

Haringey Council

Report for:	Cabinet 16.10.12	Item number	
--------------------	------------------	--------------------	--

Title:	Dog Control Orders
---------------	--------------------

Report authorised by :	Lyn Garner, Director of Place and Sustainability
-------------------------------	--

Lead Officer:	Joan Hancox, Head of Neighbourhood Services
----------------------	---


Ward(s) affected: All	Report for Key/Non Key Decision: Key Decision
------------------------------	---

1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 Cabinet is asked to consider the results of the consultation on Dog Control Orders and to approve the making of several Dog Control Orders.

2. Cabinet Member Introduction

- 2.1 Whilst we recognise that there are many responsible dog owners in the borough who wish to exercise their dogs, this needs to be balanced by the need for residents and children to play and enjoy our parks and open spaces. We also wish our borough to be a clean place to live and reduce the amount of dog fouling that takes place.
- 2.2 Residents, Friends of Parks and Safer Neighbourhood Teams have raised with us their concern over dogs that appear to be out of control and how intimidating this can be. Upon receiving this feedback we made it a council commitment to address these concerns. Specifically we made the following pledge:



“We will ensure all of our parks and open spaces are designated as Dog Control Areas, encouraging owners to look after their dogs and keep them under control.”

2.3 Consultation was conducted in the summer and the data has been evaluated. There is strong support for some of the orders that we consulted on but not for the complete exclusion of dogs from Russell Park, which had been part of the original proposals. With these orders in place and through joint working with the Police we can help people feel safer in the streets and in other public places.

2.4 I endorse the recommendations contained within this report which clearly demonstrate that Haringey will continue to be a welcoming place for responsible dog-owners and their pets.

3. Recommendations


3.1 That Cabinet approves the making of Dog Control Orders applicable to all land within the London Borough of Haringey which is open to the air and to which the public are entitled or permitted to have access (with or without payment) as follows:

- Dogs on Leads Order - dogs to be kept on a lead on roads, in car parks and cemeteries, and in parks and open spaces of less than half a hectare;
- Dogs on Leads by Direction Order - make it a requirement to place a dog on a lead when instructed to do so by an authorised officer;
- Fouling of Land by Dogs Order - make it an offence to fail to clean up after a dog; and
- Dogs (Specified Maximum) Order - limit to six the number of dogs that can be walked by an individual person.

3.2 That Cabinet approves the making of the following Dog Control Order related to specific areas as follows:

- Dogs Exclusion Order - dogs to be excluded from children’s playgrounds at all times and excluded from marked sports pitches when the pitches are in use.

Please see paragraph 5.6 for details.



4. Other options considered

4.1 Originally a pilot scheme was considered to introduce Dog Control Orders in five parks within the borough with dogs being completely excluded from Russell Park. Based on discussions and feedback from stakeholders it was felt that to be effective the scheme should be widened to cover the whole of the borough. In addition it was considered that the controls should extend to other land uses such as highways and land controlled by Homes for Haringey.

4.2 Other options were set out in the Cabinet Report in December 2011 including orders introduced by other boroughs and also a “do nothing” option.

5. Background

5.1 Cabinet agreed on 20th December 2011 to undertake formal consultation on a range of dog control orders. The report set out the concerns of stakeholders as well as outlining proposals for dog control orders and their enforcement, if approved. The proposed orders were as follows.

Dogs Exclusion Order


All public areas identified as children's playgrounds, sports courts, marked games areas and marked pitches when in use.

Dogs on Leads Order

- All roads, footpaths
- Car parks,
- Communal public areas on housing estates
- Small areas of land – less than half hectare (see appendix 2 for a list of parks and open spaces of less than half a hectare)
- Cemeteries, crematoriums and church yards

Dogs on Leads by Direction Order

This would apply to the whole borough and give designated officers the power to request that dogs are put on leads where they are not under the appropriate control of their owner or where they are causing damage or acting aggressively.



