there do not appear to be any problems. Whilst there will undoubtedly be a variety of fauna and flora here, I cannot imagine that there is anything unique or specific to this area to protect, if indeed this is the reason for the proposed constraint.

Suffolk is a dog friendly county, but it is quite right that some areas are designated off limits, such as beaches in the summer months, or wildlife reserves in the breeding season. Most people with dogs are well behaved and courteous to other dog owners (if you meet a dog on a lead, put yours on) and to other users of open spaces and paths without dogs. If there have been complaints from non dog owners about the activities of dog owners, at the sites in question, then this must be a consideration and it is a shame that more information about the reason and emanation of the PSPO request is not available.

I would imagine that dog owners are the largest user category of all visitors to the sites in question and decent exercise can only be achieved for most dogs when they are off lead. It seems that more PSPOs of this nature are being forced upon us in recent years and I am concerned about this trend.

Dear Sir or Madam,

Dogs Trust has been made aware that East Suffolk Council is planning to introduce a 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; 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 signposted areas locally for owners to exercise their dog off-lead.

The PDSA's <u>'Paw Report 2018'</u> found that 89% of veterinary professionals believe that the welfare of dogs will suffer if owners are banned from walking their dogs in public spaces such as parks and beaches, or if dogs are required to be kept on leads in these spaces. Their report also states that 78% of owners rely on these types of spaces to walk their dog.

I would also like to bring your attention to the similar recommendations stated in the Government's <u>'Anti-social behaviour powers -Statutory guidance for frontline professionals'</u> document, pages 52/53.

We believe that the vast majority of dog owners are responsible, and that the majority of dogs are well behaved. In recognition of this, we would encourage local authorities to exercise its power to issue Community Protection Notices, targeting irresponsible owners and proactively addressing antisocial behaviours.

Dogs Trust works with local authorities across the UK to help promote responsible dog ownership. If you are interested, I can send you a copy of our Services Guide, a document listing the ways in which we may be able to help with promoting responsible dog ownership in your community. Please do not hesitate to contact should you wish to discuss this matter.

Good morning

Re: Lound Lakes dogs on leads

I walk my dogs at Lound Lakes and am grateful for the one quite secure field which is signposted as a 'dogs allowed off lead' area. I hope this one field remains as a designated dogs off lead area, it is well used and one of the few places in the locality that is secure and safe for dogs away from roads and children's play areas, and this provision may encourage dog owners to keep their dogs on a lead elsewhere.

I support the proposal to not allow dogs off lead in other parts of Lound Lakes due to cattle and wildlife.

Good afternoon,

I'm against the dog on lead this is one place I can let my dog of her lead, we pick up after our dog and when there are other dogs she stays on the lead, I don't see how you can tarnish every dog with the same brush,

Lound lakes is a favourite spot for us to go as a family with our dog so she gets a good run as we don't have a big back garden, it's never over crowded like the beach and some days we hardly bump into any other people.

The other two places I can't comment on.

But for Lound I'm against it.

I have just seen that there is a proposed pspo for Lound Lakes & I would like to comment. As far as I am aware dogs are already meant to be on lead in this area apart from one designated field. As a dog owner myself & a frequent visitor to this field I would be very disappointed if this facility was to be removed. Dogs need safe areas to run free & it feels very unfair that yet again responsible dog owners are being penalised. I agree that there are inconsiderate owners but feel that these would still walk their dogs off lead & not clear up after them regardless as how do you police the situation? There is also a much bigger issue with people littering than dog fouling.

as a volunteer on the nature reserve, I would support the idea of a Public Space Protection Order to protect the

wildlife from disturbance by dogs.

