


## PSPO Consultation Responses


### Respondents

866 people responded to the consultation which took place between 27 February and 1 May 2023. 90.4% (783) of respondents are Lewisham residents; 19.3% (167) work in Lewisham; and 9.1% (79) travel through Lewisham. Of those who are not a resident, most work in or are visitors to Lewisham.



There was a disproportionately high response from females and white respondents. Ages were distributed fairly evenly between 30-69 but responses from age groups either side this were low.


- Ethnicity: 67.3% selected White, 5.4% selected Mixed, 5.2% selected Black, 3% selected Asian, 2.3% selected Other.
- Gender: 54.3% selected female, 32.3% selected male, 0.6% selected other.
- Age: Just over 20% selected 30-39, a similar proportion to the 40-49 age group. 17.9% selected 50-59 and 17.1% selected 60-69. Respondents from younger and older age groups were lower (18-29 6.4%; 70+ 8%).
- Sexual Orientation: 10.4% selected Bisexual, Gay or Lesbian.
- Disability: 11.7% responded that they consider they have a disability.



## Summary

The majority of respondents supported each restriction proposed, although in varying proportions. Restrictions related to dogs had the most opposition, while those relating to public urination / defecation had the least:

- 79.4% (683) respondents strongly support or tend to support restrictions / penalties for those that drink alcohol in public spaces and cause anti-social behaviour and nuisance to others; 11.9% (102) respondents strongly oppose or tend to oppose.
- 81.5% (701) respondents strongly support or tend to support the restriction of the use of psychoactive substances in public spaces; 10.9% (94) strongly oppose or tend to oppose.
- 69.2% (595) respondents strongly support or tend to support the restriction of unauthorised encampments; 16.0% (138) strongly oppose or tend to oppose.
- 84.9% (729) respondents strongly support or tend to support the restriction of public urination and defecation; 8.4% (72) strongly oppose or tend to oppose.
- 70.1% (602) respondents strongly support or tend to support the restriction of amplified speech and music; 14.0% (120) strongly oppose or tend to oppose.
- 63.0% (537) respondents strongly support or tend to support the restriction of dogs in specific areas; 21.6% (184) strongly oppose or tend to oppose.
- 64.1% (537) respondents strongly support or tend to support the restriction of dogs off leads in specific areas; 19.7% (165) strongly oppose or tend to oppose.




Responses tended to be similar between females and males in all categories. However, there was a consistent variation of support by age, with a lower proportion of younger people supporting measures than older people. About two thirds (583) of the responses were from people of White ethnic groups while the number from other ethnic groups was much lower (Mixed 47; Black 45; Asian 26; Other 20); for this reason, the latter groups have been combined. Support between these two groups was fairly similar in each category except for restrictions relating to dogs where a lower proportion of people from White ethnic groups supported the proposals.

## Responses by Category

### Restrictions / penalties for alcohol-related anti-social behaviour

860 people answered this section. Over half the respondents (56.6%) strongly support restrictions for alcohol-related anti-social behaviour; a further 22.3% tend to support. 11.8% oppose or tend to oppose measures.



The proportion supporting measures was similar between male and female respondents (81.5% and 79.6%, respectively), and the same between White (81%, 582 respondents) and Black, Asian, Mixed and Other ethnic groups (81%, 137 respondents). Support varied by age, with a lower proportion of younger people supporting measures (<40 years: 68.8%, 154 respondents; 40+ years: 84.5%, 462 respondents).

Comments from respondents who supported and opposed measures were reviewed and grouped into themes. These are shown below with example responses.

### Oppose

Theme	Response
<b>Will not be effective unless the underlying issues are addressed (mental health, substance misuse, homelessness, addiction etc); may exacerbate said issues for some.</b>	“Restrictions/penalties will disproportionately affect vulnerable people who might be facing untreated addiction, significant mental health illness, homelessness – the list goes on. In the same vein, punitive measures do nothing to address the root causes of violence or drug/alcohol-related ‘anti-social’ behaviour which are numerous and complex, e.g., failings of government, budget cuts to frontline services, lack of access to treatment, systemic inequality. There are already examples of this, as reported by The Big Issue, which cites how PSPOs are being misused to disproportionately criminalise homeless people, who cannot pay fines and so end up in court: <a href="https://www.bigissue.com/news/housing/homeless-people-targeted-police-pspo-anti-social-behaviour/">https://www.bigissue.com/news/housing/homeless-people-targeted-police-pspo-anti-social-behaviour/ ...</a> ”

	<p>“Alcoholism is a health condition disproportionately affecting houseless and homeless people, this requires a public health response. Criminalisation does nothing to address the underlying issues and simply displaces the problem.”</p>
<p><b>The definition is too broad and subjective; chance already marginalised groups will be discriminated against (trust in police raised).</b></p>	<p>“The wording of this question is incredibly broad. Define Nuisance? Whilst I agree that people who drink alcohol and commit crimes, defecate, etc should be penalised. The term nuisance is far too broad, and gives police carte blanche to define 'nuisance' on the spot.”</p> <p>“Why alcohol-related only? Also, what constitutes anti-social and a nuisance is subjective unless you specify exactly which behaviours are outlawed.”</p> <p>“...We know from anecdotal testimony from Council officers, residents, police officers - and it has been covered in many research publications and reports - how historically and currently, enforcement is often racialised. This is to say it disproportionately harms minoritised communities particularly young people, Black, Muslim and GRT people, disabled people and people with irregular citizenship status. This contradicts our important work as a Borough of Sanctuary upholding a public health, trauma-informed approach to equalities and youth justice, and as a Borough standing against racism and violence in all its forms.”</p>
<p><b>Penalties should exist because of the anti-social behaviour, not just because it is alcohol-related.</b></p>	<p>“Why just specifically target alcohol? Surely we have laws already around anti-social behaviour. Target the root cause of anti-social behaviour instead, not just what may or may not have been consumed at the time of the causing of nuisance.”</p> <p>“Because you drinking in public spaces is not the same as necessarily behaving in an anti-social manner. If someone wants to have a quiet drink in the park, for example, why shouldn't they? I'd support curbing anti social behaviour, but that can be caused by all manners of things and is not necessarily linked to drinking in public.”</p>
<p><b>Penalising the many because of the few.</b></p>	<p>“Restrictions tend to affect the quiet recreational activities of the law abiding more than those who cause anti-social behaviour and nuisance. I have no objection to a group of people bringing a picnic and a bottle or two of beer or wine to a park on a nice day. Enforcing a no alcohol rule is likely to ban 20 quiet picnics in order to stop 1 loud drunken gathering, which will probably go ahead anyway because the anti-social, by their very nature, tend to ignore the rules.”</p>

	<p>“Treat the causes of drinking and not the drinking. Blanket bans are not the answer. What’s wrong with a small gathering with friends in a park and a can or two?”</p>
<p><b>Concerns over where people will go if displaced, and limiting socialisation of vulnerable.</b></p>	<p>“You can’t restrict the consumption of alcohol in public places without providing alternative spaces and places for people to gather. In the current economic crisis especially, it is crucial not to penalise people for connecting with other people.”</p> <p>“For those on limited incomes there are very limited spaces available to socialise and be with others. Most people can’t afford to drink in pubs and may not have safe or adequate space at home for relaxing. The majority of people I see who are social drinking in Catford are not harassing people but are socialising. I think this also disproportionately discriminate against people from other ethnic backgrounds.”</p>
<p><b>Better to spend time / resources on measures to reduce the behaviour through other means</b></p>	<p>“I believe that the education, short-term and long-term support needs for the individual who both drinks alcohol in public spaces and cause anti-social behaviour and nuisance to others, should be assessed first by fully trained staff, and implemented with them in mind (a people-centred, compassionate approach).”</p>

