



To: The Leader and Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation: Councillor Lewis Herbert

Report by: Wendy Young, Operations Manager (Streets and Open Spaces - Community Engagement and Enforcement)

Relevant scrutiny committee: Strategy & Resources  
03/07/2017  
Scrutiny Committee

Wards affected: Abbey Arbury Castle Cherry Hinton Coleridge East Chesterton King's Hedges Market Newnham Petersfield Queen Edith's Romsey Trumpington West Chesterton

## **PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER**

### **Public Spaces Protection Order for Dog Control in Cambridge**

#### **Not a Key Decision**

---

### **1. Executive summary**

This report considers the statutory consultation exercise conducted by the Council during October and November, 2016 (stage 1), and April, 2017 (stage 2), in relation to the proposal to introduce a Public Spaces Protection Order ('PSPO') in respect of dog control (including dog fouling, dog exclusion and dogs on leads requirements) within Cambridge.

The responses to consultation and main substantive issues raised during the consultation process are examined. Recommendations are made for the Executive Councillor to approve at 2.1 in this report.

The Council received 389 responses to stage 1 of the consultation, during October and November, 2016, which were analysed by MEL Research. In April, 2017, 225 responses to stage 2 of the consultation were received. The reports produced by MEL can be found in the background papers of this report. In addition, fuller details on the consultation methodology can be found in section 4 of this report.

The Council has given careful consideration to the responses to the consultation exercise (stages 1 and 2). As a result of this, a number of

changes to the text of the draft PSPO as consulted upon are proposed, specifically:

- Removal of Mill Road Cemetery as a 'dog on leads' area;
- Revised boundary to the proposal at Cherry Hinton Hall pond / brook area; and
- Changes to the exceptions to include the definition of 'assistance dogs' as per the Equality Act, 2010

The PSPO, as proposed, is not put forward as a means of unduly restricting the exercising or recreation of dogs across the city. The reason for putting forward the PSPO is to address the detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality caused by the irresponsible behaviour of a small minority of dog owners; and to set out a clear standard of behaviour to which all dog owners are required to adhere.

## **2. Recommendations**

2.1 The Executive Councillor is recommended:

1. To approve the proposed PSPO, as set out in Appendix A
2. To approve the area of the PSPO, as indicated in the maps at Appendix B;
3. To delegate to officers' the authority to install signage appropriate to any PSPO that may be agreed.

## **3. Background**

3.1 Dog Control Orders were made by Cambridge City Council in July, 2013, and created offences of:

- 'Failing to remove dog faeces';
- 'Not keeping a dog on a lead in designated areas';
- 'Not putting, and keeping, a dog on a lead when directed to do so by an authorised officer'; and
- 'Permitting a dog to enter land from which dogs are excluded'

3.2 The Dog Control Orders created transparency and consistency within the City Council boundary and gave authorised officers<sup>1</sup> the ability to issue fixed penalty notices (FPN) for offences.

---

<sup>1</sup> Officers authorised to issue fixed penalty notices for dog offences includes one dog warden and six enforcement officers

- 3.3 Where a Dog Control Order is in force, it would continue to be valid for a period of three years following commencement of the Anti-social, Crime and Policing Act, 2014. At this point, it would then be treated as a PSPO (with effect from October, 2017).
- 3.4 The council opted to review current areas of dog control ahead of October 2017 (Strategy and Resources Committee, 10<sup>th</sup> October 2016), as an early review would allow for: new areas of dog control to be considered and consulted on; for public spaces protection order signage requirements to be reviewed; and for a smooth transition that allows fixed penalties to continue to be issued to those that breach either orders.
- 3.5 PSPOs are designed to place controls on the use of public space and everyone within it. The orders have effect for up to three years and can be extended. Only local authorities can make PSPOs. 'Public place' means any place to which the public or any section of the public has access, on payment or otherwise, as of right or by virtue of express or implied permission.
- 3.6 The Council can make a PSPO if satisfied on reasonable grounds that two conditions are met. The first condition is that:
- a. Activities carried out in a public place within the Council's area have had a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality; or,
  - b. It is likely that activities will be carried out in a public place within that area and that they will have such an effect.

