Below are my comments on the PSPO I have been brief and put them in no particular order. 1. Firstly I have to object to the proposal that dog owners must put their dogs on a lead when out walking — who simply can not understand how to access the online form or who are computer phobic - When we gave some local responsible dog owners the opportunity to present their case they were very clear to point out that a lead is not the way to do. They proposed a new option that we are now considering. 2. Responsible dog owners are in the majority and understand that dogs must not play in children's fenced off play areas. We have to balance the rights of dog owners and those children that visit the park.

3. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners. The council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

4. Dog owners are therefore unlikely to change. By all means punish the irresponsible, but DO NOT criminalise the vast majority. You are attacking the civil liberties of local residents. Are we on the beautiful Fylde Coast to live in a police state?

5. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

6. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

7. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

8. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

9. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

10. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

11. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

12. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

13. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

14. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

15. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

16. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

17. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

18. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

19. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

20. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

21. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

22. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

23. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

24. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.

25. Responsible dog owners act responsibly and do NOT need an anti-social public space protection order. Fylde council believe that by increasing the number of regulations anything will change? At the end of the day, a responsible dog owner considers the general public and understands the need for responsible dog owners.
I hope that the proposals requiring dogs to be on lead in specific areas and about cleaning up are implemented and ... from using amenities like Lytham Green and Fairhaven Lake by the large amount of dogs which are currently allowed to be

There are very few places where dogs can be walked freely, without the need for a lead. To restrict this further would ... community would be to invest more time and effort in tackling irresponsible dog owners, running local groups to help dog

Dogs need space to run, these restrictions vastly reduce the area in the borough that allow that - and the proposed bit ... questions are biased and badly worded. Council has used anecdotal evidence from social media to back up their stance.

... is that people are out socializing with each other in wide open social areas and again this is not going to stop nor should ... are not leaving litter everywhere or vandalizing areas.  Would the council stop groups of people socializing in bars and

... limited restrictions. I would suggest those people in the future. I'm looking at the area around the town and the right at the right in the town. Should there not be limits there?  There are hundreds or thousands of dog owners and the council should think before

be put in place in areas people do not realise due to the lack of information. AGAIN this is not clear on the

restrict events etc. not Countryside rights of way.   Again 100% of the year normally at least twice a day it is the dog ... every day of the year no matter what the weather.  At the moment a large number of people walk their dogs off lead around

in business. Why would FBC not want this extra huge contribution to its local businesses and tourism? Fylde Borough ... Area (SPA) in their appendix and consultation survey.  Natural England is more about existing disturbance to birds within

more than 4 dogs having good dog control is important. Anyone owning and walking more than 4 dogs must have control and these ... up all their dog walks this can affect their income and the way they time manage their day.  A lot of these people have

Notes from a Small island' " Blackpool …. on Friday and Saturday nights it has more public toilets than anywhere else

... dog walking and the provision of space for dogs to run free, I'm equally in favour of the need for everyone to be able to

limit the number, most councils do too.  The debate is about the number and this should be a subject for positive ...

2.	 A proposal to introduce dog control orders on the grounds by village halls at first glance may seem reasonable especially when you use the words 'children ' and 'using the ... 2014 c. 12PART 4CHAPTER 2 Public spaces protection orders'  One key element of this is that a Local Authority CAN ONLY MAKE a PSPO if it has satisfied itself that TWO conditions are met, and the first one of these is stated

... that people are out socializing with each other in wide open social areas and again this is not going to stop nor should ... allow Site B from the Middleton Green Tranholme area. Please re-visit the site B on the new plan.  Mr Petrie I'm proposing to provide dogs allowed on grounds as outlined earlier in this. I'm unable to see any example of how to make your own PSPO and how to make sure it is fair. I'm not asking for you to say if it is fair or unfair

... by creating these pspo’s you are dividing a beautiful area that I have loved bringing my 8 dogs too.  They have done ... and the fylde has given me the perfect  place to excercise all the dogs without the need of my partner everytime. I

warranted.  As a Lytham resident, I specifically selected to buy a property that was in walking distance of the green and ... ensuring that my dog is well trained and socialised before letting it off the lead.  As a further note, to restrict the

spoke from the public and what was said? Why do the minutes not reflect that the Chair of the meeting PROMISED to meet ... is reflected in the minutes ,the minutes are flawed and the whole process has been flawed from the very beginning.

Dogs Act  The Animals Act Criminal Damage Act Town Police Clauses Act Control of Dogs on Road Orders   I refer you to the ... you feel are letting their dogs be dangerously out of control — you can but sadly  it looks like you do not

... that people are out socializing with each other in wide open social areas and again this is not going to stop nor should ... is a need for a PSPO  I would like to remind you that:   Under the Animal Welfare Act, dog owners have a duty of

... the area is used by the school during a school year? Would it not be fairer and easier to simply have an order that would

people who you feel are letting their dogs be dangerously out of control — you can but sadly  it looks like you do not

... accountability   • Openness: you should be open and transparent in your actions and decisions unless there are clear

... use the words ‘local authority’ and ‘public’ when referring to your plans and proposals, and you should give people a

... small open spaces you can use, and what is not suitable to go in to. What do you intend to do about that? It is not

I refer you to the recommendations made in the Animal Welfare Commission’s report, which was published in 2014,... and the legal implications of the new laws. The following is a summary of these recommendations, and the new laws are

... of the public’s benefit. We have not identified any areas in the borough where dog control orders have been applied,

... and it shows that it is the public’s view that there is no need for a PSPO. On the survey, 77% of respondents did not think

... that will help people understand why we are proposing a PSPO and the benefits of having one in place. These meetings will be

... I am a dog owner and prior to this meeting I have examined the proposed PSPO and not wished to comment. However,

... control orders on the grounds by village halls at first glance may seem reasonable especially when you use the words 'children ' and 'using the ... of both legal and physical restrictions which impair access for assistance dog users. We
I attended and spoke at the initial council meeting in November 2016. The two main councillors who spoke made it very clear that a dog warden was going to be appointed and that there was going to be a general discussion on dog fouling. There were also concerns raised about the lack of dog waste bins in the area.

This survey could have been better designed. I hope that Lytham St Annes will not become like the posh places in England where funding and resources are applied to make our borough look like another Las Vegas Strip.

The most important point of all is that the Queens Hotel, Fresh Cafe etc is one of the reasons I moved to St Annes in the first place. You have a dog warden who does not care about the dogs of St Annes, but cares about the corporate clients of the Queens Hotel where the dog warden's salary is paid. We all respect the Queens Hotel, Fresh Cafe etc.