## Support

Theme	Response
<p><b>Not opposed to drinking in public spaces, opposed to the antisocial behaviour that sometimes accompanies it.</b></p>	<p>“I would not want to stop the use of alcohol in public spaces but I would welcome controlled drinking in the form of small parties or gatherings. However, I would be in favour of measures aimed at prevention of anti social behaviour especially overly loud music, litter dropping etc.”</p> <p>“I 100% agree to restrictions on alcohol + antisocial behaviour. But I have seen many times families having picnics/birthday parties in the parks and having a beer or a glass of wine etc - so I don’t know if alcohol needs to be completely banned. I’ve not seen these events end in disorder.”</p>
<p><b>Reports of alcohol exacerbating ASB, leading to people (particularly women and children, and elderly residents) feeling vulnerable or unsafe, plus witnessed associated litter / drugs / aggressive behaviour / cat calling / urination.</b></p>	<p>“Sometimes the behaviour of people who are drunk can be quite threatening. As an older female resident perhaps I feel this more strongly and feel more vulnerable. Being drunk can reduce inhibitions and people can behave in more antisocial ways. It can prevent enjoyment of open spaces and parks, and can make me feel uncomfortable when walking home alone after dark, especially in winter when it's dark.”</p> <p>“It can be frightening when you are in the vicinity of people who are drinking/behaving antisocially in public as their actions can</p>

	<p>be volatile and innocent bystanders can be caught up in dangerous situations. It is also unacceptable that law abiding citizens have to endure the actions of those who drink and cause antisocial behaviour/nuisance to others.”</p> <p>“I have had many bad experience with anti social behaviour in the area where I live. People consumed alcohol and drugs on the street right under my windows, left terrible mess behind (excrements, vomits, rubbish...) On the pavement. There were numerous fights happening outside one of the places that offers a Hall for celebration, funerals etc...and their customers do not respect any residents in the area. Parking where they weren't allowed (pavement, red lines...) And when confronted about their behaviour, they got violent. We would welcome the police having power to discourage antisocial behaviour”</p>
<p><b>Support but as long as a more holistic approach to enforcement taken (e.g. to help those with underlying issues / educating about community cohesion).</b></p>	<p>“ASB harms community cohesion - however it needs treating as a community problem and not solely as an individual problem. For some reason many (not all) those being anti social have not learnt the rules of behaviour in the community. Penalties and enforcement need to ensure that the act of enforcement supports the learning of the importance of social behaviour - the rules of living together.”</p> <p>“No issue with controls on nuisance behaviour fuelled by drink - enforcement officers could provide guidance to support service to those having drink taken away - particularly if they are street drinkers/homeless rather than just a rowdy group of students for example”</p> <p>“I want us as a borough is to understand why this happens. To deal with it in a manner that just doesn't move from one area to another. I'd like to see a team working with those on the streets in an understanding and gentle manner.”</p>
<p><b>Believe it will prevent the anti-social behaviour &amp; make the borough safer</b></p>	<p>“Anti-social behaviour and nuisance to others appears to go hand in hand with people who drink in public spaces, I feel that restriction and fines would hopefully stop this.”</p> <p>“Would help me feel safer in the community”</p>
<p><b>Enforcement concerns – who / what training / effectiveness of fines.</b></p>	<p>“I agree in principle specifically with regards to anti-social behaviour but I am concerned about the way the rules can be interpreted by enforcement. The wording is vague.”</p> <p>“I don't see how you are going to enforce this - the police are already overstretched. Are you recruiting? and if so, how do you ensure the quality of your recruits, and their training, when the police have so many problems in an established workforce?”</p>

**Protecting the many because of the few**


“The behaviour of a few negatively affects the enjoyment and safety of the majority. Excess alcohol consumption can lead to violence, abusive behaviour, and public urinating, I have witnessed all of this locally. Unfortunately, there is no effective way of controlling the safe and socially acceptable use of alcohol in public without licensing and effective monitoring”

“Public spaces are for everyone enjoyment and people should not feel that they cannot use them because they are taken over by few people that do not respect others.”



## Restrictions / penalties for substance misuse related anti-social behaviour

860 people answered this section. Nearly two thirds of respondents (61.5%) strongly support restrictions for substance-misuse related anti-social behaviour; a further 19.4% tend to support. 5.9% tend to oppose, and a further 5% strongly oppose.



The proportion supporting measures was marginally higher for female respondents than male (84.4% to 81.0%), and slightly higher for respondents of Asian, Black, Mixed and Other ethnicities than White respondents (85.5% to 81.4%). There was a larger variation by age, with a lower proportion of younger people supporting measures (<40 years: 68.3%, 153 respondents; 40+ years: 87.4%, 478 respondents).

Comments from respondents who supported and opposed measures were reviewed and grouped into themes. These are shown below with example responses.

### Oppose

Theme	Response
<b>Will criminalise and/or discriminate against the most vulnerable or particular groups, e.g. young people, ethnic minorities, people with addiction problems.</b>	<p>"I work with vulnerable adults who have substance misuse issues. Further discrimination against those with additional support needs creates an imbalanced approach where the focus is on peoples deficiencies rather than a unified approach to delivering support and maintaining tolerance within our communities."</p> <p>"This is a very broad proposal which appears to lend itself toward a range of interpretations. There are many psychoactive substances, not all of which necessarily linked to anti social behaviour. Stop and searches related to suspected drug possession are common, ineffectual and often applied with prejudice. I am concerned that a control order including this provision would lead to disproportionate and abusive application of police powers against working class and BAME people on spurious grounds"</p>

<p><b>Will not be effective unless the underlying issues are addressed (mental health, addiction etc); may exacerbate said issues for some.</b></p>	<p>“Addiction and drug use isn’t an issue that can be resolved by issuing penalties, again this doesn’t deal with the root cause of the problem. As before, direct funding to support/community services rather than enforcement.”</p> <p>“Again, criminalising addiction when our prison system is anti-reform and works to largely impact those who are from more vulnerable groups within society is not helpful. If you want to genuinely offer support or help then the proven method is acceptance, awareness, education, control, and support. It is impossible at present to get support for a mental health or addiction crises on the nhs without waiting one year. At least. Sending these people to prison in the meantime or giving the police more authority to be as violent to minority communities as they have proven is not the answer and is a violent inaction in itself.”</p>
<p><b>Laws are already in place to address these issues.</b></p>	<p>“...There are already laws in place in relation to drug use which can be used if needed.”</p> <p>“Why just specifically target psychoactive substances? Surely we have laws already around anti-social behaviour. Target the root cause of anti-social behaviour instead, not just what may or may not have been consumed at the time of the causing of nuisance.”</p>
<p><b>The psychoactive substances need to be defined; different drugs affect behaviour in different ways; varying approaches needed.</b></p>	<p>““Psychoactive substances” is a broad term that covers a wide range of substances – everything from class A to class C drugs, which have variable effects on users and their behaviour. I cannot support blanket restrictions because I believe efforts to restrict public usage should be nuanced and the framing of this question gives no indication that would be the case. Specifically, enforcement of restrictions should consider the harm posed by the substance to the user and the way the substance in question affects the user's behaviour. Some commonly used psychoactive substances don't make their users aggressive or violent and so I do not think formal (and more specifically, police-led) intervention is necessary. I am also opposed to enforcement of restrictions that could result in the criminalisation of (or the levying of civil penalties on) users of these psychoactive substances. The misuse of these substances is a social issue and punitive action won't solve it. In fact, there's evidence that this could make the problem worse. Lastly, I am concerned that any police-led intervention would disproportionately affect the young and people of colour.”</p> <p>“Depends if behaviour becomes disrespectful as a consequence of psychoactive use. For example, usually a big difference in users’ behaviour following smoking marijuana (peaceful) and snorting cocaine (agitated).”</p>