The second condition is that the effect, or likely effect, of the activities:

- a. Is, or is likely, to be of a persistent or continuing nature;
  - b. Is, or is likely to be, such as to make the activities unreasonable; and,
  - c. Justifies the restrictions imposed by the notice.
- 3.7 A PSPO is an order that identifies the public place and:
- a. Prohibits specified things being done in that public place;
  - b. Requires specified things to be done by persons carrying on specified activities in that place; or
  - c. Does both of those things.

- 3.8 The only prohibitions, or requirements, that may be imposed are ones that are reasonable to impose, in order to prevent or reduce the risk of the detrimental effect continuing, occurring or recurring.
- 3.9 Prohibitions can apply to all persons, or only to persons in specified categories, or to all persons except those in specified categories.
- 3.10 The order can specify the times at which it applies and the circumstances in which it applies or does not apply.
- 3.11 Unless extended, the order may not have effect for more than 3 years.
- 3.12 Breach of a PSPO, without reasonable excuse, is a criminal offence. The Police, or a person authorised by the Council, can issue FPN. A person can also be prosecuted for breach of a PSPO and, on conviction; the Magistrates' Court can impose a fine not exceeding Level 3 on the Standard Scale (currently £1000).
- 3.13 A FPN is an 'on the spot' fine for committing a criminal offence, such as breach of PSPOs. Payment of a FPN means that no further action will be taken for that particular offence. It doesn't constitute an admission of guilt by the offender, but it does mean that such cases are diverted away from the Magistrates Court and the risk to offenders of the Court imposing a larger penalty and a criminal record.
- 3.14 On 10<sup>th</sup> October, 2016, the Executive Councillor approved, in principle, the proposal to make a PSPO in respect of dog control (including dog fouling, dog exclusion and dogs on leads requirements) within Cambridge. Authorisation was given for the necessary statutory consultation to be carried out, prior to any decision being made on whether or not to make such a PSPO.
- 3.15 On 23 January, 2017, the Executive Councillor approved a further extension of proposals for Cherry Hinton Hall pond/ brook area, Ravensworth Gardens fenced green area and Mill Road Cemetery. These areas were where the first stage of consultation had identified results which were unclear and required further consideration.
- 3.16 An extensive consultation was carried out over two stages, which included the necessary consultation required by statute. The proposals set forward for consultation were open as to what the consultation responses might be and the need to make any resulting alterations. ,.

- 3.17 In pursuing the PSPO, the Council was required to consult with the Chief Officer of Police the Police and Crime Commissioner, the local policing body and whatever community representatives the Council thought appropriate to consult. The Council was also required to consult with the owner or occupier of land within the restricted area.
- 3.18 It was recognised that the proposed PSPO could be of interest to many sections of the community, including the public and residents' groups. Accordingly, the Council consulted widely, as evidenced by the list of consultees in the background papers. The consultation methodology used is set out in Section 4 of this report.
- 3.19 The Council received 389 responses to stage 1 of the consultation. To analyse the responses to the online consultation and the other methods of response to stage 1 of the consultation, and to undertake stage 2 of the consultation, the council commissioned M-E-L Research. Both the stage 1 and stage 2 reports can be found in the background papers to this report.
- 3.20 The Council was also required to publish the text of the proposed Order on its website. The then draft Order was published on the Council's website between 17 October and 21 November, 2016.

### **Summary of consultation responses**

- 3.21 In response to stage 1 consultation, a total of 389 responses were received 99% of respondents lived in Cambridge; and just over half (56%) were dog owners, or dog walkers (48%). Respondents to the consultation ranged in age from 18 years to 65 years and over.
- 3.22 Written responses were also received from a number of groups and organisations including residents' associations, Guidedogs for the Blind, Canine Generated Independence, The Kennel Club and RSPCA (Royal Society for Protection of Cruelty to Animals).
- 3.23 In response to stage 2 of the consultation, a total of 225 surveys were completed at Cherry Hinton Hall, Ravensworth Gardens and Mill Road Cemetery. Of those that responded, 22% had a dog at home, and 18% took their own or someone else's dog for a walk.
- 3.24 The consultation responses from statutory consultees were received from Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner. Despite multiple communications sent to Cambridgeshire Police, no response was received. Copies of the full responses are included in the background papers.