Fouling of Land by Dogs Order

This would apply to the whole borough and make dog fouling an enforceable offence.

- 5.2 Subsequently an informal information gathering exercise was carried out in April/May 2012. Feedback from this exercise recommended that dogs should not be wholly excluded from Russell Park as other proposals would be sufficient.


Consultation results

- 5.3 A detailed consultation was undertaken between 6th June and 20th July 2012 to ascertain the views of stakeholders and public opinion. We received 623 completed questionnaires and the consultation included some outreach work in parks and open spaces through which roughly 35% of the responses were obtained. A shortened analysis of the results are contained in Appendix 1. The full results, which include all the comments made will be available in the Cabinet Members room and will be put on our website.
- 5.4 The table below shows the results of the consultation for the proposed orders.

Table 1: Results of Dog Control Consultation June/July 2012

		Dog owner?		
		Yes	No	Total
		%	%	%
Make it an offence to fail to clear up after a dog	Agree	96%	99%	98%
	Disagree	4%	1%	2%
Dogs to be put on a lead when officially instructed	Agree	78%	96%	90%
	Disagree	22%	4%	10%
Dogs to be kept on leads at all times on all public roads...	Agree	59%	90%	79%
	Disagree	41%	10%	21%
Dogs not allowed on any public play grounds, sports cour...	Agree	66%	88%	80%
	Disagree	34%	12%	20%
Limit to number of dogs walked by one person	Agree	76%	87%	83%
	Disagree	24%	13%	17%

- 5.5 Cabinet should note that the third question in Table 1 above reads in full, “ Dogs to be kept on leads at all times on all public roads, car parks, cemeteries and in small areas of land less than half a hectare.” Also that the fourth question reads in full, “Dogs not allowed on any public playgrounds, sports courts, games areas or marked pitches – when in use – in parks and open spaces.”



5.6 This demonstrates that there is majority support for each kind of dog control order, with non-dog owners being more in favour than dog owners. Nevertheless, the majority of dog owners are also in support of the introduction and enforcement of the orders. The main area of concern was around whether the orders will be enforced in a sensible and positive way. Specifically questions were raised on whether Dog Control Orders will deal with “real problems” or whether they will merely be additional regulations to be ignored by what is perceived to be a minority of irresponsible owners and their often aggressive dogs. Dog owners and other park users comment on groups of younger people who actively encourage and train their dogs to become aggressive.

5.7 In general there are positive views on the Dog Control Orders as proposed in Haringey. Some dog owners are concerned about having to keep dogs on leads in small areas of land. In addition, some disagree with the limit of 6 dogs as this is seen as too many. Therefore, it is being recommended that Cabinet approves the making of Dog Control Orders applicable to all land within the London Borough of Haringey which is open to the air and to which the public are entitled or permitted to have access (with or without payment) as follows:

- Dogs on Leads Order - dogs to be kept on a lead on roads, in car parks and cemeteries, and in parks and open spaces of less than half a hectare;
- Dogs on Leads by Direction Order - make it a requirement to place a dog on a lead when instructed to do so by an authorised officer;
- Fouling of Land by Dogs Order - make it an offence to fail to clean up after a dog; and
- Dogs (Specified Maximum) Order - limit to six the number of dogs that can be walked by an individual person.

5.8 It is also recommended that Cabinet approves the making of the following Dog Control Order:

- Dogs Exclusion Order - dogs to be excluded from children’s playgrounds at all times and excluded from marked sports pitches when the pitches are in use.

5.9 A 28 day Consultation Public Notice detailing the proposals for Dog Control Orders was published on 14th September 2012. To date there have been no responses to this Public Notice. The Notice period closes on 12th October 2012. The details of any




responses that may have been received by this date will be provided at Cabinet.

