

Delegated Decision

27 May 2020

Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) for Dog Control Extension



Report of Oliver Sherratt, Head of Environment

Electoral division(s) affected:

Countywide

Purpose of the Report

- 1 To extend and vary the Durham County Council Dog Control Public Space Protection Order of June 2017 for a further three years.

Executive summary

- 2 In June 2017 the Council introduced a Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) for dog control. The PSPO made it an offence where:

- (1) A person who is responsible for a dog that defecates on the Land must remove the faeces from the Land immediately.
- (2) A person who is responsible for a dog must not permit, allow or fail to prevent the dog from being unaccompanied on the Land.
- (3) A person who is responsible for a dog must place the dog on a lead when directed to do so by an Authorised Officer.
- (4) A person who is responsible for a dog must permits, allows or fails to prevent the dog to enter a fenced off play area.

- 3 Since the introduction of the PSPO there has been:

- (a) a 32% reduction in stray dog reports
- (b) a 45% reduction on dog fouling reports
- (c) a 18% reduction in dog fouling warden investigations

- 4 Despite the improvements, reports and feedback tell us that dog fouling and associated issues remain a key area of concern for our communities.
- 5 A PSPO remains in force for a period of three years and it can be extended by a further three years before the PSPO expires. Before a PSPO is extended a public consultation is required. A public consultation for the extension of the Durham County Council dog control PSPO took place between 31st March 2020 and 24th April 2020. A copy of the full consultation results are shown at Appendix 2.
- 6 Overall the consultation was very positively supported:
 - (1) 98% agreed with the proposal to extend the existing order for a further three years.
 - (2) 96% of dog owners agreed with the proposal to extend the existing order for a further three years.
 - (3) Over four in five feel they would be positively affected by the proposal to extend the existing order by a further three years.
 - (4) Under 2% feel they would be negatively affected by the proposal to extend the existing order by a further three years.
 - (5) Over three-quarters of dog owners feel they would be positively affected by the proposal to extend the existing order by a further three years.
- 7 Town and Parish councils were consulted on the extension of the PSPO. A small number of Councils asked for a variation to the PSPO for their locality to include fenced off play areas which were not included in the PSPO.

Recommendation

- 8 It is recommended that the Head of Environmental Services in consultation with the Head of Legal and Democratic Services:
 - (i) extends the Durham County Council Dog Control Public Space Protection Order until 31st May 2023 (as shown at Appendix 3); and
 - (ii) the extended PSPO shows the additional fenced off play areas requested by Parish and Town Councils for their locality and those play areas which are no longer in operation are removed from Schedule 2 of the PSPO.

Background

- 9 The Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (the Act) brought in a range of powers available to Local Authorities including the ability to make a Public Space Protection Order (PSPO).

- 10 The power to make a PSPO is set out at section 59 of the Act which provides:
 - (1) A local authority may make a public spaces protection order if satisfied on reasonable grounds that two conditions are met.

 - (2) The first condition is that—
 - (a) activities carried on 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 have such an effect.

 - (3) The second 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.

- 11 Being satisfied the conditions in the legislation were met and following a full and comprehensive consultation, a PSPO for dog control was introduced in June 2017.

- 12 The legislation prescribes the duration of PSPO's as being for a period of not more than three years unless extended in accordance with section 60 of the Act. Section 60(2) of the Act sets out that before the time when a PSPO is due to expire, the local authority that made the order may extend the period for which it has effect if satisfied on reasonable grounds that doing so is necessary to prevent -

- (a) occurrence or recurrence after that time of the activities identified in the order, or
- (b) an increase in the frequency or seriousness of those activities after that time.

The Consultation and Findings

- 13 In February 2020 an approach for a consultation on the PSPO was developed. The proposal was to extend the existing PSPO on the same terms.
- 14 The public consultation took place between 31st March 2020 until 24 April 2020 in accordance with section 72 of the Act. Due to the Covid-19 restrictions in place, this was an online only consultation. In addition to consultation with the public, Town and Parish Councils and Durham Constabulary were contacted to comment on the extension of the PSPO. The full detail of the consultation report is shown at Appendix 2 of this report. The findings from the consultation are outlined below.
- 15 As part of the consultation the council must consult with the chief officer of the police and the local policing body before issuing the order who responded by saying that:
- “No issues from a policing point of view. The order would appear to be having a positive impact both in terms of reducing the incidents of stray animals and in reducing dog fouling in public areas. I am happy with the proposal and support the extension to the order”
- 16 A "public place" is defined at section 74 of the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act as: “any place to which the public or any section of the public has access, on payment or otherwise, as of right **or by virtue of express or implied permission**. Accordingly, land used by the public as a matter of custom and practice but not by virtue of any right or express permission will still count as a public place.

