

Consultation responses to 7/3/17

These comments have been taken from the online survey and emails returned by 7 March 2017. They have not been altered in anyway (and therefore include spelling mistakes etc.).

Do you agree with the proposal to deter dog fouling			Comments
Yes	No	Don't know	
22	9	2	<p>Leybourne parish council have banned dogs completely off one of the largest green areas in leybourne. Totally agree with people picking up after their Dog. But a total ban is not fair to the hundreds of dog owners who live in Leybourne. TMBC have put up no fouling in other areas and this seems to work fine. The non elected parish council has imposed a no dog zone on 100% of the land they control.</p> <hr/> <p>I don't see why all dogs need to be on a lead. Most dogs have responsible owners. I walk. A dog in the sports ground and the dog walk is well behaved and loves to play with other dogs. Older people who do not drive cannot go out to the likes of Hayesden Park's dog exercise area to let their dogs off the lead. Who is going to patrol the Raceground from 7 a.m. Until 9 p.m. There are better ways to spend money in this borough than employ dog wardens especially as you are moaning about the lack of cash</p> <hr/> <p>I'm a responsible dog owner and if these bans come into place - I won't frequent Tonbridge at weekends at all with my dog. The restrictions apply to places that offer most stimulation for a dog to explore. I usually buy food and drink from local shops during these walks which will now miss out on my trade due to these restrictions.</p> <hr/> <p>How will this be policed/monitored? This will surely be a deterrent only, which won't affect the feckless/selfish actions of those who it is intended to prevent.</p> <hr/> <p>Burham as many of the villages do suffer with dog fouling. Many of the pavements are very narrow and are a direct school route for those walking</p> <hr/> <p>Maximum number of dogs per person should be reduced to 3 as its impossible for a (professional) dog walker to successfully control 6 dogs, find and remove all faeces.</p> <hr/> <p>Provide more dog bins</p> <hr/> <p>I think most dog owners are responsible and clear up after their pets. However, to help them continue dog bins need to be more numerous and emptied frequently, especially at weekends. Has anyone ever been fined for letting their dog foul a public place?</p> <hr/> <p>Tonbridge has a good dog community, most owners do pickup after their dogs. Perhaps better use of your time is spent on the rubbish that is left in these areas by groups and family's. far more of this</p>

	<p>then dog fouling quick frankly and food companies should be held far more responsible.</p> <hr/> <p>While dog fouling is to be discouraged and owners should be responsible, doing this by expecting dogs to be kept on a lead is taking a sledgehammer to crack a nut.</p>
--	--

Do you agree with the proposal to exclude dogs from children's play areas			Comments
Yes	No	Don't know	<p>it will work, however clear definitions will need to be made as to what is a children's play area. Ditton Community Centre for example has a gated area, but also a football field and interactive games and gym equipment. would the dogs be free to roam on the field, but not within the gated areas? or just the nature reserve? the areas are not clearly reserved for their individual functionality.</p> <hr/> <p>Play areas can be fenced off and dog's not allowed in. Open space should not be banned</p> <hr/> <p>Many children do not like dogs or are apprehensive near them so excluding them from children's play area is a good idea and appears to work well in Tonbridge.</p> <hr/> <p>Should also include parish maintained children's play areas.</p> <hr/> <p>Thought it was already in place.</p> <hr/> <p>I'd imagine most people already know dogs are not allowed in children's play areas. This is already signposted and the case.</p> <hr/> <p>I agree dogs should be kept out of of children's play areas.</p> <hr/> <p>How will this be policed/monitored? This will surely be a deterrent only, which won't affect the feckless/selfish actions of those who it is intended to prevent.</p> <hr/> <p>No evidence has been given to justify this measure. "A number of complaints have been received" does not constitute evidence. Please specify the number of documented complaints and a date range during which the alleged incidents occurred.</p> <hr/> <p>There are already several designated "play areas" which dogs are excluded from, there is no need to restrict dogs even more. Keep the children in their area if it is that much of an issue.</p> <hr/> <p>it will work, however clear definitions will need to be made as to what is a children's play area. Ditton Community Centre for example has a gated area, but also a football field and interactive games and gym equipment. would the dogs be free to roam on the field, but not within the gated areas? or just the nature reserve? the areas are</p>
23	6	4	