Dear Sir,

I would like to object most strongly to the proposal for PSPO for the three areas. In particular the Lound Lakes area. I have been walking my dogs there for the last twenty five years and have always respected the land owners' restrictions. This proposal would discourage many dog owners from walking there, Dog walkers provide a valuable presence that keeps paths open, discourages anti social behaviour and fly tipping. Dog walking is a good source of exercise for owners and, when off the lead, dogs themselves. The vast majority of dog owners already clear up after their dogs and keep their pets under control, ensuring that they are not a nuisance in any way. Dog walking is a very sociable activity for dogs and dogs owners and supports people who may, otherwise, be lonely. Over the years I have always respected, as do most dog walkers, the signs that have been put up by Essex and Suffolk Water, kept dogs on leads in those areas that have previously been designated as such and ensured that livestock are not harmed or alarmed in any way. Please reconsider this proposal and allow the continuation of free access in the areas we currently enjoy.

In regard to the proposal for dogs to be on leads throughout the whole area of Lound Lakes I would like to express my concerns.

Currently there is a large field designated as 'off lead' and this allows for proper exercise for dogs to run and stretch freely. To remove this facility would be very detrimental to dogs health and well being.

You say East Suffolk Council is dog friendly, making changes to ensure dogs can only be walked at heel in a popular dog walking area cannot support this ethos. Dogs need to be exercised properly with off lead time and this currently designated field fully supports this in a safe environment not adjacent to roads or housing. Where would you suggest dogs can be properly exercised close to this locality if this option is removed?

Policing this would be quite difficult too, time and money could be spent to better benefit elsewhere! I therefore do not support this proposal.

ID We have had regular incidents of dogs chasing the cattle on the fields 2 of which ended up with Cattle breaking through gates and a fence.

In There have been an incidents of a dog attacking a visitor without dogs and an incident of a dog walker being bitten by a dog off lead all reported to the Police.

Dog mess is an issue constantly on Blue Doors Loke and Chapel Loke even with Dog bins in place and we have 3 incidents of dog mess in areas used by Children for educational purposes.

There has also been a history of dogs off leads being in areas of no public access as well as swimming in the lakes while off leads which are used for drinking water and also have spates of bluegreen algae.

·····

Hello, I am writing to object to the proposal to introduce a public space protection order for Lound Lakes. The grounds on which the application are being made are to "assist with the management of the area, and to protect livestock". I find this totally bogus. I walk my dog here almost every day and have done so for over 15 years (along with my partner who has walked here with a dog for nearly 30 years) and never once has this impeded the owners of the land doing what they do, or been part of or witness to any incident. When livestock are in the field then of course dogs are kept on leads. That said, livestock are in the field for only a few months of the year and you are then placing false restrictions on people needlessly. Livestock are also not grazed on all sections you are proposing to place the restrictions. If I see other people then I put my dog on a lead and maintain full control of him, as all responsible dog owners do. This area is one of the few quiet areas where people can go and exercise their dogs, it's really important to be able to let them off to be able to run and get real exercise and it is also good for personal wellbeing. Beaches are busy places and can't be used in the same way as an alternative, they also have other restrictions so I question what the motivation is for this given this is an area enjoyed by so many with no incidents. Can the council or land owners provide evidence of any conflicts or issues that have arisen with dog walkers versus the land owners or issues with livestock to justify the imposition of this order? I am certainly not aware of any and many of us walking there talk to each other. I also question if you do impose these orders, who is going to enforce them? The police most certainly will not and I don't believe there are sufficient council employees in these times of austerity to be patrolling the area, so it would be a waste of time, cause totally unnecessary stress and anxiety and in practice not be enforced....a needless and pointless piece of regulation that just detracts from the enjoyment of the area. Reducing the footfall from dog walkers in this area will also raise the potential for fly tipping and other anti-social activities. Some of the pull in areas already get waste dumped in and it is my genuine belief that other things don't happen because there are lots of people walking and deter this. The footfall will reduce with the PSPO and therefore increase the risk of other activities such as unlicensed music

events, group parties with fires, littering and fly tipping all of which will have a wholly negative effect on the activities of the landowner, environment and, most importantly, the local community. I object in the strongest terms and request you do not place these restrictions on the area of Lound Lakes.