Review of the existing order (failure to pick up dog foul)

- 17 Dog fouling has been a consistent issue reported by Durham communities on a very regular basis for many years (2435 reports to the council 2018/19) and features in most Police and Communities

Together (PACT) meetings as a priority. This is not just something that frustrates communities locally but nationally there have been great efforts to change the culture.

- 18 Dog fouling causes a number of issues including:
- (a) It can cause blindness from the disease toxocariasis which is spread from animals to humans through contact with infected foul.
 - (b) Treading in foul can also potentially lead to slip, trips and falls and is very unpleasant.
- 19 In Durham there are active 'responsible dog ownership' campaigns with a coordinated approach to promoting dog health (neutering, vaccination and microchips) along with volunteering through 'Green Dog Walkers' to promote responsibility including picking up after their pet.
- 20 Enforcement is carried out by Neighbourhood Wardens although Police Community Support Officers are also authorised to carry out enforcement. Where someone is caught not picking up dog foul without reasonable excuse, a fixed penalty notice (FPN) for the sum of £100.00 is issued and where payment is not received the individual is taken to court, in 2018-2019 there were 47 FPN's issued. Warning letters are also issued to individual where community intelligence points suggest offending in the area but an individual has not been identified. Extending the existing order maintains the existing position in that dog fouling affects our communities and that we should continue to tackle it for the benefit of health and the environment.
- 21 **Consultation results** – The overall response was 98% of responses agreed with the continuation of the order and written responses confirmed that there is continued support for this measure by community representatives (Parish and Town Councils).
- 22 **Proposal** – given the support it is proposed to progress with this extension of the PSPO.

Review the existing order (an offence to allow your dog to stray).

- 23 The Council has a statutory obligation to deal with stray dogs within its area. Last year there were approximately 1117 stray dogs reported to the council with those found and taken to our kennelling provider. This is a reduction from 1680 in the comparable period the previous year and a 32% reduction

- 24 Currently dogs found straying on the first occasion are returned to their owner (if they can be identified) after which, subsequent times they are taken to the kennels (Coxhoe) and either reunited or rehomed. When a dog is collected from the kennels the owner pays for the kennelling costs paid to the kennels and a statutory fee, which is paid and returned to the council.
- 25 Stray dogs by their nature wander in an uncontrolled manner and affect local communities through uncollected foul, have the potential to cause traffic incidents and may become aggressive to other dogs, their owners or the general public.
- 26 From 6th April 2016 it became a requirement for all owners to microchip their dog prior to becoming 8 weeks old, to support this in connection with Dogs Trust and Stray Aid free microchipping events are taking place throughout 2016. This supplements the 2000 microchips that have been implanted in dogs each year since LGR.
- 27 This proposed extension of the PSPO will see it continuing to be an offence to allow a dog to stray. In practice this will mean that dogs are returned to their owners and fined where we can identify them and so take direct action so reducing the travel cost and opportunity cost of other priorities for staff. Positively this will also result in dogs being reunited with their owner more quickly and without the hassle of travelling to Coxhoe whilst providing an opportunity for education.
- 28 The **consultation results** confirmed that of the 232 that answered the question that **98%** of respondents agreed the proposal. Supplementary comments were made by 229 respondents that this would reduce fouling, improve responsible dog ownership or for public safety reasons.
- 29 **Proposal** – given the high level of support from those that responded it is proposed to progress with the extension of the PSPO with the application being one that is fair to all and accounting for individual circumstances.

Review the existing order (the power to authorised officers to direct dogs to be placed on a lead).

- 30 Most dogs and their owners are responsible however there are a few who do not have sufficient control over their pet. This can lead to several issues from dogs acting dangerously or in a location where closer control would be preferred such as a cemetery, play area or next to a major road. This could also be applied to dog walkers and social distancing during Covid-19.

- 31 The responsibility for dangerous dogs sits with the Police who have trained dog liaison staff. Regionally and nationally the media have recently reported on several incidents including dogs who were acting in an aggressive manner and the ability to direct an individual to put their dog on a lead when required would assist with the prevention of incidents here in Durham.
- 32 The **consultation results** confirmed that **98%** of the 232 respondents agreed with the proposal. Supplementary comments were made by 151 respondents agreeing, as a responsible owner they would comply or with a good reason.
- 33 **Proposal** – given the high level of support from those that responded it is proposed to progress with this element of the PSPO with the application being one that is fair to all and accounting for individual circumstances. The guidance documents for enforcement staff will reflect a proportionate approach.

