

Ref Number	Summary of Representation	Council's Response	Changes proposed to draft document
1	<p>The issue is that there has been a dog control order in place already, which is not a problem and is welcomed. The issue is that there is a tiny sign at the side of the angling club regarding the application for the amendment about keeping dogs on leads by the pond. Respondent believes that it is unlawful to make this amendment for a private members club as the sign says it is on behalf of the angling club.</p>	<p>There is nothing that stops a private members club requesting a PSPO. The PSPO must go through the correct Council procedures which in this case it has. Also the request came from the club to local County Councillors who requested that the Rosie be included in the PSPO and therefore the consultation \justification given by he Angling Club is public safety in relation dog fouling and safety of wildlife</p>	
2	<p>The form of words that you are using on the PSPO are wholly incorrect, you state you have applied for a PSPO amendment on the inner path however in the consultation document there is no distinction between the two paths. Should your amendments be granted it would be possible that a dog warden could enforce fixed penalties on a path which was not intended.</p>	<p>The Frequently Asked Questions that accompanies the consultation states: <i>'It is a requirement for local authorities to undertake consultation with interested or affected parties prior to the introduction of a new PSPO or when an existing PSPO needs to be renewed. Consultees are invited to share their views, and make representations, that will then be considered and reviewed prior to the implementation of a new or renewed PSPO.'</i></p>	

3	I believe that timing this during a local election is outrageous as there are no local MPs to make representation in regard to this however I will expect my complaint is upheld and investigated properly.	<p>Advice was sought from Legal and we received the advice below: <i>The by election is for the town council and it is not going to make a decision on whether to approve the PSPO. The by election is not at county level and to that extent we would expect to continue business as usual.</i></p> <p><i>Are we concerned that we might be proposing a policy that tends to support one candidate or another? No the consultation is neutral and is an open question about the areas of the whole county to be covered by the PSPO, not just the specific proposals for Wepre Park.</i></p> <p>The election took place on 22nd June which would still have allowed 3 weeks to raise issues with the newly elected Town Councillor.</p>	
4	Northop Hall Bowling and Tennis Club and as Secretary to the Club I can truthfully state that the Club would welcome such an order to control dogs in a recreational area.		Noted

<p>5</p>	<p>Recently I came across a noticed pinned on the fence at Wepre Park requesting people's views on dogs being allowed to walk around the Rosie pond. I walk my dog in the park regular and in doing so often pass along the side of the Rosie like many others.</p> <p>I would like to state that I am a responsible dog owner. I always carry doggie poo bags, pick up and dispose of my dog's poo in the appropriate bins and also pick up dig poo other than my own dogs.</p> <p>I currently do not walk my dog around the pond but feel it is an injustice for me not to be able to do so esp while on a lead. The Rosie in my opinion should be available to all not just fishermen who many unfortunately appear to want exclusivity of the Rosie.</p> <p>I notice there are signs around the pond with a raised hand with large letters saying STOP!. I find that intimidating and totally unnecessary. It appears to suggest nobody but fishermen are allowed within the fenced area.</p> <p>On a slightly different note, but just as important I would like answers to the following, please.</p> <p>Why are there no signs about the conduct of fishermen with rules to adhere too round the Rosie esp in relation to conduct and H&S?</p>		<p>Noted – These issues will be raised with the Committee of the Angling Club and FCC</p>
----------	---	--	---

	<p>Why no signs instructing fishermen not to block the path around the pond with their fishing gear?</p> <p>I often see fishing poles and other fishing gear blocking the footpath around the pond?</p> <p>Why is this allowed to happen and what is the club's responsibility to ensure H&S for all?</p> <p>Should you care to visit most Saturday or Sunday afternoons you will find evidence of the footpath blocked by inconsiderate fishermen.</p> <p>Finally in my opinion I believe the Rosie should be available for all to enjoy not just a few selected few which it would appear the fishing club would like to enforce.</p> <p>Dogs on a lead pose no threat to anybody or anything and should be allowed to walk with owners around the pond.</p> <p>I would be happy to accompany one or more of your officers and walk around the Rosie to see for themselves.</p>		
6	<p>I write today regarding the proposed PSPO Wepre Park dog control.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > I am 75 yrs have walked in the park since 1st March 1977. > I have 2 dogs these are number 7&8. To my knowledge I have cleaned up any mess they have made, along with the vast magority. > For it to be considered to catorgarise and 		Noted- Will bring to the attention of the Angling Club and members of FCC Scrutiny Committee