<p><b>Penalties should exist because of the anti-social behaviour, not just because there are substances present.</b></p>	<p>“Same goes for this as for alcohol. If someone is behaving in a way that endangers the safety and well-being of others in public, they should be subject to restrictions and penalties, whatever the cause of that behaviour. Use of drugs in itself isn’t the problem.”</p>
<p><b>Preference of provision of safe spaces for people over punishment; where people will go if displaced; and limiting socialisation of vulnerable.</b></p>	<p>“For the same reason as previous, there are limited spaces where young people and adults can socialise, the majority are not harming others when participating in these activities and therefore the PSO seems disproportionate to the issue”</p>

## Support


Theme	Response
<p><b>Takes away the enjoyment of the area (smell of weed, intimidating behaviour, feeling unsafe, litter of nitrous oxide canisters and needles, public urination).</b></p>	<p>“I want to be able to enjoy the area without having to inhale substances that are illegal in the first instance. The smell in the Woodland Walk for instance is incessantly strong and off putting. It’s associated with criminal activity and you just don’t know how safe the group or individual taking the substance are so inevitably you choose not to enter that public place.”</p> <p>“Psychoactive substances adversely affect individuals behaviour, often resulting in provocative and/or threatening behaviours. This ultimately negatively impacts others who do not engage in these activities, and causes worry and concern especially for children and vulnerable people who simply want to enjoy green spaces.”</p> <p>“I want to enjoy public spaces without this”</p> <p>“It impacts on other peoples enjoyment of open spaces”</p>
<p><b>Drugs are illegal and should not be allowed in public.</b></p>	<p>“Taking drugs is illegal I support the enforcement of this.”</p> <p>“It’s illegal and should not be tolerated”</p> <p>“Illegal drugs ruin lives and add unnecessary cost to public services, especially the NHS, police and social services.”</p> <p>“They are illegal and no one should be using these substances anyway. The mess they leave is a danger to animals and children”</p> <p>“For a start they’re illegal and they lead to violent and harassing behaviour.”</p>
<p><b>Variation in drugs: should focus on non-cannabis related or have different approaches.</b></p>	<p>“I think there is a great difference in the nuisance individual substances may generate and it is more the severity of use that tips it into asocial behaviour. Groups who drink moderately or</p>

	<p>smoke ganja often are relatively calm and still can be negotiated with. They even at times support members of the public in distress acting as a bit of a watchdog as they know a lot of faces round the area. Not saying it is all honky dory but we need to keep a differentiated view and multi pronged approach. A measured and informed approach needs to be taken to not tarnish everyone with the same brush and push them further out of the community and into less caring about their impact. I am not saying they are angels or unproblematic but we often achieve better results if we form alliances, however fragile or even questionable at times but we found that their presence is a fact we cannot change and 'keep your enemies closer' as it were has been quite successful at times and turned some individuals into helpful friends. A strategy also used by the market traders btw, where they employ individuals to help with set up/ clean up. We also don't want certain communities, ie black Caribbean men to be further alienated when they actually have lived in the community for a life time while Eastern European drinkers may come and go. It would seem disproportionate if those smoking as part of their culture and being relatively calm would be criminalised more than those using a legal but more harmful substance like alcohol due to the often very aggressive behaviour."</p> <p>"Where visibly under the influence and behaving in a way that is threatening or antisocial. Unpredictability of their behaviour then makes it feel unsafe. Don't want it to be an excuse for a pointless crackdown on cannabis use (should and eventually will be legalised like in many other parts of the world)."</p> <p>"I agree however people that smoke cannabis are harmless and have brought great joy to the community. This is coming from someone that is not a cannabis user and I also don't drink alcohol it's forbidden in my life."</p> <p>"I agree in principle for illegal substances, though I disagree on possession for legal highs (because they are legal), weed (I believe in decriminalisation) and paraphernalia for those categories."</p>
<p><b>Drug dealing / taking in front of children and families, sets a bad example; risk children will pick up something dangerous.</b></p>	<p>"This behaves prevents families from enjoying the parks freely for fear of what children might pick up (disused paraphernalia) or be subjected to witnessing anti-social behaviour."</p> <p>"Some areas are open to people trading drugs and this needs to be stopped as much as possible. young children use our parks and can be influenced by this. All illegal trading or using drugs need to be stopped as much as possible and if it means on the spot fines or police dealing with it I am all for it."</p>

	<p>“When did it become acceptable for children to breathe in cannabis smoke whilst going to the park or in a green space? It is not acceptable.”</p>
<b>Enforcement</b>	<p>“No issue with controls on nuisance behaviour fuelled by psychoactive substances - enforcement officers could provide guidance to support service to those having substances and paraphernalia taken away - particularly if they are street drinkers/homeless rather than just a rowdy group of students for example. Need guidance to officers if a person has made themselves insensible and has passed out in public e.g. like with spice”</p> <p>“As with alcohol consumption and anti social behaviour, it really depends how this is implemented. There are clearly a lot of people struggling with different issues, trying to enforce restrictions without providing the relevant support these people need isn't going to solve the problem”</p>

## Restrictions / penalties for illegal encampments

860 people answered this section. Just under half of respondents (48.6%) strongly support restrictions for unauthorised encampments; a further 20.1% tend to support restrictions. 8% tend to oppose restrictions while a further 8% strongly support them.



The proportion supporting measures was marginally higher for male respondents than female (72.5% to 69.6%), and slightly higher for White respondents than Asian, Black and Mixed respondents (70.0% to 67.8%). There was a larger variation by age, with a lower proportion of younger people supporting measures (<40 years: 53.1%; 40+ years: 76.4%).

Comments from respondents who supported and opposed measures were reviewed and grouped into themes. These are shown below with example responses.

