

Open

Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Agenda

To be held remotely
6pm
Thursday, 4th March 2021



Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Members of Committee:

Chairman: Councillor M J Hart
Vice-Chairman: Councillor S J Chambers

Councillor N J Desmond
Councillor S Griffiths
Councillor T L Onslow
Councillor S E N Rook

Councillor C Edginton-White
Councillor S Miah
Councillor M Rayner
Councillor D R Sheppard

Would Members please note that, to ensure continuity in scrutiny, substitutes should only be appointed for the Scrutiny Committee in exceptional circumstances.

Information for Members of the Public:

Part I of the Agenda includes items for discussion in public. You have the right to inspect copies of Minutes and reports on this Agenda as well as the background documents used in the preparation of these reports.

Part II of the Agenda (if applicable) deals with items of "Exempt Information" for which it is anticipated that the public may be excluded from the meeting and neither reports nor background papers are open to public inspection.

1. The Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting is open to the public except for any exempt/confidential items. These items are normally discussed at the end of the meeting. Where a meeting is held remotely, "open" means available for live or subsequent viewing.
2. Members of the public will be able to hear and see the meetings by a live stream on the Council's website:

<https://www.wyreforestdc.gov.uk/streaming.aspx>
3. This meeting is being held remotely online and will be recorded for play back. You should be aware that the Council is a Data Controller under the Data Protection Act 2018. All streamed footage is the copyright of Wyre Forest District Council.

Declaration of Interests by Members – interests of members in contracts and other matters

Declarations of Interest are a standard item on every Council and Committee agenda and each Member must provide a full record of their interests in the Public Register.

In addition, alongside the Register of Interest, the Members Code of Conduct ("the Code") requires the Declaration of Interests at meetings. Members have to decide first whether or not they have a disclosable interest in the matter under discussion.

Please see the Members' Code of Conduct as set out in Section 14 of the Council's constitution for full details.

Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) / Other Disclosable Interest (ODI)

DPI's and ODI's are interests defined in the Code of Conduct that has been adopted by the District.

If you have a DPI (as defined in the Code) in a matter being considered at a meeting of the Council (as defined in the Code), the Council's Standing Orders require you to leave the room where the meeting is held, for the duration of any discussion or voting on that matter.

If you have an ODI (as defined in the Code) you will need to consider whether you need to leave the room during the consideration of the matter.

Co-opted Members

Scrutiny Committees may wish to appoint Co-Opted Members to sit on their committee in order to add value to the scrutiny process. To appoint a Co-Opted Member, a Committee must first agree to appoint either a specific person or to approach a relevant organisation to request that they put forward a suitable representative (e.g. the local Police Authority). Co-Optees are non voting by default but Committees can decide to appoint voting rights to a Co-Optee. The Co-Option of the Member will last no longer than the remainder of the municipal year.

Scrutiny Committees can at any meeting agree to terminate the Co-Option of a Co-Opted Member with immediate effect. Where an organisation is appointed to put forward a Co-Opted Member, they are able to send a substitute in exceptional circumstances, provided that they notify Democratic Services in advance. Co-Opted Members must sign up to the Members Code of Conduct before attending their first meeting, failure to sign will mean that they are unable to participate. This also applies to substitute Co-Opted Members, who will need to allow sufficient time before a meeting in order to sign the Code of Conduct.

The following will apply:

- i) The total number of voting co-opted members on any Scrutiny Committee will not exceed 25% at any one time.
- ii) The total number of voting Co-opted Members on any Review Panel will not be limited.
- iii) Those Co-opted Members with voting rights will exercise their rights in accordance with the principles of decision making set out in the constitution.

For Further information:

If you have any queries about this Agenda or require any details of background papers, further documents or information, you should contact Louisa Bright, Principal Committee and Member Services Officer, Wyre Forest House, Finepoint Way, Kidderminster, DY11 7WF. Telephone: 01562 732763 or email louisa.bright@wyreforestdc.gov.uk

Wyre Forest District Council
Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 4th March 2021

To be held remotely

Part 1

Open to the press and public

Agenda item	Subject	Page Number
1.	Apologies for Absence	
2.	Appointment of Substitute Members To receive the name of any Councillor who is to act as a substitute, together with the name of the Councillor for whom he/she is acting.	
3.	Declarations of Interests by Members In accordance with the Code of Conduct, to invite Members to declare the existence and nature of any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPI's) and / or Other Disclosable Interests (ODI's) in the following agenda items and indicate the action that they will be taking when the item is considered. Please see the Members' Code of Conduct as set out in Section 14 of the Council's Constitution for full details.	
4.	Minutes To confirm as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on the 4th February 2021.	6
5.	Public Participation In accordance with the Council's Scheme for Public Speaking at Scrutiny Committees, five members of the public have registered to speak regarding agenda item 6.	
6.	Review of Public Space Protection Orders and Results of the Consultation Process To consider a report from the Community Services Manager to consider recommendations to Cabinet on whether the Council should make any changes to Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) following the review after a 6-month period of implementation and results of the consultation process.	11