	<p>demonise all dog owners because of a few</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Is shameful on your behalf. > Please consider many many dog walkers are good people picking litter, volunteering > and doing things you do not see. > To ban all from the Rosie inner path is nothing other than pandering and pampering a few. i.e CQ AC . > Blaming it on dog mess is wrong this path is without doubt clean. > But I will add as a dog man who watches and understands their behaviour I NEVER allow my dogs off the lease in or around the Rosie the area is a toilet. > Anglers will not leave their equipment to visit the WC s instead use bushes or any cover available. I have found carrier bags with excrement in thrown into the public space. > I have witnessed and reported a Bailiffe throwing dead fish into the public space. > I incurred a £1300 vets bill when my dog ingested something that smelled of Aniseed > (Discarded ground bait I suspect). > These people (Anglers) are not without fault, and to ban all dog walkers is wrong. > The Rosie belongs to the Community and no one other. 		
7	<p>I am a dog owner and follow the proposal aims already, however, I also stand in dog muck at least once a week so whilst the rules are right, until someone enforces them and the culprits face the true consequences, it's all just wasted</p>		<p>Noted- Areas are patrolled based on intelligence received</p>

	<p>time. I've never in my life seen anyone ever patrolling Flint to inspect footpaths and dog owners so that sets the standard that it's okay to do...for those disrespecting people.</p>		
8	<p>I have been going to Maes Bodlonfa Park with dogs for 24 years. More and more restrictions have been brought in over time. My dog walking friends and I agree with the restrictions so far. We are responsible dog owners who always pick up after our beloved pets and use the very few bins provided to dispose of their poo. Our dogs are supervised and well behaved. We meet every morning in the Memorial Gardens and chat whilst keeping our eyes on our pets. We are all disabled in some way and need somewhere to sit down when required. We also pick up poo left by irresponsible dog owners! If the Council would only implement the powers they already have, things would be better for everyone. I see irresponsible dog walkers casually walking across marked pitch areas and even take dogs into the children's play area. Unfortunately, there are some people who feel rules are not made for them. If we're to be restricted to Kendricks Field with our pets, could it please be fully secured, especially at the bottom end on Ruthin Road. May we also have some seating, or some of us will be unable to use the park at all and will be effectively excluded.</p>		Noted

	<p>Dogs don't: Take drugs</p> <p>Drink alcohol</p> <p>Vandalise plants and shrubs</p> <p>Paint graffiti on the skatepark</p> <p>Cycle like a maniac round the Memorial Gardens</p> <p>Throw litter all over the entire park</p> <p>Unfortunately all the above antisocial behaviour occurs in the park on a regular basis.</p>		
9	<p>I am emailing you directly as the response the council wishes to provide does not conform to survey questions.</p> <p>At the council meeting last week, Cty Cllr Alasdair Ibbotson provided the members with the Enforcement Fines over the past 5 years: 2022/23 – 2 2021/22 – 0 2020/21 – 1 2019/20 – 42 2018/19 – 6</p> <p>The council wishes to submit and record a response to say that they would support the PSPO if enforcement was taken. Currently, given the figures for the past 5 years, enforcement in Flintshire does not hold any weight.</p>		Noted

9	<p>Hawarden Community Council have reviewed the Dog Control PSPO and request that the playing fields in Mancot and at Gladstone Playing fields be omitted from this Order please. (Gladstone was previously excluded).</p> <p>Kind regards Sharron</p> <p>Mrs Sharron Jones FSLCC, PGDBA, CiLCA, Cert HE Clerk and Financial Officer Hawarden Community Council Council Offices 113 The Highway HAWARDEN CH5 3DN</p>		Already not included in the Order
10	<p>Dear Mr Cockerton</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of a constituent, Mike Flynn, 80 Dee Road, Connah's Quay, who recently contacted me regarding the proposed amendments to the PSPO at Wepre Park, Connah's Quay.</p> <p>Mr Flynn informs me that he has raised his concerns with the County Council but there was no interest in correcting or amending the statements that have been put before the public.</p> <p>It would seem from my conversation with Mr Flynn that there is a discrepancy with regards to the actual footpaths in question that surround the Rosie pool in Wepre Park.</p>	See responses on representations 1-3	