### Oppose

Theme	Response
<b>Criminalisation of marginalised homeless or traveller people who have no alternative</b>	<p>“This is the worst of the proposed restrictions. As of last year, the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill has given police unprecedented, unconstitutional powers. All legal precedent suggests that the new powers given to police to deal with unauthorised encampments violate the human rights of one of the most marginalised groups in society - Gypsy, Roma, Traveller people. Their way of life, which has existed for thousands of years has now been made illegal, because this community is misunderstood and scapegoated. When housing is so unaffordable, more and more people will move be forced to live in this way. Having lived in Lewisham all my life, this is the only way I can afford to live here still. The council must support those on the edges, rather than continuing the cycle of making poor people homeless. I am ashamed that Lewisham is even considering such propositions.”</p>

	<p>“This is to target homeless and the traveller communities. Both are groups of marginalised people who are targeted by unfair legislation, negative stereotypes and bigotry”</p> <p>“I am strongly against this policy as I think it has a strong potential to disproportionately target and criminalise homeless and destitute people. Homelessness is a serious and growing problem in England and our borough is no exception. The criminalisation or the levying of civil penalties in the form of fines is not the way to address the fallout of homelessness. In most cases "trespassers" that set up "unauthorised encampments" are doing so out of desperation. Again, this strikes me as a social issue (caused by a combination of austerity and chronic underinvestment in the development and maintenance of public housing stock) that needs structural, social solutions not criminalisation and/or other punitive measures.”</p>
<p><b>Root causes addressed and support provided</b></p>	<p>“People experiencing homelessness and houselessness need housing, health and social support, not criminalisation. People literally have to sleep somewhere.”</p> <p>“Would hope that we can support those who don't have access to safe housing rather than criminalise them”</p> <p>“Homeless people didn't choose to occupy these spaces out of fun. It is a necessity, a desperate act. Therefore, restricting encampments does not solve the issue as it doesn't address the root cause of homelessness. It could be done together with other support measures. Just restricting where people can camp isn't nearly enough.”</p>
<p><b>Private land</b></p>	<p>“Trespassers can cause damage to private land and cause huge expense and stress to owners”</p> <p>“As before I think having an order that can be applied in multiple different situations in a blanket way is concerning. For example what provision is there for travellers / people who live in vehicles? I think that occupation and squatting can be a political and necessary action. I am more concerned about the practices of some private landowners”</p> <p>“Land owners should be compelled to use their existing powers and responsibilities to prevent access to land and ensure it is properly maintained. The local authority should not be doing the job of private landowners for them. I would also suggest a PSPO (public spaces after all) is not relevant to privately owned land - you move the risk away from private land owners and leave the council liable”</p>

<b>Definition needs clarity</b>	<p>“It’s hard to understand what illegal encampment really means here. I would be deeply uncomfortable with the idea that Lewisham would issue penalties to rough sleepers. Equally with traveller communities, they already experience a huge amount of marginalisation and I think there must be better ways to resolve issues - such as community engagement and mediation.”</p>
---------------------------------	---

## Support

<b>Theme</b>	
<p><b>Associated anti-social behaviour (e.g. rubbish and fly-tipping, urinating/defecation in public areas, noise, destruction of green-space) distressing for residents nearby and users of the space. Less likely for the rest of the community to use the public space (feeling intimidated, less enjoyable)</b></p>	<p>“Unauthorised encampments can be intimidating for others and rubbish, litter and urination/ defecation obviously end up in public areas. I would strongly support helping rough sleepers into safer accommodation”</p> <p>“I have seen people camping / living in Mountsfield park and there is evidence of drug use and they leave rubbish, glass and needles there. It is so dangerous and they particularly liked to go in a children’s play area where they had built a den - which was horrible.”</p> <p>“Beyond being an eyesore, it increases rubbish, prevents people from enjoying parts of public places, nurtures a feeling of insecurity”</p> <p>“Unauthorised encampments are relatively common in our local park and the adjoining nature reserve. They create health and safety risk with human waste; disturb the wildlife in this minute haven for birds and other wildlife; they create litter which has to be cleared up.”</p>
<p><b>Support measures but alternative places to stay / designated areas need to be provided; compassionate approach</b></p>	<p>“They should be supported and found a place to stay safely. Often they can’t help but leave rubbish and faeces around which can make the environment very unpleasant.”</p> <p>“This affects the area in which this occurs, noise, litter, flytipping There should be designated areas for travellers with the right facilities required”</p> <p>“Proper spaces are needed for groups of travellers, with sanitation and monitoring. Illegal camping usually creates mess and noise and tension with those living nearby.”</p> <p>“The Council should be helping these people so they don't have to live in unsafe places on the streets.”</p>
<p><b>Cost to the council / landowners to clear up</b></p>	<p>“Disruption of local communities, debris and rubbish accumulation, cost to local taxpayers in clean up operations, threatening behaviour.”</p>




“Such encampments are completely unfair on landowners. They tend to create a health hazard; flytipping; complete disregard; they cost a huge amount of money to deal with, and there is little legal protection or help for those impacted. Crime is also known to increase in areas where encampments spring up.”

“Again, it increases rubbish, costs money to deal with them. Also, policing is diverted from core duties to deal with this”

## Restrictions / penalties for public urination and defecation

859 people answered this section. 67.4% strongly support restrictions for public urination and defecation; a further 16.7% tend to support restrictions. 5.4% tend to oppose, and a further 3% strongly oppose.



The proportion supporting measures was higher for female respondents than male (88.1% to 82.1%), and slightly higher for Asian, Black and Mixed respondents than White respondents (89.0% to 84.7%). There was a larger variation by age, with a lower proportion of younger people supporting measures (<40 years: 74%; 40+ years: 89.6%).

Comments from respondents who supported and opposed measures were reviewed and grouped into themes. These are shown below with example responses.

### Oppose

Theme	Response
<b>Need to define 'reasonable excuse'; what about medical reasons / children?</b>	<p>"Again, please note that my opposition does not mean that I believe no action should be taken. This is not at all the case, I just query whether we are taking a holistic approach which encourages the person committing the offence to get healthier and more well. The PSPO document reads "The Order prohibits urination or defecation without reasonable excuse within the borough on land open to the air. Authorised police and council officers may issue an FPN for this offence". Could we also define 'reasonable excuse'?"</p> <p>"This needs to be reworded to ensure that public urination is allowed in designated toilet facilities. I would also suggest that it specifically excludes children under 5 (or makes it very clear that parents will be prosecuted)."</p>
<b>Already covered by law</b>	<p>"You don't need new regulations it's already covered in the law. Do please provide adequate toilets."</p>

	<p>"I really really dislike people urinating in the street and particularly when it's not discrete, however there are already laws to deal with this ie public decency. I don't think that more restrictions are helpful in changing the behaviour of a few."</p> <p>"The current criminal law covers this already and is satisfactory."</p>
<b>Needs to be sufficient public toilets available</b>	<p>"In very wild spaces it's ok for children for example to take an outside wee when they have to. Proper facilities should be provided rather than punishing people who get caught short."</p> <p>"I can imagine who will be getting fined and who won't. I don't like the idea of public urination and defecation. I've come across during volunteering sessions and as the paid for people from council manage to ignore it, we as volunteers have dealt with it. We loathe it and the attitude that people think it can be left. But if it had been done and buried or covered in suitable place, we'd have more sympathy. Lewisham's provision of public conveniences is hopeless. we are told to get outdoors and criticised for not making sure children are out in the parks etc, but unless you can rush home, what other options are you giving people. You can't just keep making everything worth a fine but doing nothing to keep help. Even if there are WCs in parks, they are attached to the cafés and close when the café shuts up shop. Have you really thought this through, bringing in fines. I bet the people enforcing won't be stopping the scary man peeing in the doorway."</p>
<b>Disproportionally affect and criminalise marginalised / disadvantaged groups, like people experiencing homelessness</b>	<p>"Similar to my previous answers, such a measure will disproportionately target marginalised groups and people experiencing multiple disadvantages."</p> <p>"I think there is a distinction between antisocial behaviour by people who have a choice and homeless members of the community who don't. Will vulnerable groups be penalised and criminalised?"</p> <p>"Again, I think these 'activities' are already covered by legislation - its just not enforced. To support such legislation I'd again need persuading that it wouldn't be used disproportionately to harass vulnerable/ homeless people."</p>


## Support

Theme	Response
<b>Leads to indecent exposure / flashing</b>	"This is just a matter of good hygiene. No one wants to be confronted by the smell of urine or the presence of human faeces in public places. It poses a health risk as well as an aesthetic problem. There is also the risk of bodily exposure if "caught in the act" which can be at the very least embarrassing.