7.	Work Programme To review the work programme for the current municipal year with regard to the Corporate Plan Priority, Annual Priorities and the Forward Plan.	26
8.	Press Involvement To consider any future items for scrutiny that might require publicity.	
9.	To consider any other business, details of which have been communicated to the Solicitor of the Council before the commencement of the meeting, which the Chairman by reason of special circumstances considers to be of so urgent a nature that it cannot wait until the next meeting.	
10.	Exclusion of the Press and Public To consider passing the following resolution: “That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of “exempt information” as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act”.	

Part 2

Not open to the Press and Public

11.	To consider any other business, details of which have been communicated to the Solicitor of the Council before the commencement of the meeting, which the Chairman by reason of special circumstances considers to be of so urgent a nature that it cannot wait until the next meeting.	
------------	--	--

**WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL
OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

HELD REMOTELY

THURSDAY, 4TH FEBRUARY 2021 (6PM)

Present:

Councillors: M J Hart (Chairman), S J Chambers (Vice-Chairman), N J Desmond, C Edginton-White, S Griffiths, S Miah, T L Onslow, M Rayner, S E N Rook and D R Sheppard.

Observers

Councillors: G W Ballinger, C J Barnett, J F Byng, V Caulfield, A Coleman, R H Coleman, H E Dyke, P Dyke, I Hardiman, N Martin, F M Oborski MBE, C Rogers and P W M Young.

OS.60 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

OS.61 Appointment of Substitutes

No substitutes were appointed.

OS.62 Declarations of Interests by Members

Councillor R Coleman declared, in respect of agenda item no. 7 – Scrutiny Proposal, that he was a dog owner.

Councillor A Coleman declared, in respect of agenda item no. 7 – Scrutiny Proposal, that she was a dog owner.

OS.63 Minutes

Decision: The minutes of the meeting held on 5th November 2020 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Councillor V Caulfield joined the meeting at 6.08pm.

OS.64 How Are We Doing? Performance Update

The Committee considered a report from the Business Improvement Officer which updated members on the performance of the Council for quarter 3, from 1st October to 31st December 2020.

The Business Improvement Officer presented the report and appendices which included an exception report for all purposes detailing actions that were approaching their due date or were overdue; a detailed report of performance

Agenda Item No. 4

against the purpose of 'Place'; an overview report on Bewdley Museum and a capital projects report.

The Committee considered each page of the report and appendices in turn. Members were advised that the data for LE015 – Total recorded ASB incidents, was out of date. The information is provided by West Mercia Police and as at September 2020 they were unable to provide the data. The Business Improvement Officer advised members that an update would be circulated to members as soon as the data became available, and a response to the queries raised in relation to LA065 - Yearly percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting, and LA071/LA072 Fly tipping incidents and enforcement actions would be circulated in due course.

Agreed: The progress in performance for quarter 3 be noted.

Councillor N Desmond joined the meeting at 6.15pm.

OS.65

Treasury Management Strategy 2021-22

The Committee received a report from the Corporate Director: Resources which provided members with background information on the Chartered Institute of Public Finance (CIPFA) Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities (Prudential Code). The Committee also considered the recommendations from the Treasury Management Review Panel from its meeting on 2nd February 2021.

The Corporate Director: Resources presented the report and gave a summary of the main points. She advised members that this was the last, and most important, of the three statutory reports that would be presented to Committee during the municipal year, as it sets out the policies and risk appetite of the authority for the 2021-22 financial year. She was pleased to report that there were no breaches to report and all the treasury management activities were in full compliance with the Council's approved strategy.

She added that the Council's Treasury Management Advisors, Link Asset Services, had provided a comprehensive member training session on 2nd February, which was followed by a detailed scrutiny of the report by the Treasury Management Review Panel. The Corporate Director: Resources said that the training was very well attended and thanked members for their input.

Agreed: The Overview & Scrutiny Committee recommends to Council to:

- 1.1 Approve the restated Prudential Indicators and Limits for the financial years 2021-22 to 2030-31 included in Appendix 3. These will be revised for the February 2021 Council meeting, as per paragraph 7.2 of this report, following any changes to the Capital Programme brought about as part of the budget process.**
- 1.2 Approve the updated Treasury Management and Investment Policy and Strategy Statements for the period 1st April 2021 to 31st March 2022 (the associated Prudential Indicators are included in Appendix 3 and the detailed criteria is included in Section 10 and Appendix 5).**

- 1.3 Approve the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement that sets out the Council's policy on MRP included in Appendix 1.**
- 1.4 Approve the Authorised Limit Prudential Indicator included in Appendix 3.**
- 1.5 Notes that the separate, but intrinsically linked, Capital Strategy 2021-31 to be approved separately by Council, sets out the policy statement covering non-treasury investments including the related suite of prudential indicators.**

OS.66 Scrutiny Proposal

The Committee considered a scrutiny proposal form submitted by a member of the Committee, Councillor M Rayner, regarding fireworks.