- 5.10 It is planned to implement the Dog Control Orders in a phased process between November 2012 and end of March 2013. Dog Control Orders will be made under delegated powers by the Head of Neighbourhood Services following the Dog Control Orders (Procedures) Regulations 2006 which require notices to be published in local newspapers before the Dog Control Orders can be made. Once the Dog Control Orders have been made there will be press releases, articles in Haringey People, web-site information, signs, stalls at Area Forums and patrols to support the message that the Dog Control Orders are in place and to encourage compliance.
- 5.11 It is likely that the Government will introduce legislation changing the basis for dog control orders as part of the revision of anti-social behaviour orders in this Parliament. This is currently expected to be in Spring 2013. The change in legislation is not expected to invalidate the proposed dog control orders.

Enforcement

- 5.12 On enforcement the expectation is that the enforcement of dogs behaving aggressively will be led by the Police and that activity will reflect policing priorities agreed for each of the Safer Neighbourhood Teams. The main initial focus will be on locations where dog control has historically been identified as an issue. The Police have agreed to undertake regular joint operations with the Council on enforcement of the orders once they are introduced.
- 5.13 The Council's Neighbourhood Action Team (NAT) and Homes for Haringey staff will be trained to enforce the orders and become authorised officers. The NATS Officers will be tasked with monitoring other exclusions and prohibitions and enforcement here will be led by the Council but will require police support in most cases. In addition, the Council has access to Waltham Forest's Dog Warden Team as part of the Regulatory Shared Services arrangements which can also bolster enforcement of the orders, although this will have to be for specific operations rather than general monitoring.




6 Comments of the Chief Financial Officer and financial Implications

- 6.1 It is expected that the costs of implementing the recommendations can be met within existing budgets. These include costs of signage, advertisements and consultation. If costs exceed the available budget then this will be reported to Cabinet through the normal budget process.

7 Head of Legal Services and Legal Implications

-
- 7.1 A Dog Control Order may be made under Section 55 of the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 in respect of any land which is open to the air and to which the public are entitled or permitted to have access (with or without payment). Exemptions exist (e.g. to the registered blind). There is a requirement that they be proportionate to the problem identified. It is function for the executive by default.
- 7.2 The Dog Control Orders (Procedures) Regulations 2006 set out the procedure for making such orders including the requirement to consult as outlined in the body of this report. Failure to consult properly or to have due regard to what is proportionate could result in a legal challenge.
- 7.3 The Dog Control Orders (Prescribed Offences and Penalties, etc.) Regulations 2006 creates offences for those in charge of a dog in circumstances covered by an Order (subject to the defence of reasonable excuse) attaching a maximum fine of £1000 in the Magistrates Court. Fixed penalty notices can be issued instead of prosecution. The permitted range is £50-£80 but £75 is the default amount if left unspecified. The offences are:
- (a) failing to remove dog faeces;
 - (b) not keeping a dog on a lead;
 - (c) not putting, and keeping, a dog on a lead when directed to do so by an authorised officer;
 - (d) taking a dog onto, or permitting a dog to enter land from which dogs are excluded; and,
 - (e) taking more than a specified number of dogs onto land.
- 7.4 Haringey currently has in place a designation made under the Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996 which will remain in force until such time as a Dog Control Order is made for any of the five offences on the same land. This provides for a Fixed Penalty Notice of £50. If any order is made under 7.1 above, then the



local authority will need to make a Dog Control Order for fouling of land as is proposed here.

7.5 Enforcement can be undertaken by appropriately authorised Council Officers or the Police, although enforcement without police support is unlikely to be effective.

7.6 The Dog Control Orders (Procedures) Regulations provides a legal requirement that, where practicable, signs must be placed summarising the order on land to which a new order applies, thereby informing the public that land is subject to an order. For Parks and similar land this can be by signage placed at entrances, for other locations signage is required at 'regular intervals'.

8 Equalities and Community Cohesion Comments

8.1 Dog control orders affect all users of the highway, parks and open spaces. No specific community group is adversely affected by this type of order. Exemptions exist for the registered blind.

