**Appendix F**
**Proposed Order Four**
A person in charge of a dog on any public place within the Borough of Dacorum must comply with a direction given to them by a Constable or a person duly authorised by the Council to put and keep the dog on a lead (no more than 2m fixed length) unless:

(a) they have reasonable excuse for failing to do so, or
(b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.

**Question 5.** Do you agree or disagree with this proposal to define the length and type of lead to be used when there is a requirement for a dog to be on a lead?

**Responses**

**Muzzle**

- I agree to the proposal but feel that it needs to be more far reaching. I have lost count of the times I have had dogs vigorously bark and bare their teeth at me, run towards me, jump up me etc and the owners tell me that it's ok because their dog is friendly and will not bite me! My husband enjoys running and has been attacked by dogs off their leads presumably because the dogs thought he was going to attack their owner. I feel dogs should either be kept on a lead, or have a muzzle fitted so they cannot bite anyone or anything. I say this as a dog lover, although I do not currently own a dog.
- Some dogs have good recall and need to be allowed to run free . Make the law to muzzel them offlead instead !

**Agree**

- I agree with your proposal but again how are you to get an "authorised" person in situ at the right time?! If you cannot invest in human patrols what about cameras. If you cannot even invest in penalty notices can you afford cameras or salaries for surveillance personnel??
- Don,t agree with schedule 2
- I don’t really disagree but just want to point out that whomever wrote this part has no clues whatsoever on how extending lead works !
- I agree but recommend that it is not enough just to put the dog on a lead but that the lead must be held or affixed to something suitable so that the dog remains under the close control of the dog walker
- I agree to the proposal but feel that it needs to be more far reaching. I have lost count of the times I have had dogs vigorously bark and bare their teeth at me, run towards me, jump up me etc and the owners tell me that it's ok because their dog is friendly and will not bite me! My husband enjoys running and has been attacked by dogs off their leads presumably because the dogs thought he was going to attack their owner. I feel dogs should either be kept on a lead, or have a muzzle fitted so they cannot bite anyone or anything. I say this as a dog lover, although I do not currently own a dog.
- I agree with the exception of the reference to extendable leads as these can be fixed at less than 2m. There should also be a requirement that dogs are under close control in public park areas used by children e.g. Gadebridge Park where the play area is not enclosed.
- I agree that dangerous dogs should be on leads. I also don't understand how this will be policed, in my experience most dog owners are responsible and put their dogs on

leads when they misbehave. Who will decide what behaviour is annoying or warrants being on a lead?

**Lead**

- Again i keep my dog on a lead when there is traffic or places unsuitable ie livestock. How about Darcoum putting in place a 4 dog rule per person when out walking. Which is what most boroughs do and is law i beleive. I offen see in Grove Hill Park (baseball field ) Hills Hounds dog walking or runabout up to 23 dogs and maybe 3 or 4 walkers. I know a lot of people dog owners or not not happy with this for the dogs sake. Again How do you deal with the 5% who dont give a S**T about anything that should be the consultation paper not this?????
- any dog off the lead had to be under control. if the dog is not under controld then the owner should be punished. not just an officer who is never around can ask them. anyone with a dog of their own should tell them.
- No. Firstly, who are the 'authorised officers?' What training will they have had? Will the recruitment process be robust enough to ensure that objective individuals are employed and not just people who don't like dogs. This will almost certainly lead to over zealous 'officers' insisting that perfectly well behaved dogs are placed unnecessarily on a lead.
- Small dogs can be adequately restrained with an extendable lead, so it depends on the size of the dog
- A dog should be on a lead if can not be trusted to not be on a lead and this should apply to toddlers and children with reins that can not be trusted or controlled by their parents around animals, people in general
- I do not think any dog should be let off a lead in a public place, as once a dog is let off the owner is no longer in control of their
- This means that a dog owner has to carry 2 leads of which one is fixed. Most dog owners that I know use extending leads which can be locked at 2 metres or less. The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 has not keep pace with dog lead development and use. Thus by only using an extending lead with a dog you are stating that that person is committing an offence.
- All dogs should be kept on leads unless they're in a dog park. Even friendly dogs can jump up and scratch a child's face. My cat was nearly killed by a Jack Russell off the lead outside my front door.
- My only issue is with use of fixed leads, most responsible dog owners keep there dogs on fixed leads on paths or near public areas. In country environments this should be eased - we have to be able to exercise our dogs. Have no problem with being instructed by a "Authorized Officer" if they can give a valid reason and not just being officious.
- I think it more important to define what reasons there might be for this requirement otherwise you are leaving a subjective decision to someone sometimes maybe not qualified to know if the dog needs to be on a lead or not. Certainly there are numerous public areas where it is perfectly acceptable for a dog to be off the lead as long as it is not causing a real nuisance to others.
  It would be better in my opinion to try to define what is or isn't an instance where a dog MUST be on a lead.
- I don’t really disagree but just want to point out that whomever wrote this part has no clues whatsoever on how extending lead works !
- I think Dogs should be kept on the lead along the canal path. I am fed up with dog owners not having control and it's dangerous with young children walking along the canal path and could end up in the canal. I also have 2 dogs and am sick to death of my dogs being approached by dogs who have no recall experience even though I shout out continuously to get their dogs away. It seems to be a big problem in the borough with dog owners and the amount of dog attacks increasing. There should