The Chairman advised that the form had also been submitted in the name of Councillors Anna and Roger Coleman, and it was proposed that a task and finish group be set up to look at the issues raised. He acknowledged that the sale and use of fireworks was dealt with in legislation, which members cannot change; however there were certain things that members would be able to influence in terms of policy on Council owned land and the communications that the authority has with members of the public about adhering to the legal restrictions on the use of fireworks.

Councillor Rayner presented the form which set out in detail the scrutiny proposal. She outlined the key issues and explained that over time firework designs had changed from being just a visual display with low levels of noise to being extremely loud and noisy. She said that she had been contacted by a number of residents who were concerned about the distress loud fireworks cause to vulnerable people and animals.

A discussion ensued. Members welcomed the proposal and agreed that it would be an opportunity to examine the current legal framework on the use of fireworks and fully explore the situation across the district with a view to recommending appropriate ways to deal with the issues identified as part of the review.

The Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration, Planning and Capital Investments and for Localism said that Wyre Forest District Council takes a responsible attitude with regards to Chinese lanterns and helium balloons within its parks. She said there was no harm in looking to take a responsible attitude regarding fireworks on Council owned land and hoped that the proposal would proceed.

Agreed:

- A task and finish group (review panel) of six members be established to undertake the scrutiny exercise; the membership of the panel will consist of one member from each political party.**
- Councillor M Rayner be appointed as Chairman of the review panel.**
- Nominations for the panel to be sent by Group Leaders to the Principal Committee and Member Services Officer by Thursday 11th February 2021.**

OS.67 Work Programme

The Committee reviewed the work programme for the remainder of the municipal year. The Chairman advised that the Principal Committee and Member Services Officer was in the process of confirming the attendance of the Environment Agency for the March meeting. He said that it was important that the Committee kept the flooding issues in the district at the forefront of their minds and additional meetings would be held if necessary.

OS.68 Press Involvement

The Chairman advised that the following items would require publicity:

- Review of Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs)
- Update from the Environment Agency – Flooding Outcomes

OS.69 Capital Portfolio Fund – Quarterly Fund Report

The Committee received a report from the Corporate Director: Economic Prosperity & Place which provided an update on the performance of the Capital Portfolio Fund (CPF) for the final quarter for the period up to the end of December 2020.

The Corporate Director: Resources introduced the report and reminded members that the performance reports were presented to the Committee on a bi-annual basis. She said it was an important report and urged members to ask questions and seek clarification on any points that they were unsure of.

The representatives from the Council's advisers, Jones Valerio, presented members with an executive summary which set out the key challenges and opportunities facing the CPF during quarter 4 2020, alongside the solutions being delivered to reduce risk and deliver opportunity. Members were advised that it was the Asset Managers summary of the larger and more comprehensive Quarterly Fund Report (QFR) as set out in the exempt appendix and did not therefore comment upon all areas of the report due to commercial sensitivity of information included in the exempt part of the agenda.

The meeting was adjourned at 7.40pm and resumed at 7.45pm. At 7.56pm the Committee agreed unanimously to suspend Council Procedure Rule (Standing Orders) 1.1 (iii) to allow the meeting to continue past 8pm.

The representatives from Jones Valerio, led members in detail through the executive summary. The Committee fully scrutinised the report by way of a question and answer session with the representatives from Jones Valerio.

OS.70 Exempt Information

Decision: Under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of "Exempt Information" as defined in paragraphs 2, 6 and 7 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

OS.71 Capital Portfolio Fund – Quarterly Fund Report: Appendix 1

The Committee received a detailed confidential quarterly performance report from Jones Valerio.

Agreed: The performance of the Capital Portfolio Fund be noted.

There being no further business, the meeting ended at 8.30pm.