9 Head of Procurement Comments

9.1 Comments are not required in this report


10 Policy Implications

10.1 A consultation on Dog Control Orders is an agreed policy of the Council.

11 Reasons for Decision

11.1 Residents, Friends of Parks and Safer Neighbourhood Teams have raised with us their concern over dogs that appear to be out of control and how intimidating this can be. The need for responsible dog owners to exercise their dogs must be balanced with the need for residents to be able to enjoy public spaces that are free of dog fouling and where dogs are kept under control by their owners.

11.2 Based on the results of the consultation work undertaken by the Council there is strong support for making dog control orders. The recommendations in this report will provide the framework to achieve the required outcomes.



Haringey Council
12

Use of Appendices

Appendix 1 – Results of Formal Consultation

Appendix 2 - List of parks and open spaces of less than half a hectare

13 Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Minutes from Responsible Dog Ownership Project Board

Cabinet Report on Dog Control Orders – 20 December 2012

DOG CONTROL ORDERS CONSULTATION

FINAL DATA ANALYSIS REPORT August 01 2012

INTRODUCTION

Following an informal information-gathering exercise in April / May; the official consultation commenced early June and ran until 23 July. 623 completed questionnaires were received by the closing date.

About 35% of responses were obtained through interviews 'on location' in parks; 40% through the post - often as a result of respondents collecting questionnaires from the interviewer, while the remaining 25% were completed online. Many questionnaires were distributed with the help of the Parks Department, Homes for Haringey, Libraries and Area Forums.

In-house resources have been used for the management and operation of the consultation and as a result, direct costs have been minimised. The only direct cost incurred was that of printing the consultation document.

Much of the analysis in this report is presented with reference to whether or not respondents are dog owners. Dog owners and non-owners have differing perspectives on a number of issues but there is also considerable common ground on matters such as aggressive dogs, irresponsible owners, and the problem of owners failing to clean up dog mess.

The analysis identifies extensive support for Dog Control Orders (DCOs) as proposed in Haringey; but also some concern at whether these will be enforced in a sensible and positive way. Specifically questions are raised on whether DCOs will deal with the 'real problems', or whether they will merely be additional regulations to be ignored by what many parks users see as the hard core of irresponsible owners and their often aggressive dogs. Dog owners and other parks users comment on groups of younger people who actively encourage and train their dogs to become aggressive.

TECHNICAL NOTE

Research surveys are designed statistically to be representative of the 'target population' and may be *weighted* to represent the total population, as with public opinion polls. Consultations can be similarly statistically adjusted and weighted, but in general they consist of a self-selected 'sample' which may or may not be representative of the wider population.

In the present instance, we are satisfied that views are representative of parks users because so many responses have been obtained through interviews in the parks and distributing of questionnaires to those users who did not have the time or inclination for an 'on site' interview. This method of data collection also has the advantage of providing first hand information from individual parks users and dog owners/walkers

DATA ANALYSIS

By questions

Q1 Name of road in which you live

Q2. Do you or others in your household currently have a dog?

Of the 623 responses; 36% are from those who do not have a dog, and 64% from dog owners.

		Count	%
Dog owner?	Yes	226	36%
	No	397	64%
Total		623	100%

Q3. Which local parks or open spaces do you most often visit for exercise or recreational purposes?

Haringey has many parks, walks and open spaces which are valued and enjoyed both by residents and by the many users from outside the Borough:


Alexandra Palace / park
 Finsbury Park
 Priory Park
 Markfield (Crowland)
 Highgate Woods
 Not stated
 Finsbury Gdns
 Parkland Walk
 Queens Wood
 Bruce Castle Park
 Other local space
 Downhills
 Albert Road Rec
 Stationers
 Lordship Rec
 Chestnuts
 Coldfall Woods
 Cemetery / playing fields

Woodside
 Russell Park
 Springfield
 Belmont
 Hampstead Heath
 Ducketts Common
 Durnsford
 River Lea towpath
 Hidden River path
 Tower Gardens
 Waterlow Park
 Noel Park
 Avenue Gdns
 Durnsford
 Broomfield
 Wood Green Common
 Nightingale Gdns

The single most important problem cited by both dog owners and non owners on their visits to parks and open spaces is that of irresponsible dog owners failing to clean up the mess left by dogs. Those who do not have dogs are also concerned about what they see as dogs not being effectively supervised. This is seen as a separate issue to that of clearly aggressive and 'status' dogs.