also be a fine if a dog keeps escaping an owners garden. You only have to look at the Facebook Hemel Community Page to see it's a regular occurrence.

- A dog should have the right to walk off the lead providing it is managed and has a responsible owner with it. Unless there is a danger to the animal, ie glass on floor or poison.
- All dogs all lead in public places and there should be secure areas for dogs to be let off if owners wish
- I think an extending lead that is locked on a short length should be deemed to comply with this rule otherwise many owners would have to carry two leads in case they were compelled to act under this rule.
- I agree but recommend that it is not enough just to put the dog on a lead but that the lead must be held or affixed to something suitable so that the dog remains under the close control of the dog walker
- Dogs should be on leads in public places. This is the only way that the majority of owners can have adequate control of their animals.
- I agree to the proposal but feel that it needs to be more far reaching. I have lost count of the times I have had dogs vigorously bark and bare their teeth at me, run towards me, jump up me etc and the owners tell me that it's ok because their dog is friendly and will not bite me! My husband enjoys running and has been attacked by dogs off their leads presumably because the dogs thought he was going to attack their owner. I feel dogs should either be kept on a lead, or have a muzzle fitted so they cannot bite anyone or anything. I say this as a dog lover, although I do not currently own a dog.
- Dogs should not be off lead
  Need to be dog only area, so people who don't have dogs can walk in peace
- Some dogs have good recall and need to be allowed to run free . Make the law to muzzel them offlead instead !
- There are laws for this. A person should be able to walk their dog in an open space as long as the dog is under control and put on a lead if necessary. The law is already there for this.
- I don't think this will be appropriate to some dogs. I don't understand why some dogs would be subjected to not being able to be let off their leads. I think a reasonable request can be made with discussion, but not for law to change
- Should be on a lead at all times in public areas
- Every dog should be placed on a lead everywhere except at Parks where they are allowed. Walking in the street yes
- We own a dog that walks to heel, will follow our instructions and is road aware. As a result we no longer carry a lead with us as she happily walks alongside when taken for a walk.
- A dog (under local bylaws) should always be 'under control'. This means that the dog must be under the dog owners control, and usually this means on lead. Too many sheep have been killed locally by out of control dogs.
- I agree with the exception of the reference to extendable leads as these can be fixed at less than 2m. There should also be a requirement that dogs are under close control in public park areas used by children e.g. Gadebridge Park where the play area is not enclosed.
- I agree that dangerous dogs should be on leads. I also don't understand how this will be policed, in my experience most dog owners are responsible and put their dogs on leads when they misbehave. Who will decide what behaviour is annoying or warrants being on a lead?