## **PSPO proposal**

This sections sets out the PSPO proposal, including a summary of the related consultation responses and any proposed alterations, by offence type.

### **a) Dog fouling**

- 3.25 The PSPO proposal is to continue the requirement that on land, open to the air, to which the public are entitled or permitted to have access (with or without payment) across Cambridge, that if a dog defecates, at any time, the person who is in charge of the dog, at the time, must clear up the dog faeces immediately.
- 3.26 Responses to the consultation indicated very high support for this power to continue (97% strongly agreed, and 3% slightly agreed) and comments received indicated dog mess was a problem in a number of areas of the city; and questions were raised on how the offence was to be enforced.

### **b) Dogs on leads by direction**

- 3.27 The PSPO proposal is to continue with the requirement that on land, open to the air, to which the public are entitled or permitted to have access (with or without payment) across Cambridge, a person in charge of a dog must comply with a direction given to them by an authorised officer to put and keep the dog on a lead. Situations when dogs appear to be 'out of control' include, but are not limited to the following:
- Where animals, or birds, or wildlife, are, or could be, threatened;
  - Where the public, particularly children or vulnerable adults, are at threat, or feel threatened;
  - Where dogs are posing a risk to the safety of pedestrians and/or cyclists and/or motorists;
  - Where dogs are causing damage to public property, including trees and plants; and
  - In case of emergency situations.
- 3.28 Over the two stages of consultation, over 97% of respondents agreed that authorised officers should have the ability to use the power in given situations. The consensus of comments received was that that this power should only be used when proportionate to the situation; and that officers should use careful judgement in applying this

requirement when a dog displayed genuine behaviour and could cause harm to people or other dogs.

### **c) Dogs on leads**

3.29 In reviewing the transition from the existing dog control orders, the PSPO proposal is to retain dogs on leads for some open play areas and cemeteries and to remove restrictions for others. Land subject to the proposed PSPO will continue to have signs using the words “dogs on leads area”; or words and/or symbols having a similar meaning displayed.

3.30 Under the proposed PSPO, existing restrictions are to be retained at the following locations:

- Abbey Pool children's play area
- Coldhams Lane children's play area
- Ditton Fields recreation ground
- Kings Hedges "Pulley" recreation ground (play area)
- Molewood Close play area
- Velos Walk play area

From the consultation, 88% of respondents agreed with the play areas where dogs were to be kept on leads at all times, and 81% agreed with the requirements to keep dogs on leads at Histon Road and Newmarket Road Cemeteries.

3.31 Under the proposed PSPO, existing restrictions are to be removed at the following locations:

- Arbury Court (unfenced play area)
- Ashbury Close play area
- Brooks Road (unfenced play area)
- Dundee Close play area
- George Nuttall Close play area
- Great Eastern street play area
- Green End Road recreation ground (unfenced play area)
- Lammas Land (unfenced play area)
- Shelly Road recreation ground
- Shenstone House play area
- Tenby Close play area
- Thorpe Way recreation ground (unfenced play area)

The majority of respondents, 54%, replied that existing dogs on leads requirements at children's play areas should remain in place. The majority of those that agreed to keep the proposals in place were non-dog owners.

- 3.32 Despite the fairly equal response regarding removal of previous restrictions, officers recommend that the areas detailed in 3.31 have the existing restrictions removed and the areas return to being locations in which both dogs can be freely exercised and children can play.