	<p>not clearly reserved for their individual functionality. Play areas can be fenced off and dog's not allowed in. Open space should not be banned</p> <hr/> <p>Many children do not like dogs or are apprehensive near them so excluding them from children's play area is a good idea and appears to work well in Tonbridge.</p> <hr/> <p>It would appear that this measure applies to TMBC owned and maintained areas, Leybourne Parish Council (LPC) has similar areas from which dogs are excluded for the reasons documented in the measure. LPC requires these areas to be continued to be exclusion areas, will this measure be amended to include Parish owned and maintained areas or will separate measures be required.</p>
--	---

Do you agree with the proposal to ensure dogs are on a lead by direction?			Comments
Yes	No	Don't know	<p>As a dog owner, I think this guidance can be clearer. I have found that signs are very poor for when areas with leads are required which can lead to confusion. If I have my dogs without a lead it is through poor signage, not ignorance or defiance. If the changes were clearly viable this would work.</p> <hr/> <p>My dog walks to heel and is well trained. Why should I be forced to have him on a lead. how do you train you dog to come back if he's never allowed off the lead. The council is imposing horrible rules on the residents, and I would move away from the area to find a better place to live rather than put up with these type of rules.</p> <hr/> <p>If you mean a dog that is running wild without apparently having an owner or the owner is riding a bicycle on the pathways in te park then they need to be directed to look after their dogs properly and pick up their dog's excrement. Why should good dogs be penalised and who is going to enforce this?</p> <hr/> <p>As long as these are individual directions to individual dog owners and not used a s blanket ban on dogs off the lead</p> <hr/> <p>This proposal is an infringement upon the rights of dog owners to exercise their animals as nature intended. It is akin to clipping the wings of a bird. I accept that not all dogs enjoy running of the lead but most do and my dog in particular does. I moved from London to this area in 2012 to enjoy a cleaner greener countryside lifestyle similar to that which i grew up with. Part of that lifestyle was having a suitable environment to make having a dog possible. My wife and I cannot have children so our dog is our child. I work long ours and enjoy walking my dog in Tonbridge at the weekend. The best part of these walks is seeing her in her element running freely across the park. Please do not stop us from doing what we love. We pay our</p>
14	14	5	

	<p>council tax to receive services not to have our freedom restricted or be dictated to.</p> <hr/> <p>There may be certain limited areas where this might be applicable to but a borough wide ban is too extreme.</p> <hr/> <p>How will this be policed/monitored? This will surely be a deterrent only, which won't affect the feckless/selfish actions of those who it is intended to prevent.</p> <hr/> <p>Except in wide open spaces</p> <hr/> <p>particularly in tonbridge cemetery ,as i see dogs of the lead there a lot</p> <hr/> <p>The dogs need to be able to run around, that is part of being in park!</p> <hr/> <p>No evidence has been provided by the council that this is an issue.</p> <hr/> <p>This seems to be a rather ridiculous measure. There is no guide on when an authorised person can direct someone to do this. The result is that a responsible owner who has a well trained and under control dog walking to heel could be criminalised not by the law but by the direction of an enforcing officer - it will clearly lead to disagreements between officers and the public. A dog is under control or it is not. If it is in any way dangerous then there is primary legislation to deal with this. If it is under control then why does the owner need to be told to put it on a lead?</p> <hr/> <p>It will be essential for the borough to have the resources to implement these new orders</p> <hr/> <p>I agree that in car parks and around food outlets loose dogs can be dangerous or a nuisance but I would not want to see them restricted in other areas. Perhaps if there are persistent complaints about a particular dog then the owner and dog should be sent on a compulsory training course (speeding drivers are sent on training courses) and if they agree the fine can be waived.</p> <hr/> <p>I want the opportunity to allow my dogs to get proper exercise and interact with other dogs. Owners of aggressive dogs should be dealt with on a one to one basis based on a set amount of complaints and investigation.</p> <hr/> <p>The Racecourse Sportsground has always been an area where people go to allow their dogs to exercise and run around. Restricting them to being on a lead is one of the stupidest ideas that even this dumb council has come up with. More stupid even than the High St fiasco.</p>
--	--