**Extendable**

- Small dogs can be adequately restrained with an extendable lead, so it depends on the size of the dog

- This means that a dog owner has to carry 2 leads of which one is fixed. Most dog owners that I know use extending leads which can be locked at 2 metres or less. The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 has not keep pace with dog lead development and use. Thus by only using an extending lead with a dog you are stating that that person is committing an offence.
- I don't really disagree but just want to point out that whomever wrote this part has no clues whatsoever on how extending lead works !
- I think an extending lead that is locked on a short length should be deemed to comply with this rule otherwise many owners would have to carry two leads in case they were compelled to act under this rule.
- I agree with the exception of the reference to extendable leads as these can be fixed at less than 2m. There should also be a requirement that dogs are under close control in public park areas used by children e.g. Gadebridge Park where the play area is not enclosed.

**Public**

- See comments in question 1
  This should not include private land which is available to the public
  The proposed measures are far too draconian
- I do not think any dog should be let off a lead in a public place, as once a dog is let off the owner is no longer in control of their
- If the direction was from a police Constable that would be suitable. A council official in my opinion will not be suitable. They can brash, rude and often make situation like this worse. A police officer has suitable training to interact with members of public and has a duty of care to limit escalation of a incindent.
- My only issue is with use of fixed leads, most responsible dog owners keep there dogs on fixed leads on paths or near public areas. In country environments this should be eased - we have to be able to exercise our dogs. Have no problem with being instructed by a "Authorized Officer" if they can give a valid reason and not just being officious.
- I think it more important to define what reasons there might be for this requirement otherwise you are leaving a subjective decision to someone sometimes maybe not qualified to know if the dog needs to be on a lead or not. Certainly there are numerous public areas where it is perfectly acceptable for a dog to be off the lead as long as it is not causing a real nuisance to others.
  It would be better in my opinion to try to define what is or isn't an instance where a dog MUST be on a lead.
- All dogs all lead in public places and there should be secure areas for dogs to be let off if owners wish
- Dogs should be on leads in public places. This is the only way that the majority of owners can have adequate control of their animals.
- Should be on a lead at all times in public areas
- I agree with the exception of the reference to extendable leads as these can be fixed at less than 2m.
  There should also be a requirement that dogs are under close control in public park areas used by children e.g. Gadebridge Park where the play area is not enclosed.

**Other**

- Once again suggest you reduce the crime rates rather than penalising people for ie traffic offences and not having a dog poop bag
- I cant answer this question as its not clear to me what constitutes an 'authorised officer'
- If the person who is giving an unlawful order is a muslim which the animal is seen as

needs to be deatroyed, this could conflict with what is right (Bukhari vol 4. #540)

- Make sure you implement new laws with a fine and community service IE clearing up and monitor.
  Don't just bring new law in.
- They should be all over dacorum
- As before, the proposed action is reasonable but not the blanket area specified
- Try putting your effort into repairing our paths and walk ways rather than dreaming up ideas of how to persecute people.
- Unless the dog is out of control or being a nuisance I believe that the owner should make this descision and indeed I feel that the proposal infringes the rights of the owner.

- The dog is out for exercise not a gentle stroll
- It would depend on the validity of the reasons behind the request.
- Dogs need to be exercised properly
- This is again a blatant vote winner for politicians, it is unenforceable, bad law is worse than no law!
- see previous comments on 'authorised officer'. Dogs do need exercise and any responsible owner will exercise their dog; this does include letting them run free in appropriate places.
- Am not convinced you will have budgets or resources to enforce this. Volunteer options considered in pilots resulted in inconsistencies in application/ enforcement poor take up.
- It is unreasonable to target a dog that is likely to cause a nuisance rather than one that is causing a nuisance. Also, there is criminal legislation in force in relation to this subject.
- I believe that constables/officials need to be trained as often they are unaware of dog behaviour and requirements. Recently I was chased after by a PCSO to say my dog had fouled. ( I always pick it up). I informed them that my dog had not fouled he had cocked his leg and scented a tree. ( A small well behaved and trained dog) .
- Ridiculous. In open countryside this is just daft.
- As long as this power is only used if there is a threat from the dog. Always a slippery slope but OK.