

**Appendix 1. Table of Proposed Changes, Consultation Responses and Recommendations for the Control of Dogs PSPO 2026**

Existing requirement	Consultation Response	Public Comments	Officer Comment	Recommendation
A person who is in control of a dog and does not remove their faeces and properly dispose of it when within a public space unless they have reasonable excuse and if the owner, occupier or authority having control of the land has consented, shall be guilty of an offence.	98% of respondents agreed  2% of respondents did not agree	I am a dog owner and always clear up after my dog and expect other people to do the same.  It is never acceptable to not pick up dogs mess. If the person is not capable of doing so, then they should not be in a public space with their dog (maybe with the exception of a blind person). The same applies to not having the dog in a lead and under control.	This is a continuation of the existing requirement of the Dog Control PSPO 2023.	It is recommended that the Cabinet agree to keep the current control remains in place.
A person who is in control of a dog and fails to keep their dog on a lead less than 1 metre in length whilst on a public road or on a pavement adjacent to the road unless they have reasonable excuse, shall be guilty of an offence.	79% of respondents agreed  21% of respondents disagreed	Only being allowed to use a lead less than 1m can be dangerous. I often run with my dog, and a short lead would make it dangerous. I need to be able to use a longer lead.  Finally, many dogs behave worse when on leads. Evidence shows this. Owners should be trusted to decide if it's best for their dog to	This is a continuation of the existing requirement of the Dog Control PSPO 2023.	It is recommended that the Cabinet agree to keep the current control remains in place.

		<p>be on/off lead in common exercise areas to reduce problems.</p> <p>Dogs should not have to be on lead if they are under CLOSE control of a responsible owner</p> <p>dog should be on lead on my opinion due to a lot of incident of out of control animals due to lack of training.</p> <p>For " A person who is in control of a dog and fails to keep their dog on a lead less than 1 metre in length whilst on a public road or on a pavement adjacent to the road unless they have reasonable excuse." 1m is too short. Most standard short leads are 100-120cm</p> <p>I strongly feel that owners shouldn't have to keep dogs on leads unless near roads. There is a lot of beautiful countryside in Devon and walking dogs through it is a wonderful way to see the countryside and exercise your dogs. Keeping them on leads restricts their exercise and opportunity to run and explore</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

<p>A person who is in control of a dog and does not comply with a direction given by an authorised officer of the Council or a Police Officer to put and keep their dog on a lead unless they have a reasonable excuse and if the owner, occupier or authority having control of the land has consented shall be guilty of an offence.</p>	<p>87% of respondents agreed</p> <p>13% of respondents disagreed</p>	<p>There should be more detail on why an authorised person would tell a dog owner to put it on a lead</p> <p>These proposals are not unreasonable</p>	<p>This is a continuation of the existing requirement of the Dog Control PSPO 2023.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the Cabinet agree to keep the current control remains in place.</p>
<p>A person who takes more than 6 dogs onto land unless they have a reasonable excuse and if the owner, occupier or authority having control of the land has consented shall be guilty of an offence.</p>	<p>87% of respondents agreed</p> <p>13% of respondents disagreed</p>	<p>6 dogs is too many for one person to be in charge of.</p> <p>I agree there is a need to limit dogs under the control of a single person but 6 is too much. It needs to be 3 or 4</p>	<p>This is a continuation of the existing requirement of the Dog Control PSPO 2023.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the Cabinet agree to keep the current control remains in place.</p>

<p>A person who is in control of a dog to allow it to enter a dog exclusion area, for example, a children's playpark shall be guilty of an offence</p>	<p>93% of respondents agreed  7% of respondents disagreed</p>	<p>All the changes are reasonable given the significant increase in the number of dogs since 2020 and the increase in owners who are irresponsible. It is unfortunate but necessary to impose new rules better to manage the problems. However, nothing will change without better enforcement which is sadly lacking at the moment. I'm a dog owner.</p> <p>Dogs should be on leads in public playing fields and public open spaces.</p>	<p>This is a continuation of the existing requirement of the Dog Control PSPO 2023.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the Cabinet agree to keep the current control remains in place.</p>
<p>A person who is in control of a dog to not keep it on a lead within a dog on lead area shall be guilty of an offence</p>	<p>77% of respondents agreed  23% of respondents disagreed</p>	<p>Dogs should be on leads in public playing fields and public open spaces.</p> <p>Makes sense</p>	<p>This is a continuation of the existing requirement of the Dog Control PSPO 2023.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the Cabinet agree to keep the current control remains in place.</p>