The full open meeting is available for viewing on the Council's website:

<https://www.wyreforestdc.gov.uk/53298>



Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Briefing Paper

Report of: Rachel Symons, Community Services Manager
Date: Thursday, 4th March 2021
Open

Review of Public Space Protection Orders and Results of the Consultation Process

1. Summary

- 1.1 To consider recommendations to Cabinet on whether the Council should make any changes to Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) following the review after a 6-month period of implementation and results of the consultation process.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Cabinet decided at its meeting of 7 July 2020 to make a district-wide Dog Control PSPO and PSPOs restricting alcohol consumption in Bewdley and Stourport-on-Severn and committed to undertake a review within 6 months after the orders came into force in October 2020.
- 2.2 A communications plan was implemented and for a period of three months following the introduction, Council Officers have used their discretion and adopted an informal/educational approach to the enforcements of any new aspects of the legislation. This period provided an opportunity to raise awareness of the PSPOs and has been received well by residents.
- 2.3 Local Authorities have the power under Section 59 of the Anti-Social Behaviour and Policing Act 2014 to make a PSPO if satisfied on reasonable grounds that 2 conditions are met.

The 1st condition is that-

- a) activities carried out in a public place within the Authority's area have had a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality, or
- b) it is likely that activities will be carried on in a public place within that area and that they will likely have such an effect

The 2nd condition is that the effect, or likely effect, of the activities –

- a) Is or is likely to be, of a persistent or continuing nature,
- b) Is, or is likely to be, such as to make the activities unreasonable, and
- c) Justifies the restrictions imposed by the notice

3. Key Issues

- 3.1 Over 900 responses were received for the online dog control order survey and emails were also sent to the Enforcement Team. A clear majority agreed or agreed strongly with all aspects of the dog control order, with one exception. There was an overwhelming response to increase the number of dogs a person can have under his or her control. A variety of views were expressed but the clear majority (63% out of 910 responses) was in favour of setting the limit at six dogs instead of three. Organisations such as The Kennel Club and Professional Dog Walking Association have also been in touch and their recommendations in appendix 4 are also to increase the number from 3 to 6 dogs.
- 3.2 A total of 287 responses were received in relation to the alcohol restrictions, 116 for Stourport-on-Severn and 171 for Bewdley. The responses demonstrate a clear majority in support of the restrictions continuing. The feedback received detailed people experiencing anti-social behaviour connected with alcohol consumption and this will be shared with relevant council officers and partner agencies targeting future patrols and enforcement activity.

4. Options

- 4.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee could recommend to Cabinet:
- Either that no changes are made to the PSPOs in light of the consultation;
- Or that no changes are made to the alcohol orders in Bewdley and Stourport-on-Severn but that the Dog Control PSPO should be amended to substitute 6 for 3 in relation to the limit of dogs that one person may have under his or her control, in line with the consultation response;
- Or that such other approach as identified by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should be adopted.

5. Consultation

- 5.1 A commitment was made by Cabinet at its meeting of 7 July 2020 to undertake a review within 6 months after the orders were introduced in October 2020.
- 5.2 Online consultation was launched for a period of 4 weeks, starting 6th January 2021 and ending on 3rd February 2021, in relation to all 3 PSPOs. The results from all 3 surveys can be found in Appendices 1 – 3.
- 5.3 The Dog Control Survey gave residents the opportunity to have their say on rules to tackle dog fouling and a new measure introduced in October 2020 which limits individuals to walking a maximum of 3 dogs at any one time. Residents were also invited to comment on the new restrictions introduced at

Stackpool and Hurcott Pool which requires owners to put their dogs on leads within these spaces.

- 5.4 2 separate surveys invited people to comment on the street drinking restrictions in both Bewdley and Stourport Town Centres.

6. Related Decisions

- 6.1 None

7. Relevant Council Policies/Strategies

- 7.1 Wyre Forest District Council Corporate Plan 2019-2023

8. Implications

- 8.1 Resources: Staff time and funding from existing budgets
- 8.2 Equalities: Assessments have previously been undertaken, no additional impact identified.
- 8.3 Partnership working: Officers have worked and will continue to work in partnership with West Mercia Police and other relevant agencies on issues concerning community safety
- 8.4 Human Rights: N/A
- 8.5 E-Government – N/A
- 8.6 Transformation N/A

9. Equality Impact Needs Assessment

- 9.1 Equality Impact Assessments were prepared when the PSPOs were originally made in 2020 and identified no significant impacts in respect of any of the protected characteristics.

10. Wards affected

- 10.1 District Wide (dog control)
- 10.2 Bewdley and Rock
- 10.3 Wribbenhall and Arley
- 10.4 Areley Kings and Riverside
- 10.5 Mitton

11. Appendices

- 11.1 Appendix 1: Summary of Responses for Dog Control
- Appendix 2: Summary of Responses for Alcohol restrictions in Stourport-on-Severn
- Appendix 3: Summary of responses for Alcohol restrictions in Bewdley
- Appendix 4: Correspondence from The Kennel Club

12. Background Papers

- 12.1 Reports to Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2nd July 2020 and Cabinet on 7th July 2020

Officer Contact Details:

Rachel Symons
Community Services Manager
01562 732923/ 07929826156
Rachel.symons@wyreforestdc.gov.uk

Appendix 1

Dog Control Public Spaces Protection Order Summary of Responses February 2021

Summary

Wyre Forest District Council consulted on the extension of the district wide dog control Public Space Protection Order between 6th January 2021 and 3rd February 2021.