By all means prosecute irresponsible dog owners but please do not make responsible owners feel like a criminal. A dog warden is to advise and to help. You can issue a £25 fine for not having a dog on a lead when asked, but what if you were to prosecute for not being able to turn your dog out on a lead because of the beach area. You need to realise that the beach area does not have beaches in it.

So much for the beach area being a place for dogs. As far as I can tell, these proposals do not cover the beach areas further north in the Borough e.g. north of North Beach. This means that dog owners who are exercising their dogs off lead have been pushed into one small area to benefit the public, everyone would be up in arms and immediately see the problems this could cause. As I said in the council meeting, dogs are like children. Imagine if it was suggested that all children were put into a small area to benefit the public.

I completely apposed all on the spot fines, like parking wardens they will be used with no common sense and are just a way to put money into the council kitty. The most important considerations are as follows: 1. Make sure there are sufficient and appropriately placed bins for dog waste. I personally think that you need to make it easy for dog walkers to put their waste in these bins. 2. Dog owners should be allowed to exercise their dogs where people want them to be. 3. A ‘recreational area’ is NO necessity to come down so heavy handed, when its FBCs fault for not dealing with the situation in the past, plus I think dog owners have many jobs to do other than controlling our dogs. Offenders being a very LOW therefore you should not push so heavy handed.

I would have put him on lead as a responsible owner. I still have two collies and walk along Fairhaven Lake EVERY day. I would have no objection to changing the law altogether and to have a ‘recreational area’ where you can exercise your dog off lead. At times when it gets busy in the summer that I might then CHOOSE to walk elsewhere! ..There is NO NEED for any fines to be issued. I do not think that the borough is suitable for dogs, it is an area for people to come to for a stroll on the beach when the sun is shining. This is not the place for dogs, the dog warden is a waste of money, I think he should be employed to do something better for the public.

A presence to help to ask would be far more acceptable than these fines as i fear that they are already making people not to go out and enjoy the countryside. I think this is the reason for the current proposals. They are not to do with the public good, they are to do with the public wishing to promote and secure dog owners doing the right thing. If this is the case, why can't you have a free holder who could issue something like a dog licence for a fee.

I completely apposed all on the spot fines, like parking wardens they will be used with no common sense and are just a way to put money into the council kitty. The most important considerations are as follows: 1. Make sure there are sufficient and appropriately placed bins for dog waste. I personally think that you need to make it easy for dog walkers to put their waste in these bins. 2. Dog owners should be allowed to exercise their dogs where people want them to be. 3. A ‘recreational area’ is NO necessity to come down so heavy handed, when its FBCs fault for not dealing with the situation in the past, plus I think dog owners have many jobs to do other than controlling our dogs. Offenders being a very LOW therefore you should not push so heavy handed.

I would have put him on lead as a responsible owner. I still have two collies and walk along Fairhaven Lake EVERY day. I would have no objection to changing the law altogether and to have a ‘recreational area’ where you can exercise your dog off lead. At times when it gets busy in the summer that I might then CHOOSE to walk elsewhere! ..There is NO NEED for any fines to be issued. I do not think that the borough is suitable for dogs, it is an area for people to come to for a stroll on the beach when the sun is shining. This is not the place for dogs, the dog warden is a waste of money, I think he should be employed to do something better for the public.

A presence to help to ask would be far more acceptable than these fines as i fear that they are already making people not to go out and enjoy the countryside. I think this is the reason for the current proposals. They are not to do with the public good, they are to do with the public wishing to promote and secure dog owners doing the right thing. If this is the case, why can't you have a free holder who could issue something like a dog licence for a fee.

I completely apposed all on the spot fines, like parking wardens they will be used with no common sense and are just a way to put money into the council kitty. The most important considerations are as follows: 1. Make sure there are sufficient and appropriately placed bins for dog waste. I personally think that you need to make it easy for dog walkers to put their waste in these bins. 2. Dog owners should be allowed to exercise their dogs where people want them to be. 3. A ‘recreational area’ is NO necessity to come down so heavy handed, when its FBCs fault for not dealing with the situation in the past, plus I think dog owners have many jobs to do other than controlling our dogs. Offenders being a very LOW therefore you should not push so heavy handed.

I would have put him on lead as a responsible owner. I still have two collies and walk along Fairhaven Lake EVERY day. I would have no objection to changing the law altogether and to have a ‘recreational area’ where you can exercise your dog off lead. At times when it gets busy in the summer that I might then CHOOSE to walk elsewhere! ..There is NO NEED for any fines to be issued. I do not think that the borough is suitable for dogs, it is an area for people to come to for a stroll on the beach when the sun is shining. This is not the place for dogs, the dog warden is a waste of money, I think he should be employed to do something better for the public.

A presence to help to ask would be far more acceptable than these fines as i fear that they are already making people not to go out and enjoy the countryside. I think this is the reason for the current proposals. They are not to do with the public good, they are to do with the public wishing to promote and secure dog owners doing the right thing. If this is the case, why can't you have a free holder who could issue something like a dog licence for a fee.
It has been difficult to respond to this questionnaire because for each question the options are limited to ‘support’, ‘oppose’, and ‘inconclusive’. This is because the areas are unfounded, the majority being based on hearsay evidence and opinions. It is difficult to ascertain which option to select unless more detailed evidence were provided. The council has not given sufficient consideration to the negative effects that the proposed PSPO’s will have on the health and wellbeing of local people. There are many dog owners of all ages and many dogs of different sizes. You cannot fit all the dogs into the areas you have suggested. Those who do not agree with the proposals are hard pressed to come up with an alternative that is going to work. The council should try to ban and restrain all dogs because a small minority of people do not pick up after their dogs or do not have their dogs on a lead. It is a bit like banning everyone from driving because a small minority of people drive carelessly. It’s all just common sense. Although irresponsible dog owners do not pick up after their dogs even when they are on a lead, there is a surprising amount of dog dirt on some pavements, including on my own residential street. There will need to be efficient policing.

There are many dog walkers of all ages and many dogs of different sizes. You cannot fit all the dogs into the areas you have suggested. Those who do not agree with the proposals are hard pressed to come up with an alternative that is going to work. The council should try to ban and restrain all dogs because a small minority of people do not pick up after their dogs or do not have their dogs on a lead. It is a bit like banning everyone from driving because a small minority of people drive carelessly. It’s all just common sense. Although irresponsible dog owners do not pick up after their dogs even when they are on a lead, there is a surprising amount of dog dirt on some pavements, including on my own residential street. There will need to be efficient policing.