Proposed change	Justification	Consultation Response	Public Comments	Officer Comment	Recommendation
Amendments to the groups of people exempt from being guilty of an offence including people who are registered blind, people with disability affecting mobility etc, people with a dog trained by prescribed charity, people in charge of a police or fire dog, person in charge of a working dog.	Exemptions for all requirements of the Order have been proposed for particular groups of people.	85% of respondents agreed  15% of respondents disagreed	<p><i>No person in control of an assistant or working dog should be exempt. If they are in control of a highly trained dog they should be able to clear up after it although they may be more likely to have a reasonable excuse.</i></p> <p>This exemption would make the legislation less clear cut and open to abuse. The exemption would open up a difficult debate for those who seek to enforce it. The requirement to look after your dog properly, including having proper control in a public area, should be non-negotiable</p> <p>I do not agree that hunting dogs should be exempt as named above. Hunting (as in similar to fox hunting) is damaging to property and the environment and s</p> <p>(ii) A person with a disability affecting their mobility, manual dexterity, physical coordination or ability to lift, carry or move objects</p> <p>I think consideration needs to be given to the above point. If people with disabilities can't look after a dog properly, which includes collecting faeces, then they should not have a dog in the first place. If they are not picking it up, who will?</p>	A separate Equality Impact Assessment has been completed and forms part of this Cabinet Report.	It is recommended that the Cabinet agreed to the amendments.
New dog exclusion controls at Jubilee Field play park and	Dog exclusion requirements covering the Jubilee Field	55% of respondents agreed	As long as we dog owners can use the rest of the park Apply British Law not "martial law". PSPOs are blanket bans on the majority of responsible dog owners.	This will provide consistency across East	It is recommended that the Cabinet

play space in Axminster.	play park and play space will prevent dogs coming into contact with children.	45% of respondents disagreed	<p>Not an area I'm likely to visit, but surely kids should have priority in a play park?</p> <p>I am not familiar with this area, but I do support dogs on leads in children's play parks</p> <p>Majority of users are dog owners and behave responsibly</p>	Devon in respect of children's play parks/areas.	agree the new controls.
<p>New dog exclusion requirements at Broadclyst</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tennis Court</li> <li>BMX Track</li> </ul> <p>New dog on lead requirements at Broadclyst</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allotments</li> </ul>	<p>Dog exclusion requirements covering Broadclyst Tennis Court and BMX Track will prevent dogs coming into contact with people engaging in sport activities.</p> <p>Dog on lead requirements covering the allotments will help to keep</p>	<p>62.5% of respondents agreed</p> <p>37.5% of respondents disagreed</p>	<p>Outside trails and allotments shouldn't be dog on lead zones unless the owner is unable to recall them safely.</p> <p>In play areas yes but not allotments</p>		It is recommended that the Cabinet agree the new controls.

	dogs under control in areas used for food production.				
<p>Renamed dog exclusion areas at Cranbrook</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hayes Square Play Park → Hayes Square Play Space</li> <li>Ingrams Sports Pitches → Ingrams Sports Centre</li> <li>Phase 3 Country Park Play Area → Stone</li> </ul>	<p>Cranbrook Town Council have requested that these dog exclusion areas have been renamed.</p>	<p>60% of respondents agreed</p> <p>40% of respondents disagreed</p>	No public comments		<p>It is recommended that the Cabinet agree the new controls</p>

<p>Meadow Play Space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Crannaford Allotments Play Area → Crannaford Allotments Play Space</li> </ul>					
<p>New dog exclusion requirements at Cranbrook</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Platinum Park Play Area</li> <li>Wheeled Sports facility (Skatepark) off Tillhouse Road</li> </ul>	<p>There is a newly built Play Area and Sports facility at Cranbrook as part of residential expansion.</p> <p>Dog exclusion requirements covering these areas will prevent dogs coming into contact with children and young people.</p>		<p>Dogs should be on leads in public playing fields and public open spaces.</p> <p>In play areas yes but not nature reserve if owner has good control over dog</p> <p>Playparks, skate parks,, etc. should clearly be free from dogs. As for allotments, that decision should rest with the allotment holders rather than the general public, who will normally have no access to them.</p>		
<p>New dog on lead requirements at Cranbrook</p>					