	<p>It should be noted however that some of the issues of unacceptable behaviour are caused by a lack of suitable and appropriately sited toilet facilities”</p> <p>“This provides a health hazard and public urination can be used as an excuse by those whose intention is to expose themselves to others, especially women. However, there needs to be better access to and provision of public toilets.”</p> <p>“Making it illegal would help keep our streets clean and less smelly and reduce incidences of indecent exposure.”</p>
<p><b>Hygiene and health reasons; unpleasant to witness / smell / tread in / find</b></p>	<p>“For reasons of hygiene and public health”</p> <p>“This behaviour leaves very ugly, disgusting and unhygienic area in public places, spreading diseases - there should be more public toilets with well managed cleaning programs around the clock as there are people around and needing somewhere to go to toilets for 24 hours a day”</p> <p>“Men and occasionally women urinate freely on any wall, house walls and doors, junction boxes, corners, on flower beds and shops. They also defecate on flower beds and in corners. The alley of Douglas Way is in frequent use for both and really smells. It is not only drinkers or drug users. It is unhygienic and obscene. This is done publicly whether people are walking by or not.”</p> <p>“It's absolutely disgusting, I shouldn't have to worry when I walk home in the dark from work, that I don't tread in poo. It's a health hazard.”</p>
<p><b>Support but toilet facilities must be provided</b></p>	<p>“Would strongly support if there were available public facilities in the area.”</p> <p>“Whilst I think nobody should be doing either of these things in public, I don't strongly support because I worry that extremely vulnerable and homeless people will be impacted most. Ultimately, though, public toilets should be available and businesses should allow people to use their facilities to prevent any public urination and defecation”</p> <p>“It's clear that this behaviour in itself alone does present a hazard to others (unlike alcohol drug use, or setting up home in a tent or caravan somewhere) so people should be stopped from doing so. However, the loss of our public toilets, which used to exist on every high st I can think of in the borough, might well have something to do with any increase there might have been in it.”</p>

## Restrictions for amplified speech and music

859 people answered this section. 42.7% strong support restriction of amplified speech and music; a further 27.4% tend to support this. 5.9% strongly oppose and 8% tend to oppose restrictions.



The proportion supporting measures was slightly higher for male than female respondents (72.7% to 69.6%). 64.5% of people from Asian, Black, Mixed and Other ethnic groups supported measures, lower than those from White ethnic groups (71.4%). There was a large variation by age, with a lower proportion of younger people supporting measures (<40 years: 56.5%; 40+ years: 75.6%).

Comments from respondents who supported and opposed measures were reviewed and grouped into themes. These are shown below with example responses.

### Oppose

Theme	
<b>Worried about impact on right to protest</b>	<p>“Given the government overreach in the police and crime bill against noise for protests I am concerned at any greater impositions.”</p> <p>“Freedom of speech. Right to protest. Fun, song, dance. These are all being squeezed. Lewisham should find itself on the right side of history.”</p> <p>“The restriction of amplified speech could be used to stifle the right to protest, therefore I oppose it.”</p>
<b>Already have laws which can deal with this; definition too broad.</b>	<p>“This is far too broad terminology and gives the police the power to shut down whatever they want, music makes an area better. We already have laws to protect against excessively loud music. A PSPO just gives police too much power to make up rules on the go.”</p> <p>“I strongly oppose the restriction of amplified speech and music on the basis that "it is likely to cause a nuisance" because this is too broad a basis on which enforce restrictions. It gives those</p>

	<p>enforcing such restrictions too much discretion and will almost certainly result in inconsistent and unfair enforcement. We already have clearly defined laws and guidelines about noise pollution and I believe those be sufficient.”</p> <p>“There is existing environmental health laws that deal with this, I’ve seen first hand that environmental health officers and police are quick to shut down sources of noise that are a nuisance. I think the existing perception of music is problematic and as a borough of culture we should be supporting cultural activity not penalising it... “</p>
<p><b>Disproportionally effect certain groups</b></p>	<p>“... This seems like it would disproportionately affect certain groups of people, who are loud because of their culture, situation, household composition, age and beliefs, so no, i don't think there should be restrictions on this until there is a clearer definition of what 'amplified' means and to whom. What i consider loud, someone else may not. There has to be a balance struck, which currently, with the wording of the above question, i do not see being struck”</p> <p>“It is unclear how an 'amplified speech or music' is being defined here. There needs to be further clarification on the guidelines around this and if this is primarily down to the discretion of the police officer. If so, this will, again, disproportionately target marginalized groups, by a police force that has been found to be institutionally racist, misogynistic and homophobic. It will also disproportionately target young people.”</p>
<p><b>Would support between certain hours</b></p>	<p>“I think there should be reasonable restrictions after a certain time of night - such as past 1am. but a lively atmosphere at events, music festivals etc. should be encouraged. it should be easier to get a licence for music at outdoor events and even private parties.”</p> <p>“Total ban is wrong. However time limitations or time framing will be ideal”</p> <p>“In the right environment and with time restrictions this is acceptable, could be for good reasons, charity event for example.”</p>
<p><b>Enjoyment of music</b></p>	<p>“I’m not sure where this has been a problem. I usually enjoy buskers. Amplified speech is generally unpleasant and uncalled for. No one needs to be harangued. But going after buskers isn’t right.”</p> <p>“Music and sound system culture is part of the cultural heritage of Lewisham which was championed as part of borough of culture, banning music in this way will negatively impact the musical culture in Lewisham”</p>

	“Music is a form of expression, it brings people together, unites a community”
--	--

## Support


Theme	Response
<b>Can impact quality of life at home, including sleep</b>	<p>“Can adversely impact quality of life and health of many residents”</p> <p>“Public nuisance, often stops people sleeping, interferes with rights of local people to quiet enjoyment of their own homes.”</p> <p>“Sleep deprivation is extremely stressful and can cause all kinds of mental health problems. In residential areas loud music should be banned. We are in a modern city with some awful behaviour from a small percentage of ignorant neighbours. And Lewisham have dropped the ball on this subject. Please reintroduce a decent sized noise abatement team with proper enforcement powers.”</p>
<b>Offended by preachers</b>	<p>“...I particularly object to amplified street preaching. I do not want to have someone's religious views rammed down my throat while I am trying to shop. I avoid certain shopping areas because of this!”</p> <p>“Walking down Lewisham High Street, you are subjected to a number of religious groups/ preachers with mega phones or playing music/ singing religious songs. It's wrong to push your religion/ views onto others. It is also an issue during election or strike actions”</p> <p>“I am not a religious person and I strongly object to being lectured on religious practice in an area that is public for all to use. I understand it is their faith, I would argue that their belief in the need to speak in public should not be allowed to be amplified by mechanical means. I would rather not be subjected to their rants.</p>
<b>Prevents enjoyment of shared spaces</b>	<p>“It prevents the full enjoyment of public spaces”</p> <p>“Impedes ability of people in general to enjoy spaces peacefully if they wish to”</p> <p>“It's really selfish It erodes a sense of communal ownership of public spaces”</p> <p>“Interferes with others right to enjoy leisure time or rest”</p>