Do you agree with the proposal to restrict the number of dogs to six dogs?			Comments
Yes	No	Don't know	six is far too many for one person
20	10	3	<p>Dogs in a pack are intimidating to other dogs Should be less than 6 and propose 3.</p> <p>I have 4 dogs myself and totally agree that any more than 6 would be very difficult to manage.</p> <p>Personally I think the limit should be fewer dogs.</p> <p>The number should be less than 6</p> <p>The maximum number of dogs per person should be reduced to 3 as its impossible for a (professional) dog walker to successfully control 6 dogs, find and remove all faeces.</p> <p>Just have something that says you have to control your dog(s) I have seen someone with many dogs and total control, one person with one dog, no control at all.</p> <p>It's not about the number of dogs you have, it is the control you have of them. Having 7 dogs well under control is no issue. Having one dog out of control is - any order should be exclusively directed at those who do not have control of their dog.</p> <p>Six dogs are too many and cannot be controlled by one person. It is intimidating for other people, especially children. So many dogs act in a pack. MORE THAN 2 DOGS TOGETHER SHOULD ALL BE ON A LEAD</p> <p>I don't think one person can be fully in control of six dogs at once.</p> <p>Is this even an issue. Maybe the council should focus on getting general visitors to pick up their rubbish after them and use the bins provided. Or how about stopping people parking all over double yellow lines or with wheels on the pavement. These are issues that could do with addressing.</p>

Do you agree with the proposal to introduce a borough wide controlled alcohol zone			Comments
Yes	No	Don't know	Is there really a problem with this in Tonbridge?
24	5	4	There is an obvious issue regarding how this will be policed. Kent

	<p>Police already have powers to implement alcohol control zones, but they don't have the manpower to monitor these. Additionally TMBC will not be able to assist with monitoring this as they already refuse to monitor antisocial behaviour, noise complaints or dangerous parking after hours.</p> <hr/> <p>If you introduce this ban it will not be possible to have a picnic in the park with a beer/glass of wine etc I am NOT in favour of blanket bans, all they do is deter/punish those who are law abiding and the jobs ignore them</p> <hr/> <p>No evidence has been given to justify this measure. "There have been many incidents" does not constitute evidence. Please specify the number of documented incidents and a date range during which the alleged incidents occurred.</p> <hr/> <p>This is a very wide ranging power and has very little, if any restriction on it's use. It should be targeted in areas where consumption of alcohol AND antisocial behaviour are linked and prevalent. Otherwise it is the "sledgehammer to crack a nut" approach. The previous ACZ's were much more tightly focused and the PSPO should also be - anything else without direct evidence of need is an unwarranted (and therefore possibly illegal) extension of powers.</p> <hr/> <p>Maybe make The Racecourse Sportsground an alcohol controlled zone, it would cut down on the amount of rubbish left strewn around particularly in the summer. The amount of empty beer cans and bottles is a far greater problem than dogs. When did a dog leave a box of beers lying around?</p> <hr/> <p>LPC has an alcohol control zone already in place, it is assumed that the TMBC measure will supercede that of LPC.</p>
--	--

Do you agree with the proposal to deter public urination/defecation			Comments
Yes	No	Don't know	But will it be enforced when the travellers come to visit?
26	3	4	<p>Please remember that when issuing an order there must be public loos</p> <hr/> <p>Don't suppose it will make any difference. People can be arrested now anyway can't they for public indecency or antisocial behaviour?</p> <hr/> <p>How will this be policed/monitored? This will surely be a deterrent only, which won't affect the feckless/selfish actions of those who it is intended to prevent.</p> <hr/> <p>Isn't this against the law anyway? Why do you need another law?</p>