Review the existing order (exclude dogs from fenced of play areas)

- 34 There are 124 Durham County Council owned play areas that are fenced off primarily for the use by younger children (under 12). Young children are also the most vulnerable to dogs and their actions and cause risks including:
- (a) It can cause blindness from the disease toxocariasis which is spread from animals to humans through contact with infected foul. Children are more prone to picking things up.
 - (b) Treading in foul can also potentially lead to slip, trips and falls and is very unpleasant.
 - (c) Children are also more vulnerable to boisterous/aggressive behaviour of dogs do to their respective sizes.
- 35 The **consultation results** confirmed that **98%** of the 232 respondents agreed with the proposal. Supplementary comments from 2020 of these said it should be implemented to protect children from the dog and foul.
- 36 Additionally, representations were received from Town and Parish Councils to include fenced off play areas in their locality which were not included in the earlier order.
- 37 **Proposal** – given the high level of support from those that responded it is proposed to continue with this element of the three-year extension. Where a Town or Parish council have requested that the PSPO includes additional play areas in their locality these be included in the list of named fenced off play areas shown at schedule 2.

- 38 **Conclusion** –all the aspects of the proposed 3-year extension PSPO meet the criteria set out in legislation and are supported by those consulted so should proceed.

Conclusion and Next Steps

- 39 The original PSPO in 2017 increased the number of offences tackled and there have been good results from this work. Dog related issues do continue to be community issues and because of this and the support through the consultation the extension of the order is required.
- 40 Upon the making of the order it is required that the variation of the order be published in accordance with regulations made by the Secretary of State which includes publication on the website and erecting notices on or adjacent to the public place to which the PSPO relates sufficient to draw the attention of any member of the public of the PSPO.

Background papers

- None

Other useful documents

- REaL Management Team February 2020

Author

Ian Houtt

Tel: 03000 265571

Appendix 1: Implications

Legal Implications

In order for the PSPO to remain in force it is necessary that the provisions set out within the Act are complied with, the details of which are contained in the body of the report.

Finance

There will need to be the ability to enforce the PSPO and would be provided by Neighbourhood Wardens with the authorisation of Durham Constabulary staff. Costs for replacement signage will come from existing budgets.

Consultation

Consultation was carried out over a 24-day period and was available through social media as it affects all areas of the County. Appendix 2 provides the responses to the public consultation.

Equality and Diversity / Public Sector Equality Duty

The prohibitions and requirements on dogs and dog walkers has no specific impact on any protected group with the sole exception of people with disabilities. The impact is mitigated by exempting any person through the regulations:

The offence does not apply to a person who is registered as a blind person in a register compiled under section 29 of the National Assistance Act 1948, or to a person who has a disability which affects his mobility, manual dexterity, physical co-ordination or ability to lift, carry or otherwise move everyday objects, in respect of a dog trained by Dogs for the Disabled (registered charity number 700454), Support

Dogs (registered charity number 1088281) or Canine Partners for Independence (registered charity number 803680) and upon which he relies for assistance.

Climate Change

None.

Human Rights

None.

Crime and Disorder

These issues affect public confidence in the Police and Council to tackle issues that are important to them and the extended PSPO would maintain offences. The Police support the extension of the order.

Staffing

None.

Accommodation

None.

Risk

None.

Procurement

None.

Appendix 2: Consultation Results

PSPO: Dog Control Order Survey 2020

Executive Summary

- There were 232 returns of the PSPO: Dog Control Order survey, carried out between 31st March 2020 and 24th April 2020.
- 98% agreed with the proposal to extend the existing order for a further three years.
- 96% of dog owners agreed with the proposal to extend the existing order for a further three years.
- Over four in five feel they would be positively affected by the proposal to extend the existing order by a further three years.
- Under 2% feel they would be negatively affected by the proposal to extend the existing order by a further three years.
- Over three-quarters of dog owners feel they would be positively affected by the proposal to extend the existing order by a further three years.
- The main comments were that 'irresponsible owners/dog muck are a problem' (37 responses), that we should 'extend or they agree with PSPO' (33 responses) and to 'punish irresponsible owners/enforce regulations' (29 responses).