Q4. Do you consider any of the following to be a problem in your local area?

The bar chart below gives a summary visual overview, while the table sets out greater detail. Respondents can identify as many as they think appropriate



	Dog owner?	
	No	Yes
	%	%
Dog fouling	90%	90%
Dogs not kept under adequate supervision by their owners	74%	55%
Dogs running around areas where children play	64%	23%
Aggressive behaviour by dogs	51%	48%
Dog fighting	27%	21%

There is agreement amongst the broad majority of respondents that that dog mess is a widespread problem. Similarly, there is shared concern at the incidence of aggressive behaviour by dogs.


There is rather less consensus over the question of dogs running round areas where children play. Comments by non-owners suggest that in many cases the mere presence of dogs tends to be frightening for children; and that dog owners may fail to appreciate this.

Dog owners comment that their dogs need exercise and do not need to be kept permanently on leads. Clearly there are differing views between owners and non owners on this aspect.

Q5. Please identify those DCOs you think should be applied in your area.

The bar chart gives a visual overview. The subsequent table provides more detail grouped by dog owners and non-owners.

Which DCOs should apply locally?




	Dog owner?			
	Yes		No	
	Count	%	Count	%
An offence to fail to clean up after a dog	204	93%	348	89%
Maximum of 6 dogs that can be walked by one person	139	63%	255	65%
Dogs must be put on a lead when officially instructed to do so	144	65%	242	62%
Dogs must be kept on a lead	39	18%	218	56%
Dogs should be excluded (not allowed at all)	9	4%	128	33%
None of these should apply	7	3%	9	2%

There is shared majority agreement amongst parks users on application of three DCOs. Around 90% of all users agree it should be an offence not to clean up dog mess. A substantial majority agree on having a limit to numbers that can be walked by one individual. The figures on this aspect would be higher except that many respondents consider 6 to be an excessively generous limit. Most consider 4 to be a more sensible limit.

Where there is disagreement is over the suggestions that dogs should be kept on the lead, and that dogs should be excluded. 33% of non-owners consider dogs should be excluded from specific areas in local parks; whereas just 4% of dog owners accept there is any case for exclusion.

Q6. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the following controls suggested for Haringey

Agree or disagree with these proposed DCOs



In general there are positive views on the DCO controls as proposed for Haringey. Some dog owners are concerned about having to keep dogs on leads in small areas of land, as discussed above, many disagree with the limit of 6 dogs being walked by one person because they think it should be less than this.

Looking at these results by dog owners and non-owners there is majority agreement on all the DCOs as proposed for the Borough. However on some DCO proposals there is markedly lower agreement from dog-owners.

		Dog owner?		
		Yes	No	Total
		%	%	%
Make it an offence to fail to clear up after a dog	Agree	96%	99%	98%
	Disagree	4%	1%	2%
Dogs to be put on a lead when officially instructed	Agree	78%	96%	90%
	Disagree	22%	4%	10%
Dogs to be kept on leads at all times on all public roads...	Agree	59%	90%	79%
	Disagree	41%	10%	21%
Dogs not allowed on any public play grounds, sports cour...	Agree	66%	88%	80%
	Disagree	34%	12%	20%
Limit to number of dogs walked by one person	Agree	76%	87%	83%
	Disagree	24%	13%	17%

Q11. Summary of comments

The table below shows comments made by respondents grouped into categories. This summary of themes from respondents' comments helps to illustrate the context of results set out in the charts and tables for the questions above. Further illustration and context is provided in Q12 which lists all the comments by individual respondents and with their local parks identified.