<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Access path leading to Wheeled Sports Facility (Skatepark) off Tillhouse Road</li><li>• Cranbrook Nature Reserve, Great Meadow area south west of river</li></ul>	<p>Cranbrook Town Council has requested that Cranbrook Nature Reserve is renamed 'Cranbrook Nature Reserve, Great Meadow area south west of river' and is changed from a dog exclusion area</p>		<p><i>Cranbrook Nature Reserve is huge and to say you have to keep dogs on leads there is too much of an ask. Its a wonderful space for dogs if the owners are disciplined and considerate and responsible.</i></p>		
---	---	--	---	--	--

	<p>to a dog on lead area.</p> <p>This will allow the area to be accessed by people with dogs.</p>				
<p>New dog-on-lead requirements in Exmouth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Maer</li> <li>Donkey Field in Exmouth</li> </ul>	<p>Dog on lead requirements at The Maer and Donkey Field will help to keep dogs under closer control and prevent dog fouling.</p>	<p>34% of respondents agreed</p> <p>66% of respondents disagreed</p>	<p><i>In eight years we have never seen a problem on the Maer and would strongly object to this being a lead-only area as it would affect many local residents. No harm is being done but is a wonderful facility for dog owners who pay their council taxes; occasional problems with dog waste occur during the summer but this could be addressed by more signage in the parking areas frequented by motorhomes and surfer camper vans.</i></p> <p>So many elderly people use the Maer, on lead in that area will never be adhered to. Although the pollution may put people off!</p> <p>I believe dogs should not have to be on a lead on the Maer recreation ground.</p> <p>The maer or the donkey field at foxholes should not be made into on lead only areas.</p>	<p>The public response is not in favour of requiring dogs on leads and existing anti-social behaviour legislation can be used to manage dog related issues as</p>	<p>It is recommended that the Cabinet does not agree this new requirement for either location.</p>

				reported to the Council.	
Removal of dog-on-lead controls on designated footpaths in Honiton	Removal of dog on lead requirements at designated footpaths will enable consistency with all other towns in East Devon.	50% of respondents agreed  50% of respondents disagreed	<p>All public areas should be dogs on lead only to protect vulnerable people - the old, young, disabled and animal phobic. There should be designated dog exercise areas - where they can be off lead - otherwise on lead.</p> <p>The proposed regulations are too strict, if a dog has been trained well it doesn't need to be on a lead all the time. My dog will heel perfectly and behave as if she of on a lead..</p>	There is no evidence to suggest there is an issue with dogs off lead on designated footpaths in Honiton and this restriction should be removed to ensure a consistent approach across the district. Existing anti-social behaviour legislation can be used to manage dog related issues as reported to the Council	It is recommended that the Cabinet remove the dog-on-lead controls

<p>New dog exclusion rule at Kilmington Recreation Ground between 10am and 6pm from 1 May to 30 September.</p>	<p>Current dog on lead requirements were put in place in December 2024 following a public consultation.</p> <p>Since December 2024, Kilmington Dog Walkers Association have requested that the dog on lead requirement is changed to a dog exclusion requirement between 10am and 6pm from 1 May to 30 September. This will allow dogs to be exercised on</p>	<p>51% of respondents agreed</p> <p>49% of respondents disagreed</p>	<p>Specifically, referring to the Kilmington playing fields it's time to finally put the issue of dogs on the field to rest. During recent years there have been consultations managed by the council which confirmed that dogs must be on leads when on the field - primarily to protect children's health, prevent aggression and reduce mess. There is evidence that this widely consulted and communicated condition is being compromised by a few dog owners. Is it not now time for a simpler, more effective solution and stop all dogs from using the playing field. We live in the countryside, where there is ample space for dog walking without encroaching on a shared recreational area. Maintaining a clear, consistent rule would be in the best interests of all residents. Proposals to open the fields during specific times invalidates all the efforts of past consultations, ignores the health of children, the aggression experienced by some and the mess created.</p> <p><i>I have serious concerns for the children of the village and the pupils of our local Primary school being adversely affected by any change.</i></p> <p><i>When the Dogs on Leads was eventually passed by Council, in 2024, after the omission earlier, the main concern was for the children being afraid of dogs running loose if they came into the field to play. For children to use the actual Play Area they have to go across the field from both of the entrance gate to the Playing Field.</i></p> <p><i>The importance of outdoor play and exercise for young children is paramount in their developments; the children are priority over the dogs running freely at Kilmington Playing Field. Thank you</i></p> <p>Villagers need this space to exercise their dogs safely off lead . The cricket club have taken over this park and people are intimidated by them to not use it . The park belongs to all residents. Previous votes have included non residents. Consultation meetings in the village hall have been unfair and people intimidated and scared to speak out against the dogs on lead issue. A compromise must be allowed</p>	<p>Residents living within the vicinity of Kilmington Recreation Ground were sent a letter to make them aware of the public consultation .</p> <p>Kilmington Primary School do not agree with the proposed change.</p> <p>Kilmington Parish Council do not agree with the proposed change.</p> <p>Kilmington Cricket Club do not agree with the</p>	<p>It is recommended that the Cabinet agree to keep the current controls in place.</p>
--	---	--	--	---	--