### **Mill Road Cemetery**

- 3.33 Mill Road Cemetery had previously had a requirement for dogs to be on leads at all times, but which had been suspended under the previous Dog Control Order of 2013.
- 3.34 Results from the first stage of the consultation were fairly even, a second stage of consultation was commissioned to understand dog use and required dog control measures at this site.
- 3.35 On focusing on users of the cemetery (both dog walkers/ handlers and non-dog walkers/ handlers) the second stage consultation found that almost two thirds of respondents (62%) agreed with the proposal to remove the requirement for dogs to be on leads at all times.
- 3.36 The general consensus by cemetery users was that dogs off leads were fine, as long as the owners had control and were responsible.
- 3.37 So under the proposed PSPO, officers recommend the existing dogs on lead restriction at Mill Road Cemetery is removed

### **d) Dog exclusion areas**

- 3.38 In reviewing the transition from the existing Dog Control Orders, the proposal is to retain dog exclusion areas for fenced children's play areas, outdoor children's paddling pools, tennis courts and bowling greens and to remove restrictions for others areas. Land subject to this order will continue to have signs using the words "dog exclusion area" or words and/ or symbols having a similar meaning displayed.
- 3.39 Under the proposed PSPO, the existing restrictions at the following locations are to be retained:

### **Bowling greens**

- Alexandra Gardens
- Christ's Pieces
- Coleridge Recreation Ground
- Lammas Land
- Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground
- Trumpington Recreation Ground

### **Paddling Pools**

- Abbey Pool Paddling Pool
- Cherry Hinton Hall
- Coleridge Recreation Ground
- Lammas Land
- Sheep's Green Learner Pool

### **Tennis courts**

- Christ's Pieces
- Cherry Hinton Hall
- Coleridge Recreation Ground
- Jesus Green
- Lammas Land
- Nightingale Avenue Recreation Ground
- Trumpington Recreation Ground

### **Childrens' play areas**

- Aberdeen Avenue
- Ainsdale
- Alexandra Gardens
- Arbury Court (fenced play area)
- Atkins Close
- Barnwell Road (fenced play area)
- Bateson Road
- Beales Way
- Brooks Road (fenced play area)
- Cherry Hinton Hall (fenced play area)
- Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground
- Chesterton Recreation Ground
- Chestnut Grove
- Christs Pieces
- Coleridge Recreation Ground
- Discovery Way
- Dudley Road
- Edgecombe Flats
- Flower Street

- Green End Road (fenced play area)
- Gunhild Way/Close
- Hampden Gardens
- Histon Road
- Humphreys Road
- Jesus Green (fenced play area)
- Kathleen Elliot Way
- Kingfisher Way
- Neptune Close
- Nightingale Avenue
- Nuns Way
- Pearl Close
- Petersfield
- Peverel Road
- Ramsden Square
- Ravensworth Gardens (fenced children's play area x2)
- Reilly Way
- River Lane
- Robert May Close
- Romsey Recreation Ground
- Scotland Road
- Sleaford Street/Ainsworth Street
- St Albans Recreation Ground (fenced play area)
- St Barnabas Court
- St Matthews Recreation Ground (fenced play area)
- St Thomas's Square
- Stourbridge Common (Access Land)
- The Bath House (Gwydir Street)
- Thorpe Way play (fenced play area)
- Trumpington Recreation Ground
- Whytford Close

85% of respondents agreed with the bowling greens, 87% with paddling pools and 88% with tennis courts, as the areas where dogs were to be excluded at all times; and 83% agreed with the requirements to exclude dogs at all times from the fenced play areas set out in the consultation.

3.40 A number of the sites, (Ekin Road play area, Barnwell Road bowling green and tennis court and Kings Hedges "Pulley" Recreation Ground-paddling pool replaced by an unfenced splash pad) are now no longer fenced or not easily accessible, and it is recommended that existing restrictions are removed at these sites.