Responses were received from a range of stakeholders including individuals, local organisations, town and parish councils and representative bodies, results are collated below:

The consultation on the district wide Dog Control Order sought comments on continuing the following restrictions and conditions:

- Failure to pick up dog faeces when in control of dog
- Failure to carry a poop bag or other means to clean up after a dog
- Failure to keep a dog on a lead in a designated area (Kidderminster Cemetery and Queen Elizabeth II Jubilee Gardens, Bewdley)
- Failure to place a dog on a lead when directed to do so
- Failure to exclude dogs from fenced off or enclosed children's playgrounds
- Walking more than 3 dogs at a time
- Failure to keep a dog on a lead in a designated area – Stackpool, Springfield Park and Hurcott Pool, Hurcott Woods

Council Officers' Response

The view of officers is that having analysed the consultation responses it remains appropriate that all existing restrictions and conditions should continue, with amendment to the restriction in relation to number of dogs walked by an individual. The consultation responses show clear support that the maximum number of dogs needs to be increased. The consultation results suggest that the number of dogs should be increased from 3 to 6.

Consultation Question 1

Do you live in Wyre Forest?

Consultation Responses

910 responses were received.

Within Wyre Forest	698 (76.7%)
Outside the District	212 (23.3%)

Consultation Question 2

Which of the following best describes your situation?

Consultation Responses

910 responses were received

Dog Owner	776 (85.27%)
Don't own but walk friend/families dog/s	18 (1.98%)
Previously owned dog	59 (6.48%)
Thinking of having a dog	16 (1.76%)
Never owned a dog	16 (1.7%)
Prefer not to say	10 (1.10%)
Other	15 (1.65%)

Consultation Question 3

To what extent do you agree/disagree that the council should continue to have the power to make sure a person in charge of a dog cleans up after it?

Consultation Responses

910 responses were received for this question

Strongly Agree	717(78.79%)
Agree	179 (19.67%)
Disagree	5 (0.55%)
Strongly Disagree	9 (0.99%)

Consultation Question 4

To what extent do you agree/disagree we should continue to have the power to make sure a person in charge of a dog cleans up after it on all public land? This includes nature reserves, agricultural land with rights of way and private land accessed by the public

Consultation Responses

910 responses were received for this question

Strongly Agree	649 (71.32%)
Agree	211 (23.19%)
Disagree	37 (4.07%)
Strongly Disagree	13 (1.43%)

Consultation Question 5

To what extent do you agree/disagree that it should continue to be an offence for a dog walker to walk their dog without something to pick up after it?

Consultation Responses

910 responses were received for this question.

Strongly Agree	396 (43.52%)
Agree	362 (39.78%)
Disagree	112 (12.31%)
Strongly Disagree	40 (4.4%)

Consultation Question 6

Currently dogs must be kept on a lead in Kidderminster Cemetery and Queen Elizabeth II Gardens in Bewdley. To what extent do you agree/disagree that dogs should continue to be kept on a lead in...

Consultation Responses

910 responses were received for this question.

Kidderminster Cemetery		Queen Elizabeth Jubilee, Bewdley	
Strongly Agree	493 (38.32%)	Strongly Agree	346 (38.52%)
Agree	340 (37.61%)	Agree	356 (39.42%)
Disagree	44 (4.87%)	Disagree	135 (14.95%)
Strongly Disagree	27 (2.99%)	Strongly Disagree	66 (7.31%)

Consultation Question 7

Most dogs love being off the lead and in many circumstances, so long as a dog is safe and under control, that is absolutely fine. However, if an officer thinks a dog is causing danger or serious nuisance to other people or their dogs, the owner will be asked to put it on a lead. To what extent do you agree/disagree that an officer should have the power to ask someone to put a dog on a lead?

Consultation Responses

910 responses were received for this question.

Strongly Agree	434 (47.49%)
Agree	410 (45.05%)
Disagree	43 (4.73%)
Strongly Disagree	23 (2.53%)

Consultation Question 8

Dogs are not allowed to enter children's play areas and splash pad areas, we introduced this for safety and hygiene purposes. To what extent do you agree/disagree that dogs should continue to be excluded from children's play areas and splash pad areas?

Consultation Responses

910 responses were received for this question.