Appendix 2: Tables

Format of response

Format	Frequency	Percent
PC	72	31%
Mobile	121	52%
Tablet	39	17%
Total	232	100%

Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to extend the existing order for a further three years?

Agreement level	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	210	91%
Agree	16	7%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	0%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly disagree	4	2%
Total	231	100%

If you disagree, please state why.

Reason	Frequency
Should be extended	2
Should include cats	1
Increase fines/action/legislation	1
Total	4

Agreement with the proposal to extend the existing order for a further three years by dog ownership.

Dog owner	Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to extend the existing order for a further three years?		Total
	Agree	Not 'Agree'	
Yes	96%	4%	112
No	98%	2%	109

Agreement with the proposal to extend the existing order for a further three years by gender.

Gender	Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to extend the existing order for a further three years?		Total
	Agree	Not 'Agree'	
Male	99%	1%	81
Female	98%	2%	135

Agreement with the proposal to extend the existing order for a further three years by age.

Age group	Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to extend the existing order for a further three years?		Total
	Agree	Not 'Agree'	
U65	98%	2%	167
65+	98%	2%	50

Agreement with the proposal to extend the existing order for a further three years by disability status.

Disability status	Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to extend the existing order for a further three years?		Total
	Agree	Not 'Agree'	
Disabled	96%	4%	45
Not disabled	99%	1%	171

Do you feel you would be positively or negatively affected by the proposal to extend the existing order by a further three years?

Affect	Frequency	Percent
Positively affected	189	82%
Not affected	38	16%
Negatively affected	4	2%
Total	231	100%

If you would be negatively affected, please state why

Reason	Frequency
Dog must be on lead	1
Increased dog fouling	1
Increased responsible ownership	1
Not enforced	1
Reputation damage to responsible dog walkers	1
Total	5

Effect of the proposal to extend the existing order by a further three years by dog ownership.

Dog owner	Do you feel you would be positively or negatively affected by the proposal to extend the existing order by a further three years?			Total
	Positively affected	Not affected	Negatively affected	
Yes	76%	20%	4%	113
No	86%	14%	0%	108

Effect of the proposal to extend the existing order by a further three years by gender.

Gender	Do you feel you would be positively or negatively affected by the proposal to extend the existing order by a further three years?			Total
	Positively affected	Not affected	Negatively affected	
Male	78%	18%	4%	82
Female	84%	15%	1%	134

Effect of the proposal to extend the existing order by a further three years by age.

Age group	Do you feel you would be positively or negatively affected by the proposal to extend the existing order by a further three years?			Total
	Positively affected	Not affected	Negatively affected	
U65	81%	17%	2%	167
65+	82%	16%	2%	50

Effect of the proposal to extend the existing order by a further three years by disability status.

Disability status	Do you feel you would be positively or negatively affected by the proposal to extend the existing order by a further three years?			Total
	Positively affected	Not affected	Negatively affected	
Disabled	78%	13%	9%	45
Not disabled	83%	17%	0%	171

Do you have any comments regarding the proposal to extend the existing order by a further three years?

Comment	Frequency
Irresponsible owners/dog muck a problem	37
Extend/agree with PSPO	33
Punish irresponsible owners/enforce regulations	29
Disapproval of irresponsible owners	21
Make permanent/long-term	12
Do bag disposal an issue	11
Extend to other areas	9
All dogs kept on lead	6
More visible wardens/monitoring	6
Implement ASAP	5
Publicise PSPO/raise awareness	5
Apply to other animals	3
Try not to restrict responsible dog	3

owners	
Comment about consultation	1
Create dog friendly areas	1
Give positive feedback	1
PSPO will be ineffective	1
Total	184

Are you a dog owner?

Dog walker	Frequency	Percent
Yes	113	51%
No	109	49%
Total	222	100%

Are you responding to this proposal as an individual, an organisation or a business?

Personal status	Frequency	Percent
County Durham resident	208	93%
Individual residing outside County Durham	9	4%
Organisation	4	2%
County councillor	1	0%
County Durham resident and business owner	2	1%
Total	224	100%

If you are responding as an organisation, please provide the name of the organisation.

Organisation	Frequency
Heritage Coast Partnership	1
Shildon Town Council	1
The Grove Community & Residents Association	1
Total	3

Are you:

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	82	38%
Female	135	62%
Total	217	100%

What is your age?