	<p>“Catford and Lewisham town centres and smaller hubs like Brockley and Crofton Park are blighted by such antisocial and intimidating behaviour especially loud music from parked cars”</p>
<p><b>Support to a certain extent</b></p>	<p>“If it is particularly loud and disruptive yes, but there needs to be common sense applied. People playing music at a respectful level shouldn't be penalised.”</p> <p>“Yes and no with this one. I don't want this to be used to curb such things as the communities right to protest, but I do feel that the amount of religious preachers and the station has got out of control. As a gay man I generally feel really unsafe in those areas as a lot of the speech used is homophobic and anti lgbtq+”</p> <p>“Not sure about amplified speech because there is scope for that to be disproportionately abused with some groups of people. Amplified music yes, and would be great if this would extend to neighbours playing amplified music as currently little recourse for application of sanctions.”</p> <p>“The occasional party etc is acceptable but continued loud music is not”</p> <p>“Private households playing loud music should not be tolerated. I'm in favour of music played in parks, festivals etc. that embrace everyone”</p>



## Restrictions / penalties for dogs

852 people completed this section. 45.3% strongly support restrictions of dogs in specific areas; a further 17.7% tend to support restrictions. 14.3% strongly oppose the restrictions, and 6.9% tend to oppose.



The proportion supporting measures was similar for male and female respondents (64.4% to 66.2%). There was more variation by ethnicity, with a higher proportion of Black, Asian, Mixed and Other ethnic groups (71.5%) supporting the restrictions than White (62.5%) respondents. There was also a large variation by age, with a lower proportion of younger people supporting measures (<40 years: 47.7%; 40+ years: 70.6%).

Comments from respondents who supported and opposed measures were reviewed and grouped into themes. These are shown below with example responses.

### Oppose

Theme	Response
<b>Impact on disabled people with support dogs</b>	As a disabled person with an assistance dog this would impact on my ability to exercise my dog off-duty (which is essential for him to be able to work). Disabled people living in there area's may not have other accessible options for accessing spaces in which they can exercise an assistance dog or emotional support animal. Assistance dogs and emotional support animals are not registered, and therefore you have no way of knowing how many disabled people implementation of these restrictions would affect. This proposal does not address the problem of irresponsible animal ownership (which i support controls on) and may infringe on the Equality Act.
<b>Concern over excluding dogs from entire parks: Dogs need space to exercise; some people may not be able to reach further afield; may increase</b>	"Dogs are part of peoples lives and need space to exercise and play. Public spaces should be for all to use and not exclude dog owners. People should act responsibly within current laws"

<p><b>aggressive behaviour if not exercised.</b></p>	<p>“Dogs are beneficial to mental health and need space to exercise”</p> <p>“Diversity and inclusion is an important issue. AGEISM however, is not included and it seems OK to exclude the elderly. lots of old people have dogs for company and can only walk a certain distance to exercise their dogs. Restricting the areas cited would seem to me to be discriminatory against this group. How can you justify this?”</p> <p>“There aren't many big green local spaces to take dogs to easily. If people have larger dogs they need to run off the lead to ensure they don't become frustrated or aggressive as a result. I do not mind dogs, but see many people going in well known dog parks and running away or becoming aggressive to dog owners if their dog goes near them, which is entirely ridiculous. There are plenty of dog restricted areas for them to visit, or certain times where dogs are less likely to be in that particular park.”</p> <p>“The map indicates large dog exclusion areas, not just children play areas, which already are largely fenced off and/or clearly signposted as no dog zones. Local green spaces need to benefit all users. Excluding certain areas will only divert dog owners to the remaining available spaces, increasing traffic and potential dog-related incidents and I am certain it will not be followed by the increase of resources dedicated to maintain the dog areas. I'm far more in favour of regulating ownership of large/dangerous breeds that pose threat to community in hands of untrained and irresponsible owners. Education and promotion of responsible dog ownership could be another way.”</p>
<p><b>Few spoil it for the many responsible dog owners</b></p>	<p>“This ‘blanket rule’ obviously negatively impacts the freedom of responsible dog owners such as myself. Nature reserves and parks should be enjoyed by anyone and everyone, provided they treat the place and people with consideration. We do not need some nanny-state operation, oppressing everyone - at the expense of a few ‘undesirables’. Many people like myself are very considerate in public parks - and should therefore be allowed to continue doing so. I for one, will be continuing to walk my dog in my usual considerate manner, irrelevant of any law your Council intends to impose.”</p> <p>“People should be allowed to walk their dogs where they feel comfortable and safe. Well behaved dogs should be welcome off lead in these areas. I appreciate that badly behaved dogs are a nuisance, and I am in support of these being dealt with on a case by case basis. Not all dog owners should be punished because of the actions of a few.”</p>

<p><b>RSPCA Feedback</b></p>	<p>“The RSPCA acknowledges the value of PSPOs for local authorities to ensure that sections of open space may be dog-free, for example, children's play areas, sports fields, etc. Dogs enjoy interacting and playing with other people and animals and it is important that they're able to express this and normal behaviour off the lead. It's therefore imperative that local authorities use PSPOs sparingly and in a manner that's proportionate to the problem, in accordance with Defra's guidance.</p> <p>Local authorities should be aware that, under Section 9 of the Animal Welfare Act 2006, owners are required to ensure they meet their pets' welfare needs, which includes the freedom to express normal behaviour and regular and appropriate exercise. It's for this reason, that where dogs are excluded or restricted in open spaces, it's essential that local authorities ensure that other open spaces in close proximity remain accessible to dogs on and off leads to allow owners to fulfill their responsibilities.</p> <p>It's the RSPCA's view that local authorities should promote responsible dog ownership through the encouragement of training, proper care, microchipping, and neutering, as well as ensuring owners clean up after their dogs. The RSPCA sees this as a better means of tackling the problem of dog control in the long term than issuing Orders - which could prove a strain on resources with regard to policing and enforcement, particularly if they are widely applied across the authority area.</p> <p>Therefore, the RSPCA hopes that local authorities, including Lewisham LBC, issue PSPOs cautiously and not as a blanket power that punishes the responsible majority in an effort to tackle problems created by an irresponsible few.</p> <p>As such, the RSPCA opposes the proposed PSPO in relation to dog control.”</p>
<p><b>Some support around play park restrictions</b></p>	<p>“Seriously ?? you’re intending to exclude dogs totally from the majority of open spaces in Lewisham? This is unacceptable and draconian. Families who have young children and a dog will effectively be banned from the vast majority of Lewisham open spaces. Areas that do allow dogs will become overcrowded with dogs. Dogs on leads in play areas I absolutely support and dog free areas in each park I support but total exclusion is wrong. Those dog owners pay taxes too.”</p> <p>“Play parks are fenced off so dogs should not be in there but the rest of park area should be shared...”</p> <p>“I understand if it’s just areas like playgrounds but otherwise I feel dogs have just as much right as humans”</p>