If we were to offer a single paragraph summary of comments it would be along the lines of: *DCOs are necessary but how would they deal with the real problem of out-of-control dogs and dog poo lying around and not be an ineffective set of regulations ignored by the worst offenders but penalising responsible dog owners.*

	Dog owner?	
	Yes	No
	%	%
No comments offered	36%	50%
Concern that DCOs will simply target responsible dog owners	24%	4%
How will DCOs deal with aggressive dogs and/or their irresponsible owners who ignore the rules ?	12%	9%
Dog poo not cleared up - lots lying around - need bags and more bins provided	6%	9%
Agree with the need for controls and fines for irresponsible owners	7%	6%
Alarming if dogs are not properly restrained or controlled - they should be on leads	3%	8%
How will the council enforce DCOs fairly and effectively? No action currently taken.	4%	4%
Other	5%	3%
The limit should be much less than six	1%	5%
Micro-chipping, tagging, muzzling or other form of control needed	3%	3%
Total	100%	100%

Appendix 2 Dog Control Orders - Cabinet Report 18.9.12

Parks and open spaces for proposed Dogs on Lead Order

Small areas of land – less than half a hectare		
Site Name	Post Code Area	Comments/Location
Adams Road To Lordship Lane	N17	Side of footpath
Archway Beds	N6	Archway Rd Opp Police Station
Aylmer Gardens	N6	jnct Aylmer Rd, Sheldon Ave & North Hill
Barratt Gardens	N22	Junction Station Road and Mayes Road
Bidwell Gardens	N11	Side of Sunshine Garden Centre Durnsford Road
Blaenhaven Gardens	N22	Junction Fortis Green and Eastern Road
Bounds Green Baptist Church	N22	Front of church jnct Bounds Green Rd and Braemar Ave
Brook Street Playground	N17	Stoneleigh Road
Brunswick Road Open Space	N15	Open Space
Campsbourne Bank	N8	Rectory Gardens/High Street
Caxton Terracc	N22	Station Road / Parkland Road
Chapmans Green	N22	Junction Lordship Lane and Perth Road
Chapmans Green	N22	
Christchurch Hedge	N8	Crescent Road/Crouch End Hill
Cline Road	N22	Cline Road Bounds Green Road
Clyde Road South	N15	Junction Lawrence Road and Bedford Road
Coleridge Gardens	N6	Shepherds Hill/Archway Road
Colney Hatch Lane	N10	Roadside verge
Crescent Road Gardens	N19	Junction Crouch End Hill
Doran Manor Strip	N2	Great North Road Opp Woodside Ave
Downhills Recreation Grnd (Outside)	N15	Outside Downhills Recreation Ground Belmont Road
Durnsford Road Verges	N11	Durnsford Road including Rhys Ave frontage
Durnsford Rockery	N11	Junction of Durnsford Road and Wroxham Gardens
Falkland Fairfax Open Space	N8	Junction Wightman Road and Falkland Road
Finsbury Gardens	N22	Finsbury Road btwn Nightingale Road and Truro Road
Florence Gardens	N4	Junction Upper Tollington Park
Graham Road	N15	Triangle
Granville Road Gardens	N4	Granville/Stapleton Hall Road
Granville Road	N22	Open space
Great North Rd Islands	N2	Gt Nth Rd/Aylmer Rd/Archway Rd
Green Gate Common	N15	Opp Ducketts Common
Greenridings Telephone Exchange	N22	High Road/Bounds Green Rd
Grove Lodge Gardens Frontage	N10	Grove Lodge Gardens Frontage Muswell Hill
Harcourt Gardens	N22	Junction Durnsford Road/Albert Road opp Albert Rec
High Road No 294	N22	Corner of Canning Crescent
High Road Gardens	N22	Opposite Civic Centre, Between High Rd/Stuart Crest
High Street Enclosure	N8	High Street Cross Lane
High Street Playground	N8	Hornsey High St opp Middle Lane. Site relandscaped
Hornsey Lane Triangles	N19	Junction Hornsey Lane and Crouch End Hill
Hospital Common	N15	Between Tottenham Green East and High Road.