	<p>The council have stated that it is a gated footpath they wish to restrict access to however in the application there is no mention to the gated area and also on the website it incorrectly shows the map of the applied area and title it “current map of PSPO sites” this in turn indicates to members of the public that legislation is to be enforced on this public right of way path.</p> <p>Mr Flynn also states that in the map of the PSPO application, the area that has been applied for is indeed the public footpath. He has however been told in a phone conversation with Richard Powell that this is a mistake yet there is not going to be any attempts to rectify this and should this amendment pass, it leaves members of the public at risk of being fined or taken to court for allowing their dogs off a lead on a public right of way footpath.</p> <p>It has also been raised that a private members club should not be seeking to deny the rights of members of the public from using a public right of way as identified on the ordnance survey maps. This leads to a further question of why your FCC mapping system which shows public rights of way does not align with the ordnance survey maps.</p> <p>I would ask that this matter is looked into and that any changes or amendments are clearly made and advertised to the public and if you could answer the issues raised above.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>I look forward to hearing from you. Yours sincerely Mark Tami MP</p>		
11	<p>From Hope Community Council:</p> <p><i>In principle the council supports the work of FCC but they need to install more enforcement signs and make people aware of enforcement. This is something the council have requested FCC to do some time ago for the Willows, however, this is still yet to be actioned. The council requests for part pitch markings on the Willows (one goal post) which would then exclude dogs from entering the playing area.</i></p>	<p>Is this a marked sports pitch. Noted: A comment requesting a marked sports pitch has been passed to Street Scene</p>	
12	<p>From Holywell Town Council:</p> <p>Members feel dogs should be kept on leads at the following locations. There are examples in Holywell but this should be County wide –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High Street/Town Centres • Immediate Streets Outside Schools • Community Hospitals • Memorial Gardens 		<p>Noted, but outside of this consultation</p>
13	<p>Following on from a recent Town Council meeting held on the 5 July 2023 in reference to the above, Councillors fully agree and support the extension of the current Dog control PSPO for another three years.</p>		<p>Has been addressed</p>

	<p>Councillors did make comments concerning the questionnaire and how a certain question was misleading. 'Do you agree that dogs should be banned from the footpath around the Rosie, Wepre Park, Connah's Quay?'</p> <p>They agreed that this question should have been worded as 'the inner footpath' as people may not be aware of there being two footpaths and only the inner footpath is the one in question.</p> <p>Could you please note that Connah's Quay Town Council agree to the extension of the PSPO.</p> <p>If you require any further information do not hesitate to let me know.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>Suzanne Wilson Town Clerk</p> <p>Connah's Quay Town Council</p>		
14	<p>I filled in your online form about dogs on leads control but I couldn't really leave any comments. I think it's unfair to ban completely, but I would like to stress that I have had several unpleasant experiences with dogs in the Mold Memorial Gardens. I've barely gone on a walk with my young children</p>		Noted

	<p>without them stepping in or finding dog poo. Many are off leads and in one case we had to witness an unleashed dog ragging and killing a squirrel whilst the owner swore at her dog and then me in front of my children (age 3 and under). So I really think some tighter restrictions are required. Thanks for reading. Laura.</p>		
15	<p>From the information currently available on the website I suspect an incorrect version of the draft Order has been displayed – the link from the website seems to relate to the 2020 Order, not the proposed Order, which I understand from press reports includes a “ban” on dogs in the memorial gardens Mold, and perhaps also at Wepre Park – I can find no reference to those sites on the draft Order.</p> <p>This may not be relevant to Buckley, but may be indicative of other inaccuracies – and would invalidate any survey responses.</p> <p>Also no email address or contact detail was given for any response other than via the very formalised and limited “on-line survey”.</p> <p>In relation to dogs on the Elfed path 22, the press has reported Mr Andrew Farrow as saying “signage is critical” , and that the public COULD walk a dog on the public path across school grounds (or a cemetery) if it were on a lead. If we could be satisfied this would be clearly conveyed by signage on ALL such public paths we would probably be able to withdraw our objection.</p>		Signage stating dogs must be on a lead are already displayed at this Public Footpath

	<p>I would suggest the easiest way of doing this is, in conjunction with your PROWay colleagues, would be to add a plate on each of the public path signs saying e.g. "Dogs must be on lead on this path" (in English and Welsh?).</p> <p>Part of the path at Elfed school is defined by tarmac, but part is over grass. Could I suggest the path line is marked by paint on the grass eg blue dash lines 2metres apart? (I have recently seen this done in Cornwall across a golf course).</p> <p>There is also a need for this situation to apply temporarily to any path route on school grounds to be used while building work is taking place on Within Cottage site, and the path is temporarily closed for safety reasons.</p> <p>This situation may also need to be assessed for any sites where public paths cross any other school sites, cemeteries, or football pitches/play areas (Offhand, I can think of Flint & Holywell cemetery, Hope recreation area, opposite school)</p> <p>I should be pleased if you would acknowledge receipt of this objection and confirm it will be taken into account.</p> <p>I have copied this email to Andrew Farrow, for information, since he was quoted in press reporting to a Ctte meeting in May. He was also involved in setting up a Consultation protocol with Ramblers for Planning applications, I hope a</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>similar protocol can be set up for any other FCC Consultations affecting public paths.</p> <p>Howard White Chair Flintshire Footpaths Ctte Ramblers Cymru</p>		
--	--	--	--