There are many dog owners of all ages and many dogs of different sizes. You cannot fit all the dogs into the areas you have suggested. Those who do not agree with the proposals are hard pressed to come up with an alternative that is going to work. The council should try to ban and restrain all dogs because a small minority of people do not pick up after their dogs or do not have their dogs on a lead. It is a bit like banning everyone from driving because a small minority of people drive carelessly. It’s all just common sense. Although irresponsible dog owners do not pick up after their dogs even when they are on a lead, there is a surprising amount of dog dirt on some pavements, including on my own residential street. There will need to be efficient policing.

There are many dog owners of all ages and many dogs of different sizes. You cannot fit all the dogs into the areas you have suggested. Those who do not agree with the proposals are hard pressed to come up with an alternative that is going to work. The council should try to ban and restrain all dogs because a small minority of people do not pick up after their dogs or do not have their dogs on a lead. It is a bit like banning everyone from driving because a small minority of people drive carelessly. It’s all just common sense. Although irresponsible dog owners do not pick up after their dogs even when they are on a lead, there is a surprising amount of dog dirt on some pavements, including on my own residential street. There will need to be efficient policing.

There are many dog owners of all ages and many dogs of different sizes. You cannot fit all the dogs into the areas you have suggested. Those who do not agree with the proposals are hard pressed to come up with an alternative that is going to work. The council should try to ban and restrain all dogs because a small minority of people do not pick up after their dogs or do not have their dogs on a lead. It is a bit like banning everyone from driving because a small minority of people drive carelessly. It’s all just common sense. Although irresponsible dog owners do not pick up after their dogs even when they are on a lead, there is a surprising amount of dog dirt on some pavements, including on my own residential street. There will need to be efficient policing.

There are many dog owners of all ages and many dogs of different sizes. You cannot fit all the dogs into the areas you have suggested. Those who do not agree with the proposals are hard pressed to come up with an alternative that is going to work. The council should try to ban and restrain all dogs because a small minority of people do not pick up after their dogs or do not have their dogs on a lead. It is a bit like banning everyone from driving because a small minority of people drive carelessly. It’s all just common sense. Although irresponsible dog owners do not pick up after their dogs even when they are on a lead, there is a surprising amount of dog dirt on some pavements, including on my own residential street. There will need to be efficient policing.

There are many dog owners of all ages and many dogs of different sizes. You cannot fit all the dogs into the areas you have suggested. Those who do not agree with the proposals are hard pressed to come up with an alternative that is going to work. The council should try to ban and restrain all dogs because a small minority of people do not pick up after their dogs or do not have their dogs on a lead. It is a bit like banning everyone from driving because a small minority of people drive carelessly. It’s all just common sense. Although irresponsible dog owners do not pick up after their dogs even when they are on a lead, there is a surprising amount of dog dirt on some pavements, including on my own residential street. There will need to be efficient policing.

There are many dog owners of all ages and many dogs of different sizes. You cannot fit all the dogs into the areas you have suggested. Those who do not agree with the proposals are hard pressed to come up with an alternative that is going to work. The council should try to ban and restrain all dogs because a small minority of people do not pick up after their dogs or do not have their dogs on a lead. It is a bit like banning everyone from driving because a small minority of people drive carelessly. It’s all just common sense. Although irresponsible dog owners do not pick up after their dogs even when they are on a lead, there is a surprising amount of dog dirt on some pavements, including on my own residential street. There will need to be efficient policing.

There are many dog owners of all ages and many dogs of different sizes. You cannot fit all the dogs into the areas you have suggested. Those who do not agree with the proposals are hard pressed to come up with an alternative that is going to work. The council should try to ban and restrain all dogs because a small minority of people do not pick up after their dogs or do not have their dogs on a lead. It is a bit like banning everyone from driving because a small minority of people drive carelessly. It’s all just common sense. Although irresponsible dog owners do not pick up after their dogs even when they are on a lead, there is a surprising amount of dog dirt on some pavements, including on my own residential street. There will need to be efficient policing.

There are many dog owners of all ages and many dogs of different sizes. You cannot fit all the dogs into the areas you have suggested. Those who do not agree with the proposals are hard pressed to come up with an alternative that is going to work. The council should try to ban and restrain all dogs because a small minority of people do not pick up after their dogs or do not have their dogs on a lead. It is a bit like banning everyone from driving because a small minority of people drive carelessly. It’s all just common sense. Although irresponsible dog owners do not pick up after their dogs even when they are on a lead, there is a surprising amount of dog dirt on some pavements, including on my own residential street. There will need to be efficient policing.

There are many dog owners of all ages and many dogs of different sizes. You cannot fit all the dogs into the areas you have suggested. Those who do not agree with the proposals are hard pressed to come up with an alternative that is going to work. The council should try to ban and restrain all dogs because a small minority of people do not pick up after their dogs or do not have their dogs on a lead. It is a bit like banning everyone from driving because a small minority of people drive carelessly. It’s all just common sense. Although irresponsible dog owners do not pick up after their dogs even when they are on a lead, there is a surprising amount of dog dirt on some pavements, including on my own residential street. There will need to be efficient policing.

There are many dog owners of all ages and many dogs of different sizes. You cannot fit all the dogs into the areas you have suggested. Those who do not agree with the proposals are hard pressed to come up with an alternative that is going to work. The council should try to ban and restrain all dogs because a small minority of people do not pick up after their dogs or do not have their dogs on a lead. It is a bit like banning everyone from driving because a small minority of people drive carelessly. It’s all just common sense. Although irresponsible dog owners do not pick up after their dogs even when they are on a lead, there is a surprising amount of dog dirt on some pavements, including on my own residential street. There will need to be efficient policing.

There are many dog owners of all ages and many dogs of different sizes. You cannot fit all the dogs into the areas you have suggested. Those who do not agree with the proposals are hard pressed to come up with an alternative that is going to work. The council should try to ban and restrain all dogs because a small minority of people do not pick up after their dogs or do not have their dogs on a lead. It is a bit like banning everyone from driving because a small minority of people drive carelessly. It’s all just common sense. Although irresponsible dog owners do not pick up after their dogs even when they are on a lead, there is a surprising amount of dog dirt on some pavements, including on my own residential street. There will need to be efficient policing.
The protesters cannot complain about any of the proposals. If they obey the rules (let alone the new proposals) they will have no grounds for complaint.

The current byelaws are designed to safeguard people and dogs alike and allow responsible dog owners to exercise their dogs off leads. People who own and walk dogs irresponsibly (by allowing them to foul and not clean up or have uncontrolled dogs) will be penalised. Responsible dog owners, who are in the majority, should not be punished by fines for allowing their dogs to exercise off the lead.

Dog owners need to be made aware that they are not the only people to use these public areas. If owner clean up after their dogs then there should be no issues. People should have choice where they go with their own dogs, safely.