Small areas of land – less than half a hectare		
Site Name	Post Code Area	Comments/Location
Ivatt Way to Belmont Road	N22	Space between Ivatt Way/Belmont Rd
Kingsley Place	N6	Junction Southwood Lane
Lordship Recreation	N17	Outside Main Gates
Lydford Road Island	N15	Oulton Road
Lynton Gardens	N11	Junction Blake Road
Marsh Lane	N17	Roadside verge
Middlesex Cricket Entrance	N8	Park Road
Midhurst Gardens	N10	Junction Fortis Green and Midhurst Ave
Muswell Hill Banks	N10	Near subway north and south
Muswell Hill Peace Gardens	N6	Junction Archway Rd/Muswell Hill Road
Neville Place	N22	Neville Place/High Rd N btwn Trinity and Commerce Rds
New Road Recreation Ground	N22	Between New Road and Norman Avenue
Newnham Slips	N22	Behind Woodside Park from school to White Hart Lane
Page Green Common	N15	Between Ashmount Road and Broad Lane
Page Green Terrace Borders	N15	High Road rom Pembroke Road to Townsend Road
Palace Gardens	N22	Junction of Albert Rd/Alexandra Park Rd
Palace Gates Road	N22	Palace Gates Road junction Crescent Road
Park Grove	N11	Open space
Park House Passage	N6	Park House Passage off North Hill
Park Rd Beds & Maynard Gdns	N8	Junction Park Road and Palace Road
Priory Common	N8	Priory Rd roadside verge Park Ave North to Redston
Pulford Rd	N15	North End Open Space
Rangemoor/ Herbert Rd	N15	Open Space
Rectory Gardens	N8	Hornsey High Street/Rectory Gardens
Rokesly Gardens	N8	Tottenham Lane/Rokesly Avenue
Russell Park	N22	Russell Avenue
Ryecroft Way	N17	Open space
Seven Sisters Gardens	N15	Junction of Manchester Rd and Heysham Rd
Shelbourne Junction	N17	Jnct Lansdowne Road
Sheldon Avenue	N6	North end open space
Shepherds Hill Gardens	N6	Shepherds Hill
Somerford Grove Play Area	N17	Adjacent green space
Somerset Gardens	N6	Roadside verge
Southwood Lane	N6	
Springfield Park	N11	Park Road
St Georges Hall	N8	Cranley Gardens / Park Road
St. Albans Crescent	N22	Junction Cranbrook Park
Stainby Road	N15	Junction Monument Way
Stanley Road	N15	Open space
The Drive	N11	Small areas parallel with Bounds Green Road
The Green School Open Space	N17	Somerset Road /Fairbanks Road
The Linkway	N4	Between Eade Road and Vale Road
The Mansions	N22	Junction Palace Gates Road and Alexandra Park Road
The Tunnel	N11	Blake Road
Tiverton Road	N15	Playing Field
Tottenham Lane Triangle	N8	Junction Tottenham Lane and Church Road

Small areas of land – less than half a hectare		
Site Name	Post Code Area	Comments/Location
Tottenham Lane(C E G B)	N8	Opposite 60 - 86 Tottenham Lane
Town Hall Common	N17	Common Q9, Town Hall Approach Road/High Rd
Tunnel Gardens	N11	Wroxham Gardens
Twyford Avenue	N22	Grass verge
Walpole Road Triangles	N17	Walpole Road Triangles
West Green Common	N15	Junction of West Green Rd and Philip Lane and Spur Rd
Williams Close Triangle	N8	Avenue Rd Williams Cl Crescent Rd
Wood Green Crown Court	N22	Lordship Lane (part site)
Woodlands Gardens	N8	Haslemere Road Crouch End Hill
Woods Path	N8	Park Road Opp Park Ave South
Woodside Gardens	N6	Jnct Fordington Road/Woodside Ave
Wycombe Road	N17	Junction Lansdowne Road