Strongly Agree	603 (66.26%)
Agree	260 (28.57%)
Disagree	33 (3.63%)
Strongly Disagree	14 (1.54%)

Consultation Question 9

A limit to walking three dogs at a time was introduced in October 2020. This was following a consultation where 73% of respondents said this should be a maximum of three or fewer dogs. The Dogs Trust and Professional Dog Walking Association say the maximum should be four dogs, while the Kennel Club suggests a limit of six dogs for professional dog walkers.

Do you think there should continue to be a limit to walking three dogs at one time?

Consultation Responses

910 responses were received for this question.

Yes	4 (0.44%)
No	906 (99.56%)

Consultation Question 10

How many dogs do you think one person should be allowed to have under their control at a time?

Consultation Responses

910 responses were received for this question.

Up to 2	4 (0.44%)
Up to 4	229 (25.16%)
Up to 5	100 (10.99%)
Up to 6	577 (63.41%)

Consultation Question 11

There are businesses in the district that provide boarding kennels, home boarding or day care for dogs. To do this they must have an 'animal activities licence'. Many, if not all, of the people working in these businesses may be walking one or more dogs at one time. They may also have public liability insurance. How many dogs should someone who holds an 'animal activities licence' be able to walk at one time?

Consultation Responses

906 responses were received for this question.

Up to 4 as suggested by Dogs Trust and Professional Dog Walking Association	904 (100%)
---	------------

Consultation Question 12

There are businesses in the district that provide boarding kennels, home boarding or day care for dogs. To do this they must have an 'animal activities licence'. Many, if not all, of the people working in these businesses may be walking one or more dogs at one time. They may also have public liability insurance. How many dogs should someone who holds an 'animal activities licence' be able to walk at one time?

Consultation Responses

906 responses were received for this question.

Up to 2	4 (0.44%)
Up to 4 (Dogs Trust and Professional Walking Association)	207 (22.5%)
Up to 5	38 (4.19%)
Up to 6 (suggested by Kennel Club)	657 (72.52%)

Consultation Question 13

In October, following support in our previous dog control survey, we added new restrictions requiring dogs to be on a lead by Stackpool in Springfield Park and Hurcott Pool. We felt these restrictions were important as both pools are home to a variety of wild birds and wildlife. To what extent do you agree/disagree that dogs should continue to be kept on leads by...

Consultation Responses

900 comments were received for this question., 10 didn't comment.

Stackpool at Springfield Park		Hurcott Pool	
Strongly Agree	204 (22.7%)	Strongly Agree	189 (21.19%)
Agree	357 (39.76%)	Agree	317 (35.4%)
Disagree	234 (26.06%)	Disagree	259 (29.04%)
Strongly Disagree	103 (11.47%)	Strongly Disagree	127 (14.24%)

Consultation Question 14

If someone doesn't follow our current dog control rules we can fine them £100. The maximum fine we can give is £100. Do you think £100 is...

Consultation Responses

898 responses were received for this question, 12 skipped.

Too Much	203 (22.61%)
About Right	695 (77.39%)

Formal Written responses

In addition to the survey, formal written responses were received from individuals outside of the online consultation and from canine organisations, including The Kennel Club, The Dogs Trust and Professional Dog Walking Association. Individuals made contact who walk dogs as their profession. From these formal written

responses there is support for the restrictions at Stackpool and Hurcott Pool but overall support to revise the number of dogs currently set at 3, and to be guided by recommendations from canine organisations that feel 6 is a suitable number of dogs for an individual to responsibly walk.

Appendix 2

Restriction of Alcohol in Stourport-on-Severn Public Spaces Protection Order Summary of Responses February 2021

Summary

Wyre Forest District Council consulted on the Public Spaces Protection Order to restrict alcohol consumption in Stourport-on-Severn for a four week period between 6th January 2021 and 3rd February 2021.

116 responses to the online consultation were received. 69.57% of those respondents live within Stourport-on-Severn, 28.7% live within Wyre Forest District but not Stourport-on-Severn and 1.74% live outside of the District. Responses were received from a range of stakeholders including individuals, local organisations, town and parish councils and representative bodies.

The consultation on the Alcohol Restriction Order for Stourport-on-Severn sought comments on the following restrictions and conditions:

- To provide the power for authorised officers of the Council, Police Officer or Police Community Support Officer to require a person drinking alcohol in public to surrender their alcohol (or anything which is reasonably believed to be alcohol).
- Failure to comply with the requirements of the PSPO by drinking alcohol in a public place will be an offence and people may result in a £100 fixed penalty notice.

Council Officers' Response

The view of officers is that having analysed the consultation responses it remains appropriate that all existing restrictions and conditions should be continued. The proposed boundary of the PSPO is regarded as appropriate and is supported through the review of the evidence. Education, community engagement and signage will be essential to the effective operation of the PSPO.