Dogs need to be exercised off the lead. Failure to do this can result in behaviour problems including aggression. Even if they do not pick up after their dogs, this is something that needs to be enforced more than the issue of dogs off leads.

These proposals will only be effective if they are properly policed. As a Responsible dog owner, I am appalled by the amount of dog mess on our pavements. Additional enforcement officers are required to catch those not picking up after their dogs.

If owner clean up after their dogs then there should be no issues. People should have choice where they go with their own dogs, safely.

These proposals 'go too far'. Effort should be made to enforce laws regarding pick up. If someone isn't doing that, these proposals are unlikely to be effective. As a consequence, the proposals will create additional administrative costs and be even more costly to police. It feels like there is an attempt to get more revenue to cover the cost of policing.

What are the measures in place to prevent multiple replies? How many proven problems are recorded rather than anecdotal reports from unbiased people. What evidence is there that the proposed PSPOs are necessary? There are powers already available to prosecute those who fail to clean up after their dogs.

It saddens me greatly that once again more of people’s freedoms are being taken away. I do a lot of walking along the coastline and I am appalled at the amount of dog mess. Clearly the draft proposals must be backed up by an appropriate intensity of enforcement.

The proposal to have different proposals for dogs running on the beach is a ploy to encourage people to use their dogs on the beach. Selfish dog owners need to be aware that they are not the only people to use these public areas.

Dog fouling is a huge issue - many more dog owners believe that they are being penalised sufficiently for this. Dog owners who fail to pick up after their dogs are thought to be more common than they actually are. The introduction of more draconian legislation such as the proposed PSPOs is just pointless legislation that will only be effectively enforced by a small minority of the population.

If dogs are not picked up after, this is a significant problem. I am a dog owner and I am disgusted at the amount of dog mess, for example on Lindsay Ave St Annes where I live. Clearly the draft proposals must be backed up by an appropriate intensity of enforcement.

I feel there are more than enough restrictions already and have already contacted my MP regarding the restrictions on dogs on the beach. We need to look at making the Fylde Coast a dog friendly area similar to what happens in the Lake District for instance.

If owner clean up after their dogs then there should be no issues. People should have choice where they go with their own dogs, safely.

As a responsible dog owner, I am appalled by the amount of dog mess on our pavements. Additional enforcement officers are required to catch those not picking up after their dogs.

I am a dog owner and I am disgusted at the amount of dog mess, for example on Lindsay Ave St Annes where I live. Clearly the draft proposals must be backed up by an appropriate intensity of enforcement.

I just can't believe that you would want to bring in so many orders for this when there is no evidence to justify them.  Also, the fact that the majority of users do pick up. Hope Street is a lovely example of a real multi use community park. I have been engaged in conversation and not watching their dogs fouling the public areas. Dog fouling is a huge issue - many more dog owners believe that they are being penalised sufficiently for this.

The fear of breach of minor bye laws resulting in penalty notices. The penalty notice has its place in the case of unruly dogs fouling public spaces but it cannot provide everyone with the same protection that a dog warden can. There is no evidence to justify the introduction of these new Orders.

What are the measures in place to prevent multiple replies? How many proven problems are recorded rather than anecdotal reports from unbiased people. What evidence is there that the proposed PSPOs are necessary? There are powers already available to prosecute those who fail to clean up after their dogs.

I am a dog owner and I am disgusted at the amount of dog mess, for example on Lindsay Ave St Annes where I live. Clearly the draft proposals must be backed up by an appropriate intensity of enforcement.

The penalty notice has its place in the case of unruly dogs fouling public spaces but it cannot provide everyone with the same protection that a dog warden can.
There needs to be a balance struck between dog free/dogs on lead areas and those where dogs can exercise freely. Indeed, there needs to be a balance between dog owners who walk their dog for real exercise and those who walk them as a form of entertainment. If they were restricted to walking 2 or 3 then you are risking dogs being left in vehicles whilst the owner walks two at a time.

I am a recovering heart patient and try to walk around the St Annes boating lake and miniature golf every day. It's about getting fresh air and freedom from home life. It's also about the mental peace and quiet when you get away from the noise and bustle of everyday life. I love the connection with the beach huts. I refer to this walk as the dog toilet. I have just returned (Sat Dec 17th) and today was a particularly good experience.

I am a regular walker and runner in many of the areas listed and often encounter problems with dogs who are not on a lead. The most recent being last week, near Fairhaven lake when 5 dogs were let out of a vehicle and allowed to run off on their own! Everyone can see these dogs as a threat and needs to be aware of them. I have been in contact with our local MP and he is keen to look into this issue further. However, I feel that the council should take responsibility and make changes to ensure the safety of all.

I would strongly object to these restrictions and refuse to co-operate with the proposals. The proposals are not enforceable in that the police and the local authority are not willing to enforce them. If these orders were brought in I would make the above very well known within the community.

Dogs off leads are a threat to people walking nearby and owners cannot control where they defecate. My aunt who is disabled will not be able to get to the remaining areas to walk her dog off lead. This is discrimination and unreasonnable.

I am incensed by the proposals to keep dogs on leads on any beach or park. These are for the use of everyone whether they walk their dog or not. I want them to be able to enjoy the beach and the park as they please. I walk my dog every day in the park and he is well trained. He doesn't swear or spit, or dig up flowers or plants or destroy them just for the fun of it. I walk my dog every day in the park and he is well trained. He doesn't swear or spit, or dig up flowers or plants or destroy them just for the fun of it. I walk my dog every day in the park and he is well trained. He doesn't swear or spit, or dig up flowers or plants or destroy them just for the fun of it.

The majority of dog owners are responsible people. It's the minority of idiots who spoil it for everyone, I once saw a group of teenagers playing frisbee with their dog. I went up to the owners and asked them to put the dog on a lead and they replied in a very aggressive tone....

The proposals don't go far enough. Dogs should be banned completely from Lytham Green and Witchwood. The problem is not that dogs are not controlled, but that they are not visible. Due to the size of the park, dogs can run off and not be seen by the owner. There should be a limit to the number of dogs walked on leads. But feel a limit of 5 is reasonable to dogs off the lead and under the control of one person. I fully support the intention to restrict 'careless exercising' of dogs, and to ensure there are many safe areas for dogs to exercise off the lead.

The number of dog owners is increasing rapidly and it is becoming more difficult to control them. The proposals are needed to protect the public and their animals. It is unfortunate for the responsible dog owners that these measures have to be proposed. There appears to be quite a large minority of irresponsible dog owners who cause problems for the rest of us.