	the field outside of these times.		<p>A compromise is the way forward to promote the well being of all ages of residents in Kilmington to enjoy the playing field. There are no alternative areas in Kilmington that the elderly, people with reduced mobility and disabled residents can access safely and exercise their dogs off lead and meet like minded people. This helps with the wellbeing of the elderly residents who enjoy the company of their pet dog and live on their own. It is a lovely green space that should be used by all residents of Kilmington, which was the intention of the Arthur Hitchcock Charity Object.</p> <p>Kind regards *** Personal details have been removed ***</p> <p>Good compromise</p> <p>My concerns are the same as ever, that the use of our village amenities by our school and youngsters will be adversely affected if the Dogs on Leads restrictions are removed. The strong feelings in the last application were that dogs running loose were frightening children and parents, carers and older villagers using the field. This was because due to the circumstances of Covid etc. far more dogs were on the field. In order to get to the Play Area, with its No Dogs restrictions, the children have to cross the Playing Field from the two entrance gates. There is great concern about the health and development of our youngsters being in a very poor state.....restricting their freedom to run, grow and develop easily and enjoy using Kilmington Playing Field will be taken away if the new proposal is implemented. Are the needs of our youngsters being suppressed and overlooked by the attention given to dogs running freely?</p>	proposed change.	
--	---	--	--	---------------------	--