Other Matters

The majority of comments were relevant to the remit of the PSPO. There were some comments that fall outside of the remit of the PSPO, for example issues that would be outside of the proposed PSPO boundary or were comments on organisations. These will be shared with the relevant council officers and partner agencies.

Consultation Question 1

The PSPO is in place to stop people continuing to drink alcohol when asked to stop by an officer. They are able to do this in the area shown on the map. Do you agree with this?

Consultation Responses

116 responses were received for this question

Yes	109 (93.7%)
No	7 (6.03%)

Consultation Question 2

The PSPO requires a person to hand over alcohol at the request of an officer. They are able to do this in the area shown on the map. Do you agree with this?.

Consultation Responses

116 responses were received for this question

Yes	107 (92.24%)
No	9 (7.76%)

Consultation Question Q3

What impact do you think the PSPO will have on people living/working/visiting the town?

Consultation Responses

116 responses were received for this question

	Positive	Negative	No Impact
Living in the town	95 (81.9%)	4 (3.45%)	17 (14.66%)
Working in the town	89 (76.72%)	3 (2.59%)	24 (20.69%)
Visiting the town	89 (77.39%)	19 (16.52%)	19 (16.52%)

Consultation Question 4

In the past 12 months have you been affected by alcohol related anti-social behaviour in Stourport-on-Severn? Further detail of locations have been provided and so this information will be dealt with as explained under 'other matters'

Consultation Responses

116 responses were received for this question

Yes	24 (20.69%)
No	92 (79.31%)

Formal Written Responses

In addition to the survey, a formal written response was received from West Mercia Police who agreed with all of the proposals.

Appendix 3

Restriction of Alcohol in Bewdley Public Spaces Protection Order Summary of Responses February 2021

Summary

Wyre Forest District Council consulted on the Public Spaces Protection Order to restrict alcohol consumption in Bewdley as part of the PSPO review for a four-week period between 6th January 2021 and 3rd February 2021.

171 responses to the online consultation were received. Responses were received from a range of stakeholders including individuals, local organisations, town and parish councils and representative bodies.

The consultation on the Alcohol Restriction Order for Bewdley sought views on the following restrictions and conditions:

- To provide the power for authorised officers of the Council, Police Officer or Police Community Support Officer to require a person drinking alcohol in public to surrender their alcohol (or anything which is reasonably believed to be alcohol).
- Failure to comply with the requirements of the PSPO by drinking alcohol in a public place will be an offence and people may result in a £100 fixed penalty notice.

Council Officers' Response

The view of officers is that having analysed the consultation responses it remains appropriate that all existing restrictions and conditions should be continued. The proposed boundary of the PSPO is regarded as appropriate and is supported through the review of the evidence.

Education, community engagement and signage will be essential to the effective operation of the PSPO.

Other Matters

The majority of comments were relevant to the remit of the PSPO. There were some comments that fall outside of the remit of the PSPO or the proposed boundary, for example as litter, drug dealing/misuse and public disorder related matters. These will be shared with the relevant council officers and partner agencies.

In the survey, some comments were made in relation to Anti-Social Behaviour within the town, particularly in relation to groups of young people. These issues will be raised with key partners, including West Mercia Police at Safer Wyre Forest Tasking Group

Consultation Question 1

The PSPO is in place to stop people continuing to drink alcohol when asked by an officer. They are able to do this in the area shown on the map. Do you agree with this?

Consultation Responses

171 responses were received for this question.

Yes	160 (93.57%)
No	11 (6.43%)

Consultation Question 2

To require a person to hand over alcohol at the request of an authorised officer in the area shown on the map.

Consultation Responses

173 responses were received for this question.

Yes	157 (90.75%)
No	16 (9.25%)

Consultation Question Q3

What impact do you think the PSPO will have on people living/working/visiting the town?

Consultation Responses

170 responses were received for this question.

	Positive	Negative	No Impact
Living in the town	144 (84.71%)	5 (2.94%)	21 (12.35%)
Working in the town	139 (81.76%)	4 (2.35%)	17 (15.88%)
Visiting the town	132 (77.65%)	11 (6.47%)	27 (15.88%)

Consultation Question 4

In the past 12 months have you been affected by alcohol related anti-social behaviour in Bewdley?

Consultation Responses

171 responses were received for this question.

Yes	40 (23.39%)
No	131 (76.61%)



The Kennel Club
Clarges Street
London
W1J 8AB

Wyre Forest District Council
Wyre Forest House
Finepoint Way
Kidderminster
Worcestershire
DY11 7WF

21 January 2021

Dear Councillor,

Wyre Forest Public Spaces Protection Order – Maximum number of dogs per walker

As the largest organisation in the UK devoted to dog health, welfare, and training, The Kennel Club's main objective is to ensure that dogs live healthy, happy lives with responsible owners. As part of our external affairs activities, we run KC Dog which was established to monitor and keep dog owners up to date about relevant issues, including Public Spaces Protection Orders.