	<p>No evidence has been given to justify this measure. "There are complaints" does not constitute evidence. Please specify the number of documented incidents and a date range during which the alleged incidents occurred.</p> <hr/> <p>You need a comment for this? Seriously? Who do these people think they are? Paula Radcliffe?</p> <p>Could the wording about public toilets exclusion make it clear defecating public within the toilet is not allowed.</p>
--	---

Do you agree with proposed PSPO for Leybourne Lakes Country Park*			Comments
Yes	No	Don't know	Don't know the area well enough
12	7	10	No evidence has been given to justify these measures. Please specify the number of documented incidents and a date range during which the alleged incidents occurred.

*Not everyone responded to this question

Do you agree with the proposed PSPO for Tonbridge Memorial Gardens *			Comments
Yes	No	Don't know	I live next to the Memorial Gardens and it is often used as a skateboard play area
18	8	3	<hr/> <p>My grandfathers name is on the wall for- 1914-1918 I regard this as his grave.</p> <hr/> <p>How will this be policed/monitored? This will surely be a deterrent only, which won't affect the feckless/selfish actions of those who it is intended to prevent.</p> <hr/> <p>If you must ban things then have the time after 18:00. If/when the drinkers congregate tell them to move on.</p> <hr/> <p>Measures to control drinking/music/bbq's etcetera should also be included.</p> <hr/> <p>In this particular space there should be no ball games as well as no skateboards, scooters, bikes and roller skates.</p>

*Not everyone responded to this question

Do you agree with the proposed PSPO for Tonbridge Moorings*			Comments
Yes	No	Don't know	How will this be policed/monitored? This will surely be a deterrent only, which won't affect the feckless/selfish actions of those who it is intended to prevent.
14	9	6	

			Don't know where that is.
--	--	--	---------------------------

*Not everyone responded to this question

Do you agree with the proposed PSPO for Haysden Country Park?*			Comments
Yes	No	Don't know	
15	11	3	<p>Dogs should not be allowed in the lake or to antagonise water birds.</p> <hr/> <p>I don't want anything added to the ban. Make the cycle path go all around the whole of Barden Lake. The children can then legally cycle all the way around. Just as a thought about bans, the NO CYCLING is ignored on that part of the lake. Have a large dumpster at the entrance so people can put rubbish in it. Use some of the money you are taking in parking fees!!!! Put in benches & tables that have provision for BBQ's. Educate people what they are meant to do, how they should behave. Banning is the lazy way out.</p> <hr/> <p>No evidence has been given to justify these measures. Please specify the number of documented incidents for each proposed measure and a date range during which the alleged incidents occurred.</p>

*Not everyone responded to this question

Do you agree with the proposed PSPO for Tonbridge Racecourse Sports Ground and Tonbridge Castle?*			Comments
Yes	No	Don't know	
11	13	4	<p>Just Tonbridge Castle not the Racecourse Sports Ground</p> <hr/> <p>This proposal is an infringement upon the rights of dog owners to exercise their animals as nature intended. It is akin to clipping the wings of a bird. I accept that not all dogs enjoy running of the lead but most do and my dog in particular does. I moved from London to this area in 2012 to enjoy a cleaner greener countryside lifestyle similar to that which i grew up with. Part of that lifestyle was having a suitable environment to make having a dog possible. My wife and I cannot have children so our dog is our child. I work long ours and enjoy walking my dog in Tonbridge at the weekend. The best part of these walks is seeing her in her element running freely across the park. Please do not stop us from doing what we love. We pay our council tax to receive services not to have our freedom restricted or be dictated to.</p> <hr/> <p>Banning BBQs is going too far</p> <hr/> <p>Have a large dumpster at the entrance so people can put rubbish in it. Use some of the money you are taking in parking fees!!!! Put in benches & tables that have provision for BBQ's. Educate people what they are meant to do, how they should behave. Banning is the lazy way out. The idea is to make it more of a fun place not YOU CAN'T DO THAT</p>