	<p>“As someone who owns a dog and pays their taxes I feel it's unfair to exclude dogs especially as someone who has trained and picks up after them. From actual playgrounds I tend to agree but not large open fields such as in Mayow Park.”</p>
<b>Already laws in place</b>	<p>“If the dog isn't dangerous or mistreated then there's no issue, if it's either there are already laws on it.”</p> <p>“What areas? Parks? Where else are you supposed to walk your dog? Lots of parks also have bylaws that restrict where and how dogs can be walked. Again, there are already powers that can be used to tackle nuisance dogs. I don't think we need more bans.”</p> <p>“I haven't seen any evidence that this is a problem I think there are already sufficient restrictions in place”</p>

## Support


Theme	Response
<b>Dogs can be dangerous, particularly for children; dog excrement hazardous; not everyone likes or feels comfortable around dogs.</b>	<p>“Twice in the last year dogs have run barking at me and jumped up unprovoked. One time ripping my clothes. I think a number of people bought dogs during COVID lockdown who were inexperienced or didn't train them, so spaces where they are not allowed are more necessary than ever.”</p> <p>“It is very important that dogs and other animals that may harm or threaten children are kept out of specific play areas. It is also important that there is no animal urination or faeces in those areas”</p> <p>“Nuisance, detrimental, compromised safety with aggressive dogs and public health risks with dog fouling.”</p> <p>“It's important that children have safe spaces to play, and I remain concerned about the growing number of dog -related attacks on children, and adults, and therefore feel the proposed measures seek to protect children in particular.”</p> <p>“Big aggressive dogs, often off a lead in and around Catford is scary and inappropriate.”</p>
<b>Dog fouling is a problem</b>	<p>“Any restriction on dogs is to be welcomed. The borough is suffering an epidemic of dog fouling at the moment. In our local park many dog owners allow their dogs to run free in the dog restricted areas. These areas suffer from persistent dog fouling.”</p> <p>“The extent of dog fouling on street pavements is shocking.”</p>

	<p>“There are so many people who don’t follow rules and don’t pick up after their dogs. They absolutely shouldn’t be allowed in children’s play areas or cemeteries. I’ve also seen people distracted by their children who then don’t notice their dog fouling and don’t pick it up.”</p> <p>“I have young children and they have a right to explore certain places fully and without having to worry about encountering dog poo...”</p>
<p><b>Particularly bad issue in cemeteries</b></p>	<p>“I extremely support a ban of dogs in cemeteries, they use Ladywell Cemetery like a dog walking park. I have been approached so many times by dogs there, where they are not on a lead. Not to mention the amount of times I have trod on dog poo in the cemetery where they are not picking it up. I have seen them let their dogs wee on graves which is so disrespectful. Dogs need banning in Ladywell Cemetery. It's a place of rest for the dead, not a park.”</p> <p>“Dog walkers should not be permitted access to Cemetery ground, this is giving rise to a huge increased in dogs off leads which is causing anti-social behaviour, staff are cutting grass covered in dog fouling and local wildlife is being harassed and chased away.”</p> <p>“Being a resident and with children I have seen unnecessary urination near children’s play areas. Also in my local cemetery where I have 2 relatives buried I have seen dogs urinating and pooing near graves of loved ones and others at rest. Brockley cemetery had become a dog park.”</p>
<p><b>Agree but:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>must provide alternative exercise areas;</b></li> <li>- <b>presence of dog walkers provides feeling of safety against mugging etc.</b></li> <li>- <b>is such a broad ban necessary?</b></li> </ul>	<p>“I strongly agree however it is the council's responsibility to provide exercise facilities for dogs as it is their responsibility to provide facilities for humans”</p> <p>“Although I agree with restrictions in children's play areas-I thought those were already in place. As someone who likes to walk (when I get the chance) dog walkers give me a sense of safety. I know there are irresponsible people who don’t care for their dogs properly or clean up mess but we shouldn’t want to exclude dogs friends too many places. If that happens then there’ll be places I won’t feel able to walk in. Dog walkers provide a presence that helps deter the even worse behaviour of mugging SS or other physical threat. PLEASE TAKE NOTE”</p> <p>“This needs to be thought about carefully. Restricting every dog owner because of a few irresponsible owners is not the best course of action. A more proactive and visible approach to dealing with irresponsible owners would better prevent any issues rather than merely banning all owners and their dogs.</p>

	This simply shifts problems elsewhere. This is why park keepers had such an important role.”
--	--

## Restrictions / penalties for dogs on leads

838 people completed this section. 43.7% strongly support the restriction of dogs on leads in specific areas; a further 20.4% tend to support restrictions. 13.3% strongly oppose the restrictions, and 6.4% tend to oppose.



The proportion supporting measures was fairly similar for male and female respondents (68.7% to 65.2%). A higher proportion of respondents from Black, Asian, Mixed and Other ethnic groups supported the measures than those from White ethnic groups (71.5% to 63.7%). There was also variation by age, with a lower proportion of younger people supporting measures (<40 years: 50.9%; 40+ years: 70.8%).

Comments from respondents who supported and opposed measures were reviewed and grouped into themes. These are shown below with example responses.

### Oppose

Theme	Quote
<b>Measures will make the issues worse if dogs are unable to exercise: they will not be able to burn off energy and may become more aggressive or bark more.</b>	<p>“It strikes me that Lewisham Council are proposing a large scale of dog exclusion areas on places where dogs are currently allowed. Are places where dogs CAN be exercised off-lead going to be provided to allow for the reduction in places one can exercise one's dog? Dogs are much more likely to develop behavioural problems if they cannot express their dog behaviour properly. That includes exercise off-lead. Proposals such as this will mean an increase in dogs with problems such as aggression and fear as a result of frustration from being unable to release energy in appropriate exercise. This is contrary to the Animal Welfare Act.”</p> <p>“Majority of dogs that are off leash are well behaved. If we keep restricting access to areas to walk off leash our dogs won't get the sufficient amount of exercise they need which will cause frustration to the animal making them more likely to misbehave. Dogs that are well trained should be able to have</p>

	<p>free range of the park. Also a friendly dog is not a well behaved dog so that doesn't go in conjunction to this ."</p> <p>"According to your maps, there will be no parks where dogs can enjoy off lead running - this is going to increase the risk of them becoming frustrated, trying to play with other dogs on leads and getting into trouble with other peoples. Overall, it will lead to more dogs becoming distressed because they can't run properly and naturally, meaning they are more likely to bark and have behavioural problems at home, leading to noise complaints!"</p>
<p><b>Limiting many because of the actions of a few; should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis</b></p>	<p>"Dogs have an enormously positive impact on mental health, social connections and community, and physical health for their families. There are already too few spaces where dogs can be exercised off the lead which is beneficial for both dogs and humans. Concerned parties should focus on better, responsible integration and socialisation of both humans and dogs, not implement further restrictions on public freedoms which limit the many in reaction to the few."</p> <p>"It's unrealistic to expect owners with well-behaved dogs to walk or drive them to parks other than their local in light of this restriction. This measure punishes all dogs and their owners, rather than incentivising good training and social responsibility."</p> <p>"Dogs should be able to be free as long as the owner as control over the situation"</p> <p>"I strongly oppose well behaved dogs being forced to walk on leads because of the actions of a minority of dogs. Poorly behaved dogs should be dealt with on a case by case basis. Green spaces in the borough are sparse, and should be enjoyed by all. Please do not impose these restrictions on those who have put time and effort into ensuring their dogs are well trained."</p>
<p><b>Restrictions go too far - support in a limited sense, e.g. cemeteries and children's play areas</b></p>	<p>"For many dog owners in the Borough these green spaces are the only places we can walk and exercise our dog I cannot back the full exclusion of dogs in these spaces but do accept that in some areas dogs should stay on leads. If the council is going to exclude dogs from certain areas then there needs to be more DOG ONLY areas like those in Forster Memorial Park and Manor House and Gardens. Dog only areas in Mountsfield Park and Ladywell Fields would be the ideal solution."</p> <p>"In general dogs are fine, however there are places like playing fields and children's play areas where they can be a nuisance."</p>