Following our letter to you last year, dated 27 August 2020, we wanted to raise our concerns again and provide our view on the proposed maximum number of dogs per person provision within the PSPO.

The Kennel Club is not aware of any robust evidence that it is not possible to walk six dogs in a manner that maintains the interest of both the dogs being walked and other site users. This position is supported by insurance companies, who widely insure commercial dog walkers to walk six dogs for modest annual premiums – under £100p.a. A single incident resulting in either a claim for veterinary care or injury to a third party would easily exceed such a premium. The clear implication is that serious incidents involving commercial dog walkers walking up to six dogs are rare.

Guidance from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and the Welsh Government's joint Practitioner's Manual for dealing with irresponsible dog ownership refers to a maximum limit of six dogs per person as a guiding principle. A lower limit on the number of dogs a commercial dog walker can walk will reduce the income generate per walk. It is inevitable that the dog walker would then seek to recoup this revenue loss, either by increasing their prices and/or by cutting corners. A reduction from six to three dogs per walk would require dog walkers to double their fee to dog owners in order to maintain existing revenue levels. Consequently, this could result in dog owners being unable to continue paying for their dogs to be walked as often or at all. Alternatively, this could also result in dogs being walked for a shorter distance or dogs being left in vehicles so that the dog walker does not meet the maximum limit, which gives rise to a number of serious animal welfare concerns. Additionally, dogs that do not receive sufficient exercise may develop behavioural problems.

The Kennel Club believes that the maximum number of dogs a person can walk in a controlled manner depends on a number of factors relating to the dog walker, the dogs being walked, the location that the walk is taking place, the time of day, and so on. As such, we suggest that



defined outcomes are used instead to influence people walking multiple dogs, whether domestically or commercially, which could include requiring dogs to always be under control, not running up to people uninvited, or on lead in specified areas. In situations where numerical limits are deemed necessary, we would endorse the position of both the insurance companies and the guidance provided by Defra and the Welsh Government that a maximum of six dogs, in most circumstances, would be a reasonable number to adopt.

Should you wish to discuss this further, please do not hesitate to get in touch by emailing edward.hayes@thekennelclub.org.uk.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Edward Hayes
Head of Public Affairs
The Kennel Club

**Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Work Programme 2020-2021**

11th June 2020

“How are we doing?” Q4 update (Housing and Planning)
Consideration of the flooding motion from Council
Car Parking Changes as of 1st June 2020

Information Items:

Recommendation Tracking 2019-2020
Feedback from Cabinet 31-03-2020

25th June 2020 – Special

Consideration of the flooding motion from Council – Evidence Gathering from the Environment Agency

2nd July 2020

Consideration of the flooding motion from Council – Evidence Gathering from Worcestershire County Council, West Mercia Police, Hereford & Worcester Fire and Rescue Service and Severn Trent
Review of Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) and Results of the Consultation Process
Community Led Housing Policy Update
Property Flood Grants – Amendment to Capital Programme
Bromsgrove Street Car Park Developer Agreement
Nominations for Treasury Management Review Panel

23rd July 2020 – Special

Capital Portfolio Fund - Quarterly Fund Report - EXEMPT Appendix

3rd September 2020 – Special

Consideration of the flooding motion from Council – Evidence Gathering from voluntary partners, affected residents and businesses.
Consideration of the flooding motion from Council - Draft Final Report and Recommendations for Council

8th September 2020

“How are we doing?” Q1 update (Enabling)
Annual Report on Treasury Management Service and Actual Prudential Indicators 2019-20
Planning Consultation Responses
Planning s106 Obligations
Consultation Response to the Pre-Submission Draft of the Shropshire Local Plan Regulation 18

Information Items:

Feedback from Cabinet 07-07-2020

5th November 2020

“How are we doing?” Q2 update (Business and People)
Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy Mid
Year Report 2020/21
Green Homes Grant – Local Authority Delivery Scheme
Amendment to the Capital Portfolio Fund Acquisition Geography - EXEMPT
Appendix
Response to Consultation on Homeworking
Establishment of Independent Museum Trust

Information Item:

Feedback from Cabinet 16-09-2020

4th February 2021

“How are we doing?” Q3 update (Place)
Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy 2021-22
Scrutiny Proposal Form – Councillor M Rayner
Capital Portfolio Fund Quarterly Performance Report (Qtr ending Dec 2020) –
EXEMPT Appendix

Information Item:

Feedback from Cabinet 10-11-2020

4th March 2021

Review of Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) and Results of the Consultation
Process

1st April 2021

Enterprise and Business Growth Strategy
Strategic Asset Management Plan
Facilities Asset Management Plan