## **Ravensworth Gardens green area**

- 3.41 For the green area at Ravensworth Gardens, the proposed options put forward for consultation were to require dogs to be on leads at all times; or for dogs to be excluded.
- 3.42 When presented with the two options in stage 1 of the consultation, 30% of respondents agreed that dogs should be excluded from the green area at all times, and 65% agreed that dogs should be on leads at all times. When asked to state their preference for a dog exclusion area, dogs on leads restriction, or neither, the results were 21% for dog exclusion area, 47% for dogs on leads area, 25% for neither and 8% set out other ideas. The ideas suggested include marking a dedicated dog exercise area, CCTV cameras and timed dogs on leads / dog exclusion areas. It was not possible to verify whether the responses received were from the users of Ravensworth Gardens, local residents or simply visitors/residents to the city generally.
- 3.43 In stage 2 of the consultation, Ravensworth Gardens was an area that was to be looked at due to the unclear level of results from stage 1. Only eleven respondents were available that were users of the green space. When asked what would their preferred option of control be, dogs' being on leads at all times was the most commonly cited response.
- 3.44 A number of residents and South Petersfield Residents Association wrote to support the proposal for a dog exclusion area at Ravensworth Gardens. Comments from residents included that children were put off using the green space, due to the ongoing issue of dog mess not being cleared up by irresponsible dog owners. No responses were received against a dog exclusion area, nor in support of a dogs on leads area.
- 3.45 In considering whether to make this proposal for the green area at Ravensworth Gardens, officers have sought advice from the Dog Warden service and the Assets Team. Based on this advice, the officer recommendation is to designate the Ravensworth Gardens green space as a dog exclusion area under the proposed PSPO, and to monitor the designation to see if it resolves the existing dog mess issue.

## **Cherry Hinton Hall**

- 3.46 For the pond area and brook area at Cherry Hinton Hall, the consultation proposal was to require dogs to be on leads at all times.

- 3.47 The results of the first stage of consultation showed that 60% of respondents agreed with the proposal, though a number of comments were made about the geographical area that had been identified in the consultation. Of those that disagreed, comments focused on the majority of dog owners being responsible, so they shouldn't be penalised, the areas not having have any dedicated play areas and that well behaved dogs should be able to cool off in the water.
- 3.48 A second stage of consultation was commissioned to engage users of Cherry Hinton Hall and seek their views on the PSPO proposal. Overall, almost six in ten (59%) of respondents agreed with the proposal to create a dog on leads area at the brook/ pond. Of those that disagreed, the reasons for the order not being introduced was that well behaved dogs shouldn't be punished and should be allowed to have a run about; and that the majority of owners have control of their dogs off the lead and shouldn't be punished.
- 3.49 In considering whether to make this proposal for the pond / brook area, officers have sought advice from relevant Council services (including Assets and Nature Conservation officers) and considered existing restrictions for dogs at Cherry Hinton Hall. The dog exclusion areas, that currently extend to the fenced children's play areas, tennis courts and outdoor paddling pool, mean that dogs are not permitted in these fenced off areas. All other areas of the Hall are free for dogs to roam off lead.
- 3.50 The brook that flows through Cherry Hinton hall is one of only a small number of chalk brooks in the world, and so is a nationally rare habitat supporting many species, the council are working in partnership with the Friends of Cherry Hinton Hall and the Friends of Cherry Hinton Brook to protect and enhance the brook. The recent S106 project to desilt the small lake and establish more diverse bank side and marsh vegetation will benefit local biodiversity and create a more attractive environment. The council hope that as the new plants grow, the threatened water voles will return to breed within the hall. Although many species will learn to tolerate humans and dog disturbance, dogs off of leads in this area will inevitably reduce suitable areas of habitat for species to thrive and park users to enjoy.
- 3.51 It is therefore recommended that the area of Cherry Hinton Hall by the pond / brook is set as a dog on leads area to balance the interests of the wildlife and users of the parks with dogs. The boundary of the original proposal has been amended to allow dogs' access to a

section of the brook and are included with the PSPO, as set out in the maps of Appendix B.

### **Cherry Hinton Lakes**

- 3.52 For the area of Cherry Hinton Lakes, the consultation proposal was to require dogs to be on leads at all times. The results of the consultation show that 51% of responses agreed with the proposal.
- 3.53 Due to the site, not currently being open to the public, it is not proposed to continue with the introduction of any restrictions at this site for the present time.