			<p>No evidence has been given to justify these measures. Please specify the number of documented incidents for each proposed measure and a date range during which the alleged incidents occurred.</p> <hr/> <p>Deal with rubbish left by people.</p>
--	--	--	---

*Not everyone responded to this question

Do you agree with the proposed PSPO for Tonbridge Farm Sports Ground?*			Comments
Yes	No	Don't know	Banning BBQs is going too far
12	12	5	<p>Don't go there</p> <hr/> <p>No evidence has been given to justify these measures. Please specify the number of documented incidents for each proposed measure and a date range during which the alleged incidents occurred.</p>

*Not everyone responded to this question

Do you agree with the proposed PSPO for Tonbridge Cemetery?*			Comments
Yes	No	Don't know	How will this be policed/monitored? This will surely be a deterrent only, which won't affect the feckless/selfish actions of those who it is intended to prevent.
18	6	5	<p>Yes there is and am glad this includes the cemetery. there are two lockable gates, one in the top of welland road and one in derwent drive, which are fine but want to bring to your attention that the small unlockable gate at the bottom of welland road is unsuitable as many people enter through this small gate when the cemetery is closed and the other gates are locked!. i feel a new high fence is needed there with a new lockable gate. there is a very low wall which people very easily climb over i've seen lots of people do this made of stone this needs to be made more substantial as is very inadequate. there are quite a few people in the cemetery at night drinking alcohol dogs off leads at night after closing and people with torches shining them into peoples houses which i did report to the police. you need to do something about this regarding what you propose. there has also been interference with graves which is very distressing for people visting lost ones at the cemetery.</p> <hr/> <p>Measures to control drinking/music/bbq's etcetera should also be included.</p> <hr/> <p>More clarity about the impact on other recreation/open space land especially if Parish Councils do not agree with any aspect of these new orders, especially the number of dogs to be taken onto a public place</p>

*Not everyone responded to this question

Is there anything else that you would like to see included or any other comments?	Comments
	<p>Where is the money coming from for enforcing these proposals</p> <hr/> <p>As a Dog Owner who extensively uses our local recreation areas I just wanted to voice my support for the new proposals you have outlined in the PSPO consultation. They would appear to me to be very balanced and fair between the needs of dog owners and the needs of non-dog owners. I think it is essential we maintain many public spaces where dogs can be exercised off of the lead, many breeds need this, and if there is no-where in the borough then people will drive to other places, causing pollution and potentially loss of business for dog friendly businesses in town. However I also agree that it is essential that safe areas are provided for families and individuals who don't want the company of dogs to have recreation areas where they too can enjoy our open spaces. As regards the other aspects of the order regarding littering, dog fouling, ASB, out of control dogs, you have my complete support.</p> <hr/> <p>As much green space as is possible. The proposed development of the green off Avebury Avenue is ridiculous this is one of the first areas to flood.</p> <hr/> <p>The monitoring and policing of existing law regarding licensed premises, licensed private hire vehicles, littering, noisy neighbours, antisocial behaviour (in town centres) and dangerous parking is already completely inadequate to achieve the purposes of existing legislation - due to TMBC's incompetence to carry out its obligations in relation to these matters (especially outside of the hours of 10am-4pm Monday to Friday). How will this be policed/monitored? These measures will surely be a deterrent only, and won't affect the feckless/selfish actions of those who it is intended to prevent.</p> <hr/> <p>Wrotham Parish Council evoked a Dog Order that excluded dogs from the following areas. Wrotham Cricket Ground Wrotham Burial Ground The Children's Play Area The Multicourt in the Recreation ground Wrotham Parish Council would ask Tonbridge and Malling to include these measures in their PSPO. I shall email the original Dor Order which includes a schedule map of the areas.</p> <hr/> <p>Yes please put a new fence along welland road with a new lockable gate at the bottom of welland road as this makes the other lockable gates a farce</p> <hr/> <p>It is noted that the PSPOs replaces the Dog control orders and alcohol control zones. Within the existing Dog Control Orders (therefore an existing restriction) dogs should be on leads in St Stephens Churchyard and St Peters and St Paul's Churchyard. This has been missed on the proposed PSPO but can could cause the public distress if dogs are running off leads in this area, much the</p>

same as Tonbridge Cemetery. Please could these be added to the PSPOs as they are an existing restriction.