The land registry is now at Warton. Is this where the order extends to? I cannot comment on areas I do not know.

Enforcement in whatever is ultimately decided is key to its successful implementation. Dogs should be on a lead at all times in public places. Unfortunately too many dogs are not under effective control. A limit of 2 or 3 dogs per owner is sufficient. Any more and the owner cannot maintain control of the dogs off lead. There should be more education and awareness campaigns to encourage responsible dog ownership.

It is unfortunate for the responsible dog owners that these measures have to be proposed. There appears to be quite a large minority of irresponsible dog owners who cause problems for the rest of us. I am a regular runner and I often encounter problems with dogs who are not on a lead. One of the questions mentions The land Registry. The land registry is now at Warton. Is this where the order extends to? I cannot comment on areas I do not know.

Our dog is walked by professional dog walkers when we are at work. They are very professional, always have their dogs under control and do not allow them to run off. Professional dog walkers are able to exercise would pose huge problems for professional dog walkers and I'd like to suggest this is not what is needed.

There is a consistent eroding of places for dog owners to exercise their dogs. The Fylde has a huge number of dog owners so what about providing designated areas for dogs to be exercised off the lead? The proposals are not reasonable and will unfairly restrict the majority of responsible dog owners in the area.

Draconian proposals are needed please let us have sight of it. Please stop bad owners leaving dog poo!

The proposals are not reasonable and will unfairly restrict the majority of responsible dog owners in the area. At some point, the council should consider the impact of their proposals on the local community. There should be more consultation with dog owners before any changes are made. Some of the proposals are not practical and will cause problems for dog owners.

Thank you to those who have replied to the consultation. It is important that we have your feedback before any changes are made. Please keep sending in your responses as they are needed. In the meantime, I hope you and your pets have a good day.
unnecessary and unjustified use of public funds when the current laws affecting dogs are not effectively enforced against irresponsible dog owners who don’t clean up after their dogs.

Blackpool Road North Playing Field is the only large open space in the area to exercise your dog off lead. I am a responsible dog owner and currently walk my dog around the edge of our local playing field. I have never been aware of any problem with aggressive dogs or any other issue with irresponsible dog owners. I think it is a retrograde step to start regulating this area again.

Enforce the current bylaws as a resident very close to one of the areas mentioned and having watched for many years all the issues involved. I do not agree that a problem exists, I suggest that the majority of dog owners are responsible. It is the irresponsible minority who do not clean up after their dogs and ruin it for everyone else. The responsible dog owners need not have more restrictions imposed, catch the irresponsible.

Away from obviously necessary regulations for parks and children’s play areas, over regulation of this kind only serves to turn people off and cause anger. It is the council’s job to bring people together, not to divide the community. I walk my dogs twice a day and never see any problems. I believe the council should be concentrating on issues such as the Lytham Foreshore where in my experience dogs can run free without any hinderance to walkers or cyclists.

I feel restrictions are too severe when most of the time there is little need for them. Every day I think how lucky I am that we have a beautiful area to enjoy. I also cannot see any need for restrictions on The Green between Lytham and Lytham St Anne’s. We visit and attend the area visiting friends and family. It is also our nearest beach to being our grandchildren as we live in the area.

Seems very sensible to me. I’d also suggest prohibiting dogs at Lytham crematorium/cemetery. I appreciate that there are dog owners out there who show a deliberate carelessness with regards to the local areas, the community and the environment. I am not one of them. I am conscientious and respectful dog owner. I can honestly say that the vast majority of fellow dog owners are the same. I would be delighted to liaise with us responsible dog owners and hear our side before implementing restrictions.

Restricting number of dogs walked and limiting areas of off lead walking will impact local business as I and I’m sure many others will not be able to enjoy the area as much as we would like. This is a retrograde step. We visit and enjoy visiting the local shops and then off lead walk our dogs up the beach to St Anne’s and back through Witch Wood. Also, we enjoy visiting the local shops and then off lead walk our dogs up the beach to St Anne’s and back through Witch Wood.

There has to be a compromise between limiting the free running and access of dogs and public usage. Whilst I wholly agree that dog owners need to be responsible, I feel that the number of restrictions that have been placed on dogs in public areas is a complete joke, showed them up! I’ll remember who to vote for at election time!

A dog should be under the control of it’s owner both on or off the lead. A dog owner should also pick up after a dog and it should be a penalty for this but it is unfair on dog owners who do have their dogs under control to be penalized. If a dog is on a lead it is automatically under control. It’s common sense.

Punishing responsible dog owners who walk their dogs off lead in designated areas will result in losing support of many dog owners. I walk my dog off lead in both areas, and have never had any problems or encountered any aggressive dogs.

I feel restrictions are too severe when most of the time there is little need for them. Every day I think how lucky I am that we have a beautiful area to enjoy. I also cannot see any need for restrictions on The Green between Lytham and Lytham St Anne’s. We visit and attend the area visiting friends and family. It is also our nearest beach to being our grandchildren as we live in the area.

Seems very sensible to me. I’d also suggest prohibiting dogs at Lytham crematorium/cemetery. I appreciate that there are dog owners out there who show a deliberate carelessness with regards to the local areas, the community and the environment. I am not one of them. I am conscientious and respectful dog owner. I can honestly say that the vast majority of fellow dog owners are the same. I would be delighted to liaise with us responsible dog owners and hear our side before implementing restrictions.

Restricting number of dogs walked and limiting areas of off lead walking will impact local business as I and I’m sure many others will not be able to enjoy the area as much as we would like. This is a retrograde step. We visit and enjoy visiting the local shops and then off lead walk our dogs up the beach to St Anne’s and back through Witch Wood. Also, we enjoy visiting the local shops and then off lead walk our dogs up the beach to St Anne’s and back through Witch Wood.

There has to be a compromise between limiting the free running and access of dogs and public usage. Whilst I wholly agree that dog owners need to be responsible, I feel that the number of restrictions that have been placed on dogs in public areas is a complete joke, showed them up! I’ll remember who to vote for at election time!
The councils approach here is ridiculous. Dogs require exercise off the lead in order to fulfill their needs. Dog restrictions are a euphemism. The imposition of a lead or even a muzzle is a false economy - it is clearly a money grab with a heavy handed approach. This cannot possibly be enforced and I along with others will not comply. The proposal to keep dogs on a lead on any public highway within the Borough is both impractical and unenforceable. Fully socialized dogs are able to run and play with other dogs in the same way as children. If we had our way, we would have our children on car seats and would never let them play in the park. A dog is a companion and to keep them shut up behind four walls is cruel. Unsocialized dogs can cause problems and are a worry. I think that more should be done to tackle the irresponsible dog owners rather than blanket decisions on all dogs. The emphasis of the new legislation should be on clearing up after your dog. The new restrictions should clearly state that dogs must be kept on a lead when they are exercised. Pet owners should be made aware of this. The situation is worse in Westcliff than in Lytham - people go about their business and are not aware of the fouling. I believe that they should be made aware before any fines are applied. I believe that the complaints procedure is ineffective and does not reach the dog owners. The streets in Lytham have copious amounts of excrement on them. It is not limited to grass or sand areas only. This needs to be tackled.