## **4 Exceptions**

- 4.1 It was proposed, at consultation, that some exceptions were included within the PSPO, in line with those that are already in place for the Dog Control Orders.
- 4.2 These were proposed to ensure that the restrictions placed on dog owners / handlers were reasonable and take into account conditions where it is not possible to comply.
- 4.3 87% of respondents agreed with the proposed exceptions; however, a number of responses suggested changes, that should be considered and had not previously formed part of the Dog Control Orders, in particular, to reflect the legislation when it comes to 'assistance dogs'.
- 4.4 In considering the exceptions for the PSPO, officers have sought advice from the council's Equalities and Anti-Poverty Officer and used the consultation responses from relevant organisations including the Kennel Club and Guide Dogs for the Blind. Following consideration, the original exceptions are considered unsuitable, and so revised exceptions, in accordance with the Equality Act, 2010, are included in the PSPO proposal of Appendix A.

## **4. Implications**

### **(a) Financial Implications**

The Council has already incurred the cost of carrying out the consultation, both stage 1 and 2. When the PSPO is made, in accordance with Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act, 2014, the Council must "cause to be erected on or adjacent to the land in relation to which the public spaces protection order has been made such notice or notices as it considers

sufficient to draw the attention of any member of the public using that land to –

- (i) the fact that a public spaces protection order has been made; and
- (ii) and the effect of that order being made.”

The signage required will cost approximately £9.60 each, plus delivery charge of £15. Approximately the total cost is in the region of £3000, which will be met from within existing departmental cost centres.

The dog fouling and dogs on leads by direction aspects of the order are city-wide offences and therefore advisory warning signs will be placed in hotspot areas. Such hotspot areas may change over time as targeted education / enforcement has an impact. Dog exclusion and dogs on leads areas are small fixed geographical areas, and will have advisory signs placed at entrances and exits to the designated areas under these orders.

The issuing of FPN for breach of a PSPO will generate additional income, which can offset the cost of signage in future years if considered appropriate. FPN receipts will be used for the purpose of exercising functions to improve street cleanliness and enforcement of offences; it is not being regarded as an ‘income generator’. It is not envisaged that the revenue generated from the fines will be significant, but it will reduce the need to pursue costly prosecution in some cases and enable a more flexible approach in dealing with specific offences.

#### **(b) Staffing Implications**

There are no additional staffing implications as authorised officers (enforcement officers and dog wardens) are already equipped to deal with dog fouling and nuisances.

#### **(c) Equality and Poverty Implications**

An Equality Impact Assessment has been completed and is set out in Appendix C.

The impact on residents, visitors and businesses is expected to be positive, as these proposals should continue to act as a deterrent to irresponsible dog ownership. Exemptions for those with ‘assistance dogs’ have been fully considered and included in the PSPO proposal. There is no adverse impact on any other Protected Groups from the PSPO’s adoption.

#### **(d) Environmental Implications**

There will continue to be a positive effect on local environmental quality with the enforcement of a PSPO for dog control and the continued enforcement against dog fouling.

**(e) Procurement**

Costs for the purchase of signage are estimated to be in the region of £3000, and best value will be demonstrated by obtaining at least one written quotation.

Any further procurement involved in delivering the proposed PSPO (Appendix A) will be undertaken in accordance with the procurement and financial regulations of the council.

**(f) Consultation and communication**

The Council has carried out an extensive consultation, which included the necessary consultation required by statute. The consultation was carried out at a stage when the proposal was at a sufficiently formative stage and undertaken with an open mind as to what the consultation responses might be and the need to make any resulting alterations. The Council believes this is amply demonstrated by the proposed alterations made to the terms of the PSPO, resulting from the consultation responses and the recommendation for further specific consultation over the proposals for Cherry Hinton Hall, Ravensworth Gardens and Mill Road Cemetery.

It was recognised that the proposed PSPO could be of interest to many sections of the community, including the public and special interest groups. Accordingly, the Council has consulted widely.

The consultation methodology included:

**Stage 1:**

- Making the survey available on the Council's website
- Letters sent out to statutory consultees and to any individual, organisation or business on request.
- Posters were put up in the affected parks and green spaces which notified users of the consultation
- Posters were put in all the Council Community Centres
- Emails were circulated with a link to the survey to residents' groups, and friends of groups
- All animal associated organisations were emailed the link of the consultation (vets, pet shops, RSPCA and Guide Dogs for the Blind)

## Stage 2

MEL Research interviewers surveyed residents over a three-day period, between 13th and 15th April, 2017, speaking to those who used the three target parks/ green spaces: Cherry Hinton Hall, Mill Road Cemetery and Ravensworth Gardens. A mixed method was used with the interviewers either working on each site and speaking to park users; or going door-to-door speaking to residents who use the parks/sites. The doorstep approach was with a random sample of households gathered from postal addresses falling within a half a mile radius of each of the three targeted park/ green space sites

Following the consultation, responses have been used to make amendments to the final PSPO that is presented to the committee (appendix A).