	<p>"I believe dogs should have the freedom to have walks but if there are areas that require food or children play areas to use lead but shouldn't be on lead for entire park. Greenwich park has a balance because it has restricted flower gardens that dogs can't use but have space for dogs off lead as well which works well."</p> <p>"This depends on the area. Some areas e.g. new cemeteries and children's play areas makes sense, but parks in general or shared usage areas makes less sense."</p>
<b>Owners should be targeted, not the dogs.</b>	<p>"Again, people should have trained their dogs to behave off a lead. If the dog isn't able to be off the lead the owner is responsible."</p> <p>"Again this is about trained dogs and responsible owners"</p> <p>"Dogs do need to be off lead sometimes. Usually the problem is the owner."</p> <p>"How on earth do you stop dogs in a park such as Mayow not going in the big bit in the middle - ridiculous. Control bad dog owners, not good ones with well behaved mutts."</p>
<b>Already restrictions in place</b>	<p>"I am for restrictions around this but there are already existing police powers. It's not clear why further restrictions are needed nor the evidence behind these."</p> <p>"Instead of creating new rules to police just police and enforce current ones. Exterminate dangerous animals that are proven to have attacked other animals or people. The law already exists."</p> <p>"I think this can be done with bylaws and doesn't need new sweeping, borough-wide powers."</p>

## Support

Theme	Response
<b>Would make spaces feel safer; limit incidents of dog attacks (dog on person, dog on dog, dog on animal).</b>	<p>"Dogs need to be on leads, for public safety."</p> <p>"Safety reasons, specially for children and vulnerable people (e.g. people with anxiety)"</p> <p>"I strongly agree that dogs should be on leads in certain areas and would like to see this at the back of the Viney Road estate backing onto Algernon Road where they currently let unmuzzled and unleashed aggressive dogs run around bark constantly and snap at the resident cats."</p>

	<p>“As before - possible danger to others human and animals. Also, some people are inherently afraid of dogs rational or not.”</p> <p>“Many dog owners do not have full control of their dogs. if the dogs are on leads it minimises dog on dog attacks and dog on human attacks or incidents.”</p> <p>“Too many people have dogs with no recall or they don’t watch what their dog is doing. I have a reactive dog who likes to be left alone. He is only reactive due to being attacked by out of control dogs. People need to be educated if their dog has no recall please keep it on a lead or ask another owner for permission before allowing their dog to approach another or people”</p>
<p><b>Feeling unsafe and nervous around dogs off the lead</b></p>	<p>“Some people are really frightened of dogs and some dogs are uncontained by their owners / dog walkers. In areas where dog walkers tend to walk many dogs at a time it can feel unsafe.”</p> <p>“As with previous answer there are so many dog owners letting dogs run wild in parks etc that can be extremely unsettling for small children putting them at risk and making families feel unsafe. We have witnessed dogs jumping up at prams, jumping at toddlers barking in their faces etc, and often when asked to put dogs on lead the owners can become very offensive and abusive.”</p> <p>“Safety issue. You might love your dog but some people are frightened of dogs. This might affect where they go.”</p> <p>“Not everybody likes dogs and many are afraid of them. Owners can be irresponsible. By having dogs on leads in specific areas all can enjoy those spaces. Since lockdown the number of dogs in the borough has increased considerably.”</p> <p>“Dogs off leads are very frightening especially when you have young children and the dogs are bigger than them. I have had to leave many times when dogs are loose as my children are frightened. Children are more important than dogs and should be a priority.”</p>
<p><b>Observed or experienced incidents</b></p>	<p>“Since lockdown I have noticed a marked increase in dogs off leads and people not controlling their dogs well in public areas, particularly parks and green spaces. I have witnessed near incidents between cyclists, walkers, children and dogs who are not under their owner's control. It is also detrimental to wildlife. I am proud of the green spaces in Lewisham and restricting dog access to nature reserves is a very positive step towards protecting our wildlife and biodiversity. I do like dogs</p>

and will probably get one myself in the future, but I agree 100% with these restrictions.”

“My partner has been chased by dogs during his morning run - they are not friendly dogs and seemed dangerous. Cases of dangerous dogs biting other dogs or humans often appear on Nextdoor App and other media reports. Dog owners should be putting dangerous [ones] on their leads.”

“There have been far too many incidents of dogs off leads, mostly illegal variants attacking smaller at risk dogs and people. The council must implement onlead AND muzzles for larger dogs. The police are responsible for sorting out any problems. Of course they need to be empowered and actually turn up quickly to solve these issues. My wife has direct experience of suffering an attack by a larger illegal type dog which also severely hurt our small dog.”

“Myself, my dog and my family have all been attacked by off lead dogs in parks and public places in the borough in the last 12 months. Please make the borough safer by not allowing dogs off leads in public areas/parks/areas.”

## Suggestions for other restrictions

Comments were grouped into themes:

The most common suggestion was for restrictions to help reduce **litter** and **fly-tipping**. These were mentioned approximated 160 times (28% of comments overall).

Comments around **enforcement** were made 36 times (6% of the suggestions). This included enforcement of the PSPO, but also greater presence of police and community officers in public spaces to help people feel safe and to deal with issues as they occurred.

A similar number of comments were made about **dog fouling** (mentioned approximately 36 times, 6% of overall suggestions). This included fining people who did not clear up after their dog and general observations of the amount of dog poo in streets and public spaces.

Complaints about **electric scooters** occurred approximately 33 times (5.8% of overall suggestions). This included requests to restrict and enforce scooters on pavements, and complaints about ignoring road traffic rules. Similar complaints were made about cyclists (18 times, 3.2%) and, to a lesser extent, mopeds.

Comments mentioned **motor offences and vehicle-related ASB** approximately 34 times (6.0%). This included vehicles which were speeding and not stopping at pedestrian crossings, those which created loud noise from the exhaust, and those playing music loudly.

Observations of **begging** and associated harassment and occasional aggression were made 24 times (4.2%).

Issues regarding **graffiti** and **vandalism** were mentioned approximately 17 times (3%).

**Parking on pavements** resulting in the obstruction of walkways occurred approximately 17 times (3%).

Engine idling and related pollution was mentioned 15 times (2.6%).

ASB associated with **groups of people** were mentioned about 15 times (2.6%), with a further 14 (2.5%) people mentioning ASB associated with **groups of school children**.

**Drug dealing** occurring overtly was mentioned 14 times (2.1%), as well as people taking **drugs** in public, the unpleasant smell associated with it and related criminal activity (10 times in total, 1.8%).

Other mentions included: the presence of rough sleepers, tackling crime and harassment, ASB noise (private and generated by business), bins blocking the pavement, requests for more public toilets, restrictions of BBQs, fireworks, spitting, drones, mopeds on pavements, parking on park land, smoking in public, hire bikes, cleaner streets,

There were also comments about community engagement encouraging good behaviour instead of punitive action, and better lighting / CCTV to improve safety. A few people mentioned feeling unsafe following a recent spate of muggings.