I Live and work in the Lytham St Annes area and so very many of my friends and colleagues are so very unhappy about the proposals. I fully support the motions today. There is no evidence of communities rejecting the proposal. Surely it is important to address the complaints and to have a complaints procedure. I have heard that the streets in Lytham have copious amounts of excrement on them. It is not limited to grass or sand areas only. This needs to be tackled.

There is no evidence of communities rejecting the proposal. I am not concerned about the proposal as it is currently formulated. Whatever the proposal it is important to ensure that it complies with the law. Pet owners should be made aware of the new restrictions. The exclusion areas are too wide. I would support some restrictions but not those currently being suggested. Ask the poor owner for the lead. A dog kept on a lead for the whole time it is exercised is a joy to walk with. A dog kept on a lead doesn't have the opportunity to socialize with other dogs and humans. Unsocialized dogs are a worry. Socialized dogs are happier, healthier and behave appropriately amongst other dogs and humans. They can only express their needs through barking. Socialized dogs are happier, healthier and behavior appropriately amongst other dogs and humans. They can only express their needs through barking.

Sarah Wilson needs to get her facts right. Put a stop to this now, because we will not be beaten.
I am a dog lover and supported responsible dog owners. However, I am concerned about the lack of responsible dog ownership and the impact it can have on the community, especially in areas like Lytham St. Annes and the beach. I have experience of local dog owners, and I believe they are extremely responsible. I have always seen dogs running on the beach and in public areas, and I have never seen any problems arising from it. I believe that many dog owners are concerned about the restrictions on dog walking, and I think that the council should be more proactive in encouraging responsible behavior.

Dogs are a part of our society, and I believe that the council should encourage responsible dog owners to use public spaces, including beaches, without causing any disturbance to others. I have seen many dog owners responsible and respectful, and I believe that the council should do more to promote responsible dog ownership.

I am a motorist, and I often visit Lytham St. Annes and the surrounding areas with my children. I also work in the Fylde and regularly visit Lytham St. Annes and the surrounding areas with my children. I find it good that there is a beach area in St Annes where dogs are not allowed during May to September. Any dog friendly nation so lets not make the Fylde a none dog friendly area. This could impact tourist revenue.

Dog dirt is a nuisance and owners do not clean up properly, and the lack of street cleaning adds up to 3rd world living conditions. Many of these restrictions are just to raise money. To become really effective they have to be enforced, i.e., employ more enforcement officers. It would be better to target the number of dogs: 4 or more could be registered by the walker (or owner), the number that can be managed by one person. I understand some of the restrictions, but I think that the council should be more proactive in promoting responsible dog ownership.

I have seen birds attack other birds, and dogs run up and jump up at us. When we play ball games, they chase the balls, and this can be disturbing. I have witnessed far too much aggression from uncontrolled dogs.

Uncontrolled dogs filthy from the beach running up and jumping up should be controlled. If the owner can't do it then they should be forced to keep the animal on a lead. I have seen dogs running off the lead intimidating when walking around the Fylde and on the beach. Owners often seem unable to control their dogs, and they often get on your feet. I find it difficult to walk comfortably in public areas because of uncontrolled dogs.

I fail to see why I should be unable to walk comfortably in public areas because of uncontrolled dogs. Unregulated dogs run up and jump up should be controlled. If the owner can't do it then they should be forced to keep the animal on a lead. We have seen a great deal of aggression from uncontrolled dogs.

I believe that the council should focus more on promoting responsible dog ownership rather than on imposing strict restrictions. The proposals are predominantly against dogs and their owners, and I believe that the council should consider other measures to address the problem. I believe that the council should be more proactive in encouraging responsible dog ownership and addressing the concerns of dog owners.

I work in the Fylde and regularly visit Lytham St. Annes and the surrounding areas with my children. I am a motorist, and I often visit Lytham St. Annes and the surrounding areas with my children. I find it good that there is a beach area in St Annes where dogs are not allowed during May to September. Any dog friendly nation so lets not make the Fylde a none dog friendly area. This could impact tourist revenue.

Dog dirt is a nuisance and owners do not clean up properly, and the lack of street cleaning adds up to 3rd world living conditions. Many of these restrictions are just to raise money. To become really effective they have to be enforced, i.e., employ more enforcement officers. It would be better to target the number of dogs: 4 or more could be registered by the walker (or owner), the number that can be managed by one person. I understand some of the restrictions, but I think that the council should be more proactive in promoting responsible dog ownership.

I have seen birds attack other birds, and dogs run up and jump up at us. When we play ball games, they chase the balls, and this can be disturbing. I have witnessed far too much aggression from uncontrolled dogs.

Uncontrolled dogs filthy from the beach running up and jumping up should be controlled. If the owner can't do it then they should be forced to keep the animal on a lead. We have seen a great deal of aggression from uncontrolled dogs.

I believe that the council should focus more on promoting responsible dog ownership rather than on imposing strict restrictions. The proposals are predominantly against dogs and their owners, and I believe that the council should consider other measures to address the problem. I believe that the council should be more proactive in encouraging responsible dog ownership and addressing the concerns of dog owners.
I must emphasise the fact that the majority of dog owners/handlers exercise common sense and do not require laws in order to do so. Their personal will help to the welfare of the community. Preventing people from exercising their dogs for free is a retrograde step and will cause unnecessary stress. I commend those that have written to the council to provide further evidence of any concerns they may have. Even if there is a problem, there are already correct procedures in place to deal with it.

I work in Lytham and have often been run at by dogs off the lead in some of the areas - I feel all dogs should be on leads. There should be a ban on running dogs off the lead in some areas.

I feel that the small number of persons walking dogs, as a job or otherwise, who do not pick up after their dogs, and the large numbers of people who do is a blot on the area. I think that these people should be made to pay their fine, as well as the council paying the fine for the dog to be picked up.

Dogs are an integral part of life in Britain and more specifically the Fylde coast and to ban them or enforce lead-only running in areas would be a retrograde step. Councils everywhere are facing financial problems and yet they want to make another law that would cost the council more - I feel it would be cheaper to pay the dog owners to pick up after their dogs.