### (g) **Community Safety**

The introduction of a PSPO for dog control will continue to have a positive effect on community safety, reducing the risks associated with *Toxocariasis*<sup>2</sup> and nuisance dogs.

## 5. Background papers

The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014:  
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2014/12/contents/enacted/data.htm>
- DEFRA Dealing Practitioner's Manual on dealing with irresponsible dog ownership:  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/373429/dog-ownership-practitioners-manual-201411.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/373429/dog-ownership-practitioners-manual-201411.pdf)
- The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 Statutory guidance for frontline professionals:  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/352562/ASB\\_Guidance\\_v8\\_July2014\\_final\\_2\\_.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/352562/ASB_Guidance_v8_July2014_final_2_.pdf)
- Report to Strategy and Resources Committee Proposed Public Spaces Protection Orders for Dog Control in Cambridge 10<sup>th</sup> October 2016: [http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/s36153/PSPO\\_DCO Comittee Paper 2.pdf](http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/s36153/PSPO_DCO_Comittee_Paper_2.pdf)

---

<sup>2</sup> *Toxocariasis* is a rare infection caused by roundworm parasites. Its spread from animals to humans through contact with infected faeces and infection may cause disease that involves the liver, heart, lung, muscle, eye, and brain.

- Report to Strategy and Resources Committee Proposed Public Spaces Protection Orders for Dog Control in Cambridge and 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2017:  
[http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/s37453/Public\\_Spaces\\_Protection\\_Order\\_for\\_dog\\_control.pdf](http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/s37453/Public_Spaces_Protection_Order_for_dog_control.pdf);
- Minutes for Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2016:
- Minutes Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2017: [http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/g3082/Printed\\_minutes\\_23rd-Jan-2017\\_17.00\\_Strategy\\_and\\_Resources\\_Scrutiny\\_Committee.pdf](http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/g3082/Printed_minutes_23rd-Jan-2017_17.00_Strategy_and_Resources_Scrutiny_Committee.pdf)
- List of consultees Stage 1 (included in within Minutes Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2017)
- Original Draft Public Spaces Protection Order (Dog Control) PSPO  
[https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/draft\\_pspo.pdf](https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/draft_pspo.pdf)
- Copy of survey for Stage 1  
[http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/s37454/PSPO\\_Appendix\\_D\\_-\\_Consultation\\_Questionnaire.pdf](http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/s37454/PSPO_Appendix_D_-_Consultation_Questionnaire.pdf)
- MEL Research - Stage 1 - Dog Control Consultation 2016 (Cambridge City Council) Final Report May 2017:  
[https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/stage\\_1\\_dog\\_control\\_draft\\_consultation\\_report\\_final.pdf](https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/stage_1_dog_control_draft_consultation_report_final.pdf)
- MEL Research - Stage 2 - Dog Control Consultation 2017 (Cambridge City Council) Final Report May 2017:  
[https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/stage\\_2\\_dog\\_control\\_draft\\_policy\\_consultation\\_report\\_final.pdf](https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/stage_2_dog_control_draft_policy_consultation_report_final.pdf)
- Responses from Statutory bodies to Stage 1:  
[https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/responses\\_from\\_statutory\\_bodies\\_0.pdf](https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/responses_from_statutory_bodies_0.pdf)

## 6. Appendices

1. Proposed Public Spaces Protection Order (Dog Control) - Appendix A
2. Proposed Public Spaces Protection Order (Dog Control) maps – Appendix B
3. EQIA - Appendix C

## 7. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name: Wendy Young  
Author's Phone Number: 01223 - 458578  
Author's Email: wendy.young@cambridge.gov.uk