Heavy fines for persons driving motorbikes within the controlled area. The use of the car parks by people NOT taking exercise or legitimately visiting the open spaces. Fines for littering / picnic littering / leaving behind babies nappies / packaging from burgers / KFC Fines for using Bicycles / Horses / Motorbikes in areas restricted to walking or on the grass. Fines for Fishermen staying over 12 hours per occasion. Fines for kids throwing stones at the wildlife.

Banning things is the lazy way out. You need to educate citizens how they are meant to behave. If you must have these banning orders for alcohol etc then do it after 18:00. Stop making it difficult for the average person just because a few can't/won't don't know how to behave

Please ensure that all proposed measures that are based on 'incidents' have documentary evidence of the number, dates and nature of the incidents easily accessible to all the people of Tonbridge and Malling so that we may make an informed decision as to whether the proposed measures are both necessary and proportionate. Please also include the dates and details of any previous measures introduced so that we may judge their efficacy. At present there is insufficient data for me to make an informed decision in such cases.

The consultation document raises more questions than answers. In particular there is NO EVIDENCE AT ALL to justify any measure such statistics on the number of complaints or ASB, damage caused or other lawful activities that have been impeded as a result. The restrictions on dog fouling, dogs in play areas, & urination and defecation seem sensible and would be difficult to argue against - indeed I support them - but even these have no real evidence to support them. The document suggests that council enforcement and Police officers will enforce the PSPO but it also suggests that powers could be delegated to others but gives no guidance on who this might be and what powers they may be able to use. This could include private security or other groups which I consider to be a dangerous extension of the role of enforcement outside of those trained and employed by the state. TMBC MUST give guidance on who will be able to enforce these powers and offer further consultation before that was changed. The dogs on leads, maximum number of dogs and ACZ whole borough powers appear to be ridiculous and potentially criminalise normal members of the public who are going about normal daily business without negatively impacting anyone - they must be re-thought and either targeted in areas where there is a problem or withdrawn. FOR ALL PARKS ORDERS The restrictions on BBQ's may be sensible but is it really necessary to criminalise this behaviour? Swimming - why is it OK to swim as part of an organised activity but not without an organised

activity? This seems to be targeted at wider ASB problems (such as drunken parties) but it will do nothing to deal with those. Again, is it really necessary to criminalise this? Dogs - Having dogs on a lead in a specified area can be a good thing to ensure appropriate mixed uses for all - no issues. Camping - There is no evidence of who is camping in these areas and why. I strongly suspect that many of these people will be the most vulnerable of our society - for example the homeless. It is not appropriate to criminalise those people and moving them from these areas will only export the issue to others. I believe this could be in breach of Article 8 HRA. Lastly.... The order relating to prohibition of wheeled sports within the Memorial Gardens. I agree that these gardens should be kept as a place of remembrance and quiet contemplation. However, the order as worded does not prohibit wheeled sports, only the failure to stop when directed. It also does not address anyone who wants to play music or do anything else regarded as ASB in this area. In the absence of an enforcement officer there all the time, people will take part in these sports until someone arrives to tell them to move. They will leave and come back as soon as the enforcement officer has gone and in the absence of guidance on how long after the warning someone can return and be warned again rather than being prosecuted. Could this be five minutes??? Bearing in mind that the majority of those participating will be young people, all this order will do is risk criminalising potentially otherwise law abiding children. TMBC should take a different approach that includes hard landscaping to prevent wheeled sports as well as offering diversionary activities. If these things have already been trialled then the consultation should explain this and why it has become necessary to impose this measure - criminalisation should be the last step!

I have some doubt that any of these orders could be effectively enforced given the chaotic nature of car parking and rare presence of traffic wardens in this part of the Borough. You could promise the moon, but it is all hot air unless you can deliver.