Age group	Frequency	Percent
Under 18	0	0%
18-24	3	1%
25-34	10	5%
35-44	37	17%
45-54	53	24%
55-64	65	30%
65-74	47	22%
75+	3	1%
Total	218	100%

Do you consider yourself to be a disabled person?

Disability status	Frequency	Percent
Disabled	46	21%
Not disabled	171	79%
Total	217	100%

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL

Durham County Council Dog Control Public Space Protection Order

Durham County Council by virtue of section 60 of The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime & Policing Act 2014 (the Act) being satisfied that the conditions set out in section 60 of the Act have been met hereby makes the following extension to the current county wide Public Space Protection Order.

General Provisions

- (1) The extension of the Order comes into force on 1st day of June 2020 and will remain in force for a further three years unless extended, varied or discharged by a further Order.
- (2) A person who fails to comply without reasonable excuse with any obligation imposed by this Order is guilty of a criminal offence by virtue of section 67(1) of the Act and is liable to a fine on summary conviction not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale.
- (3) A fixed penalty notice may be issued in accordance with section 68 of the Act as an alternative method of disposal of the offence.
- (4) The 'Land' is defined as any public place, within the local authority area shown edged red on the plan at Schedule 1, to which the public or any section of the public has access, on payment or otherwise, as of a right or virtue of expressed or implied permission.
- (5) 'A person who is responsible' is defined as a person who is in charge of a dog whether on a permanent or temporary basis at the time of the offence.
- (6) An 'Authorised Officer' for the purposes of this Order is defined as a person authorised by Durham Constabulary or a person authorised by Durham County Council.

Part 1

Part 1 of this Order applies to the Land.

(1) Fouling

A person who is responsible for a dog that defecates on the Land must remove the faeces from the Land immediately.

(2) Allowing a dog to stray

A person who is responsible for a dog must not permit, allow or fail to prevent the dog from being unaccompanied on the Land.

(3) Failing to place a dog on a lead when directed by an Authorised Officer

A person who is responsible for a dog must place the dog on a lead when directed to do so by an Authorised Officer.

Part 2

Part 2 of this Order applies only to fenced off play areas within the Land as set out in Schedule 2 (the 'Play Area').

(1) Allowing a dog into a Play Area

A person who is responsible for a dog must not permit, allow or fail to prevent the dog to enter the Play Area.

Exemption for Assistance Dogs

Where a person who is responsible for a dog wishes to rely upon an exemption set out in this Order, they must demonstrate that they satisfy the requirements of the exemption.

(1) Part 1 of this Order shall not apply to a person who is on the Register as blind or partially sighted and is responsible for an Assistance Dog.

(2) Part 2 of this Order shall not apply to a person who is on the Register and is responsible for an Assistance Dog.

(3) For the purposes of this Order the 'Register' is defined as a register compiled under section 29 of the National Assistance Act 1948.

(4) For the purposes of this Order an 'Assistance Dog' is defined as:

- a) a dog which has been trained to guide a blind or partially sighted person; or
- b) a dog which has been trained to assist a deaf person; or
- c) a dog which has been trained to assist a disabled person who has a disability that consists of epilepsy or otherwise affects the person's mobility, manual dexterity, physical co-ordination or ability to lift, carry or otherwise move everyday objects.

Made this 29th day of May 2020 by

the affixing of the Common Seal of the

County Council of Durham by Order:

.....

Authorised Signatory

(a permanent Officer of the County Council))

SCHEDULE 1



Map data sourced from multiple providers:
© Crown Copyright and database right 2011. Ordnance Survey 1A 100049055.
© 2011 Philips Ltd. DIGITAL MAP DATA © Collins BARTHOLOMEW LTD 2011.
Copyright © Landmark Information Group 2011.

Schedule 2

For the purposes of Part 2, the term 'Play Area' includes:

1. All play areas that are fenced off which are owned and operated by Durham County Council; and
2. The play areas listed below:

Barnard Castle Town Council

Barnard Castle Town Council	Bouch Way
Barnard Castle Town Council	Scar Top
Barnard Castle Town Council	Marwood Drive
Barnard Castle Town Council	Green Lane

Belmont Parish

Belmont Parish	Polar Drive Play area
Belmont Parish	Belmont Community Centre
Belmont Parish	Cheveley Park Play area
Belmont Parish	Polar Road Play area

Chilton Town Council

Chilton Town Council	Rushyford Park
Chilton Town Council	The Pentlands
Chilton Town Council	Miners Welfare Recreation Ground
Chilton Town Council	New South View
Chilton Town Council	Rushyford Park