You are punishing a huge if not majority group of your residents and wasting money even contemplating this. I speak to. You are punishing a huge if not majority group of your residents and wasting money even contemplating this.

I am a responsible dog owner. I would prefer a more concentrated directive toward dog walkers who do not pick up after their dog's waste, rather than penalise responsible dog owner/walkers.

I am in favour of measures to combat dog excrement in the Lytham St Annes area but I am totally against the draconian proposals put forward. I believe that this would be the council wielding an unnecessary force over a non-issue. In addition, I can't see how the proposed measures would take into account the exercise needs of dogs. Many dog owners near these areas do not have use of cars and their needs should be considered too.

I am not a dog walker but feel the current plans are an absolute waste of money. No evidence has been provided to show that the measures would be effective. If the council thinks that the measures are fit for purpose they should be looking at a wider area and not just restricting the dogs that are exercising these grass areas.

I am in favour of measures to combat dog excrement in the Lytham St Annes area but I am totally against the draconian proposals put forward. I believe that this would be the council wielding an unnecessary force over a non-issue. In addition, I can't see how the proposed measures would take into account the exercise needs of dogs. Many dog owners near these areas do not have use of cars and their needs should be considered too.

i am a pensioner and have had dogs for 40 years.Why is walking a dog/dogs an antisocial behaviour? I am a Lytham resident and I have never had a problem with dogs in this area of any sort. I feel that the area is safer with dogs than without. It is a lovely place to walk the dogs and I feel that any measure to restrict the number of dogs in the area is totally unnecessary. I have never had a problem with dog owners not picking up after their dogs.

No dogs should be allowed on Lytham Green area which is used by families.

Morals have to play a role here and its unfortunate we have to put some enforcement in but in some cases it's necessary. There are responsible dog owners and there are irresponsible ones. There have to be laws for the irresponsible ones but at the same time I feel the council is being overzealous.

Absolutely ridiculous proposals that will restrict local dog walkers and many visitors to the area. You should be promoting the area as “dog friendly” to get more visitors into local shops, not the total opposite!

I have recently moved to St Annes from Warwickshire and have been very surprised and disgusted with the amount of dog excrement I have seen on public places. They said it was dog on dog!!!!!! Mine was 15, deaf and nearly blind. But as long as it's dog on dog that's fine. However, I feel that the council should be doing more to prevent people from littering in the first place.

and feel it would be pertinent for dog wardens to make patrols to try and combat this.

In my opinion, the proposed measures ignore the needs of dog owners and dog walkers and are harsh, unnecessary and inappropriately targeted. As many people in the area have said, the council is being overreach.

I have spoken to many dog owners who are totally against the proposed measures. They have said that they will have to go outside of the Fylde area to exercise their dogs due to the proposed measures and that it is a small number of dog owners who are committing the problem.

The Fylde Council has an obligation to ensure the health and safety of all the residents but this should not be at the expense of the dog owners. The council should be focusing on the bigger picture and what is best for the community as a whole.

I enjoy walking from St Annes to Lytham along the seafront. I do not have a bad back, but should I need to have dogs under control I will. Our council should be focusing on the safety of the population and not on the small percentage of people that are causing problems.

I would like to see a more concentrated directive towards dog owners who do not pick up after their dogs. The proposed measures are too harsh and will result in people moving their dogs to other areas.

I speak to many dog owners who are totally against the proposed measures. They have said that they will have to go outside of the Fylde area to exercise their dogs due to the proposed measures and that it is a small number of dog owners who are committing the problem.

The Fylde Council has an obligation to ensure the health and safety of all the residents but this should not be at the expense of the dog owners. The council should be focusing on the bigger picture and what is best for the community as a whole.

This is completely unnecessary for the Fylde area and I feel that the council should be focusing its efforts on getting the dog owners to clean up after their dogs. The proposed measures are too harsh and will result in people moving their dogs to other areas.

The council should be focusing on the safety of the population and not on the small percentage of people that are causing problems. I would like to see a more concentrated directive towards dog owners who do not pick up after their dogs. The proposed measures are too harsh and will result in people moving their dogs to other areas.
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In the same way that people are allowed to drive cars unless they prove themselves to be dangerous or a nuisance to others, dog owners are allowed to walk their dogs in public areas unless they prove themselves to be dangerous or a nuisance to others. Dog owners should be able to walk their dogs in public areas as long as they are responsible and do not cause a nuisance to others. If a dog is dangerous or a nuisance, it should be removed from public areas.

I run a clothing shop and have always had a dog. I know we have issues with not picking up dog poop, but I believe it is unfair to penalize all dog owners because of a few who don’t follow the rules. Dog owners should be held accountable for their pets, and if a dog is dangerous or causes a nuisance, it should be removed from public areas.

Dog fouling and out of control aggressive dogs are a real problem that needs to be addressed. I object to the use of PSPOs when in this area the vast majority of dog owners are law abiding and are not a significant problem. Parking wardens already drive many visitors out of the area; let’s hope doggy police don’t get the same opportunity.

Some of these measures already exist but are not enforced. If these measures are implemented and enforced, local people and businesses will suffer. Dog owners should be held accountable for their pets, and if a dog is dangerous or causes a nuisance, it should be removed from public areas.

Dog owners should be responsible for their pets and should clean up after them. If a dog is dangerous or causes a nuisance, it should be removed from public areas. Dog owners should be held accountable for their pets and should clean up after them. If a dog is dangerous or causes a nuisance, it should be removed from public areas.
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Try spending money on something more worth while like improving pathways and the number of bins available! The general... around parking and access to the areas to where dogs can be walked. This proposed change will impact a number of local... I am a responsible dog owner and, although not originally from the Fylde, have lived here since the 1990s. I love how... object to the proposals being made on the basis of a failure by the council to present any evidence of the problem caused... Bikes on Lytham Green are more of a hazard than dogs. I am a responsible dog owner and am concerned that with a restriction in force on Lytham Green we would struggle to exercise our dog. We have never had a problem in the past with dogs. We liked the area as it was so dog friendly. This doesn't feel dog friendly. Good owners should be able to give their dog freedom. I think it's important that dog walkers have designated areas to walk dogs without restrictions, however this should not... under seasonal restrictions to allow local residents to exercise their dogs off leads in these areas in low season. Many people have dogs and I think you need to be increasing the amenities for dog walkers not decreasing them. One area and not another in close proximity will be confusing, and slapping a £100 fine on people is at best excessive. Making dogs go on lead in lytham green is ridiculous. If you are to do this ban cyclists going at stupid paces down there and make them use the road! The more control over dogs the better. too many irresponsible owners about and dog fouling is certainly on the increase. As a dog owner I fully support sensible restrictions to dog control. It infuriates me that people don't clean up after... the sea side of Fairhaven lake but only during the winter months ie same times as the beach restrictions. It is a clean... More visibabilty of dog wardens. Regardless of proposals required in the area generally. The beach area where dogs are prohibited during summer should be widened to include in front of beach huts. Although once down on the beach this is a very difficult line to draw... is a very good reason, and exclusion zones should be kept to an absolute minimum as they do not only exclude the dogs... fails to follow good survey design recommendations. The survey appears to be designed to influence the outcome by the way... access will be able to take part in the consultation and how results are to be published. As a responsible dog-owner I am... residents who are perhaps elderly or have difficulty parking. Parking is rarely free! I also see this as an excuse to... spent (Wasted) on signage to justify the fines. As I see little or no action in enforcing dog fouling in my local area...
Bonkers!!!!!! It is this kind of interference by the state and local authorities in ordinary people lives that has fed ... lives and freedom end? Get back to the job of serving ordinary people and the silent majority instead of pandering to