			<p>Yvette Turner</p> <p>yvettenjazz@gmail.com</p> <p>Mobile: 07894327861</p> <p>Dear Alice Gill</p> <p>My name is Yvette Turner and I represent the Kilmington residents dog walking group and 156 signatures from residents of Kilmington.</p> <p>Evidence to support the compromise.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. 156 signatures from the residents of Kilmington. The residents were unhappy when the original PSPO with restrictions for dogs on leads was put on Kilmington playing field, May 2023. They were only aware the PSPO had been applied for and approved in April 2023 when it was too late to object. The object of the Arthur Hitchcock Charity Trust is for residents of all ages to enjoy the space and help promote wellbeing and mental health, the compromise is the way forward.</li><li>2. Home Office Antisocial Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, Antisocial behaviour powers, Statutory guidance for frontline professionals, revised in March 2023, page 69. The guidelines have not been taken into account when considering PSPO restrictions on Kilmington Playing field since 2022 when it was first applied for. There are no alternative areas for the elderly, people with reduced mobility and disabled residents to access and safely exercise their dogs off lead.</li><li>3. The object of the Arthur Hitchcock Charity Trust states: Facilities for recreation and other leisure times pursuits, with the object of improving the quality of life of inhabitants.</li><li>4. The Alfred Hitchcock Charity Trust Trustees emailed EDDC Environmental in October 20222 to request the PSPO. No evidence was presented to support this.</li><li>5. Pictures show that playing field use has been dominated by the cricket club. The cricket pitch is fenced off to prevent damage by children and dogs.</li><li>6. A log of dog/wild animal faeces has been recorded twice daily April 2023 – March 2025. This clearly shows there has never been a problem with dog fouling as stated by the Trustees of the Arthur Hitchcock Charity Trust when the PSPO was applied for in 2022.</li></ol> <p>The compromise is the way forward to suit all ages of Kilmington residents. The school and cricket club only use the playing field during the Summer.</p> <p>Not all outdoor activities that keep people healthy in body and mind are organised sport. Dog walking is carried out 365 days a year in all weathers. There are NO alternative areas in Kilmington to exercise dogs safely off lead that can be ACCESSED SAFELY for elderly, disabled and people with reduced mobility.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p> <p></p> <p>Yvette Turner</p> <p>On behalf of the Kilmington Dog Walking Group and 156 signatures from the residents of Kilmington</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>New dog-on-lead requirements in Sidmouth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Byes</li> <li>Sidmouth Cemetery, Temple Street</li> </ul>	<p>Dog on lead requirements at The Byes and Sidmouth Cemetery will help to keep dogs under closer control, particularly at The Byes which is frequently used by cyclists, and to prevent dog fouling.</p>	<p><b>The Byes</b></p> <p>23% of respondents agreed</p> <p>77% of respondents disagreed</p> <p><b>Sidmouth Cemetery</b></p> <p>90% of respondents agreed</p> <p>10% of respondents disagreed</p>	<p>Sidmouth TC responses:</p> <p>1)The PSPO as proposed for Sidmouth Cemetery be fully supported with additional clear and suitable signage erected to support.</p> <p>2) The PSPO for the Byes be not supported. Members felt that clearer and more appropriate signage should be introduced by EDDC and DCC along the footpaths and shared path/cycleway.</p> <p><i>The Byes- the dogs should be allowed off the leads in The Byes. Most people over the 22 years we have had dogs who have enjoyed their walk on The Byes, have enjoyed their company as some people cannot afford a dog or a bike.</i></p> <p>there are a massive number of dog owners whose dogs do not cause any problems yet you will penalise these people.</p> <p>The rest of the byes is an open area where dogs can safely run off lead and it should be left that way. Its a really valuable asset for people with pushchairs and dogs to walk, and those dog owners with mobility issues, who struggle to walk dogs freely on the coast path and hills</p> <p>Socialising dogs OFF THE LEAD is an important part of training and welfare experience for humans in charge. No extra restrictions are necessary in the "Byes Area".</p> <p>In total agreement especially The Byes which is a very busy area with dogs often not under control and causing a hazard. However my concern is how will this be policed. Area of The Byes which this covers needs to be defined, e.g. does it exclude Gilchrist and Margaret's Meadow.</p> <p>In the cemetery they should be on a lead - respect is required! In the Byes they should be under control.</p>	<p>Existing anti-social behaviour legislation can be used to manage dog related issues as reported to the Council</p>	<p>It is recommended that the Cabinet agree to the new dog on lead requirement for Sidmouth Cemetery only.</p>
--	---	--	---	---	--

			<p>Vision for Sidmouth responded requesting that dogs be on leads within the cemetery.</p> <p>The Byes is a very long-standing general public and dog-walkers free space, bequeathed for the enjoyment of all, where responsible dog owners can allow their dogs to run off lead without annoying or endangering anyone. The freedom to use this space accordingly by the majority of responsible dog owners should not be restricted just because of a minority of irresponsible dog owners who do not know how to control their own dogs. Such poor behaviour can be dealt with already under existing bylaws.</p>		
<p><b>Further requests during consultation:</b></p> <p>Clyst Honiton Parish Clerk has requested that dog exclusion requirement for Clyst Honiton play park is extended to whole field.</p>	<p>Play equipment no longer enclosed in field.</p> <p>Signage already in place suggesting dog exclusion requirements relate to whole field.</p>		<p>The Clyst Honiton PSPO Area is described in the Order as being the play area in the field, which was because it had an enclosed set of play equipment. The new play facilities are now not enclosed within the field, so perhaps the description should relate to the whole field rather than to a non-existent 'play area'. It has always been understood that the Order referred to the field and the EDDC signage is on the gate</p> <p>indicating it relates to the field so it is proposed to bring the PSPO wording in line with practice.</p>	<p>This play area was originally enclosed and excluded dogs. Now there is no enclosure and we would recommend further public consultation for a proposal to exclude dogs from the playing field</p>	<p>Recommend the Cabinet do not agree this change until a further public consultation has taken place.</p>



				or dogs on leads.	
--	--	--	--	----------------------	--