Easington Colliery Parish Council

Easington Colliery Parish Council	Oak Road
Easington Colliery Parish Council	Memorial Park

East Hedleyhope Parish Council

East Hedleyhope Parish Council	East Hedleyhope
--------------------------------	-----------------

Edmondsley Parish Council

Edmondsley Parish Council	Edmondsley
---------------------------	------------

Evenwood Parish Council

Evenwood Parish Council	Ramshaw
Evenwood Parish Council	Evenwood

Ferryhill Town Council

Ferryhill Town Council	Dean Bank
Ferryhill Town Council	King George V Playing Field
Ferryhill Town Council	Mainsforth Sports Complex

Fishburn Parish Council

Fishburn Parish Council	Memorial Playing Field
-------------------------	------------------------

Framwellgate Moor Parish Council

Framwellgate Moor Parish Council	KGV play park
----------------------------------	---------------

Great Aycliffe Town Council

Great Aycliffe Town Council	West Park
Great Aycliffe Town Council	Horndale Park
Great Aycliffe Town Council	Simpasture Park
Great Aycliffe Town Council	Town Park
Great Aycliffe Town Council	Woodham Park
Great Aycliffe Town Council	Moore Lane Park
Great Aycliffe Town Council	St Oswalds
Great Aycliffe Town Council	Aycliffe Village
Great Aycliffe Town Council	Byerley Park
Great Aycliffe Town Council	Oakleaf Sports Complex
Great Aycliffe Town Council	Scott Place

Great Aycliffe Town Council	Cobblers Hall
Great Aycliffe Town Council	School Aycliffe

Haswell Parish Council

Haswell Parish Council	Hutton Grove
Haswell Parish Council	Hessewell Crescent
Haswell Parish Council	Windsor Terrace

Lanchester Parish Council

Lanchester Parish Council	Park House, Station Road
Lanchester Parish Council	Kitswell Road
Lanchester Parish Council	Hollinside
Lanchester Parish Council	Hurbuck

Middleton in Teesdale and Newbiggin Parish Council

Middleton in Teesdale and Newbiggin Parish Council	Wesley Terrace
--	----------------

Monk Hesleden Parish Council

Monk Hesleden Parish Council	Shaftesbury Avenue
Monk Hesleden Parish Council	High Hesleden Play Area
Monk Hesleden Parish Council	Corry Close
Monk Hesleden Parish Council	Hesleden Play Area (Scheme Houses)
Monk Hesleden Parish Council	Hart Crescent

North Lodge Parish Council

North Lodge Parish Council	Low Flatts
----------------------------	------------

Pelton Parish Council

Pelton Parish Council	Pelton Community Centre Thornton Lea Pocket Park
-----------------------	--

Satley Parish Council

Satley Parish Council	Glebeside
-----------------------	-----------

Seaham Town Council

Seaham Town Council	Seaham Town Park
Seaham Town Council	Deneside Park
Seaham Town Council	Welfare Edith Street (Dawdon)
Seaham Town Council	Parkside
Seaham Town Council	Rainton Street Play Area (Dawdon)
Seaham Town Council	Elgin Avenue
Seaham Town Council	Ropery Walk

Shildon Town Council

Shildon Town Council	Hackworth Park
----------------------	----------------

Shincliffe Parish

Shincliffe Parish Council	Shincliffe Play Area
---------------------------	----------------------

Spennymoor Town Council

Spennymoor Town Council	Tudhoe
Spennymoor Town Council	Byers Green
Spennymoor Town Council	Wood Street
Spennymoor Town Council	Kirk Merrington
Spennymoor Town Council	Jubilee Park

Stanhope Parish Council

Stanhope Parish Council	Ashcroft
Stanhope Parish Council	Crawleyside
Stanhope Parish Council	Daddy Shield

Thornley Parish Council

Thornley Parish Council	Galt Street
-------------------------	-------------

Trimdon Foundry Parish Council

Trimdon Foundry Parish Council	Memorial Park
--------------------------------	---------------

Trimdon Parish Council

Trimdon Parish Council	Trimdon Grange Play Park, Salters Lane, Trimdon Grange
Trimdon Parish Council	Trimdon Colliery

West Auckland Parish Council

West Auckland Parish Council	New Street (Oakley Cross) This is under DCC ownership
------------------------------	---

Witton le Wear Parish Council

Witton le Wear Parish Council	School Street
-------------------------------	---------------