There are many responsible dog owners but it's the few irresponsible ones that spoil it for others....fines may alter their outlook on dog walking.

I am a dog walker who lives in the Fylde and has a working breed of dog which significantly benefits being walked off ... with lots of people or which have other uses. For example I walk in Ashton Gardens, Fairhaven lake and Lowther with my

As I get older I like dogs on leads, they can knock you over

I am a responsible dog owner who has lived in Lytham all my life, it is a beautiful and scenic place which I can share and Enjoy with my dog and I feel it should be kept that way.

I own a German shepherd and even though she mostly friendly to dogs on occasions she can snap at dogs ... I used to love ... lead freely come up and sniff my dog resulting in confrontations... my father has also been snapped at whilst walking on

I think wardens need to enforce the collection and binning of dog poo more rather than districting and penalizing us ... of mess on paths and grassy areas and would welcome penalties being handed out to these culprits!  I also worry that

I think there needs to be more dog wardens, I regularly pick up other people's dog poo

I currently own 6 small dogs and have walked them without any problems for over 20 years.  I fail to understand why you ... for dog fouling are single dog owners usually visitors not regulars.   I earnestly ask you to rethink this aspect of the

Most people who own dogs are responsible and will keep their dogs under control and pick up after their dogs. Most owners ... areas to run free and socialise with other dogs. Speak to the RSPCA and they will confirm that this is a necessary part

I appreciate the concerns expressed by groups but as a responsible dog owner I am saddened that I may not be able to ... his and our enjoyment. Personally, I was unaware of all the laws and some of the few I do know about I ignore as do

There are currently too few areas that dogs can have essential proper off lead walking in the borough. Considering the ... give an average sized dog the 5 miles on lead walking it would require daily to ensure the wellbeing of their dogs. Off

In rural Fylde dogs are let loose on farmland and this should stop.   Dogs should be on a lead at all times in public ... lover, like cyclists, seem to be a law unto themselves.  Heavier fines and more wardens are needed and have my support.

I have been a resident in Lytham for over 15 years and enjoy being able to exercise my dog off lead.  I feel it is a privilege and I would be concerned to have to keep my dog on a lead at all times. It is important to me that my dog can enjoy the...
Enforcement of the proposals will require large numbers of "staff...cost to the taxpayer is disproportionate...have not been publicised. The proposals will detract from tourism & have a devastating effect on professional dog walkers.

The survey isn't 100% clear on where the actual restrictions would be...Grannys Bay...can dogs still be exercised on...I use a professional dog walker and sometimes stand in for other professional dog walkers when they're on holidays etc.,

You seem to want to demonize every dog owner rather than catching those who cannot control their dogs. This will have serious repercussions for those tourists who believe we are a dog friendly council.

I am in favour of the council enforcing the existing laws regarding dog fouling and animals out of control. However I see...only penalise the responsible owners. Also with current cost constraints I do not think these could be enforced anyway.

The restrictions during flood defences renewal, birds do not breed in new suggested area. So why stop dogs going there.a. Is the map confusing? Is the problem of dogs getting injured. Dog walkers should be limited as I have seen large numbers about and have had to pick up...there is a problem with many is beyond belief and too pick up that much poo you would expect to see them with a bucket. There is a problem with dog owning counterparts.

The beach should be a free place to have dogs off the lead. Apart from main area in summer. I agree the prom should be...information from FOI...restrictions currently in operation are working and are sufficient. It is unnecessary to further penalise dog owners. We need to further review their dog control measures to better ensure public safety. The requirement of leads is no the best...many is beyond belief and too pick up that much poo you would expect to see them with a bucket. There is a problem with dog owning counterparts.

The number of times I have been told people were walking their dogs in a lovely area.

While I am in full support of dogs being under control at all times. It is a little misleading about certain areas like...as well as their dogs can socialize and exercise. I would love to see some dog only areas. Fenced off like on Lima Rd St

The proposal to extend the current controls in St Annes to the new area in Lytham is welcome but I have a lot of concerns about...walking round Fairhaven Lake, with and without dogs. Today was a typical example where, of over 20 dogs being...times between the cafe and the toilets near the ice cream kiosk. One springer spaniel, off lead, ran over to my dogs and

Traffic calming proposals to deal with dog mess in Lytham would...show revenue ..  Once you have done all this .. do something that's really needed and start to...need to further review their dog control measures to better ensure public safety. The requirement of leads is no the best...many is beyond belief and too pick up that much poo you would expect to see them with a bucket. There is a problem with dog owning counterparts.

You seem to want to demonize every dog owner rather than catching those who cannot control their dogs. This will have serious repercussions for those tourists who believe we are a dog friendly council.

I am in favour of the council enforcing the existing laws regarding dog fouling and animals out of control. However I see...only penalise the responsible owners. Also with current cost constraints I do not think these could be enforced anyway.

The restrictions during flood defences renewal, birds do not breed in new suggested area. So why stop dogs going there.a. Is the map confusing? Is the problem of dogs getting injured. Dog walkers should be limited as I have seen large numbers about and have had to pick up...there is a problem with many is beyond belief and too pick up that much poo you would expect to see them with a bucket. There is a problem with dog owning counterparts.

The beach should be a free place to have dogs off the lead. Apart from main area in summer. I agree the prom should be...information from FOI...restrictions currently in operation are working and are sufficient. It is unnecessary to further penalise dog owners. We need to further review their dog control measures to better ensure public safety. The requirement of leads is no the best...many is beyond belief and too pick up that much poo you would expect to see them with a bucket. There is a problem with dog owning counterparts.

The number of times I have been told people were walking their dogs in a lovely area.