

Draft Dog Control Bylaw & Policy: Summary of feedback

To support hearings and deliberations 29 July 2021

Table of contents


- 1.1 Summary of feedback received 3
- 1.2 Summary of submitters..... 3
 - 1.2.1 *Submitters who support the draft Dog Control Bylaw and/or Policy as presented* 5
 - 1.2.2 *Submitters who do not support the draft Dog Control Bylaw and/or Policy as presented* 6
- 1.3 Other comments / those who did not state a preference 11

1.1 Summary of feedback received

Public consultation on the draft Dog Control Bylaw and Policy was undertaken from 11 June to 11 July 2021.

- 28 submissions were received on time. There was one late submissions received as at 13 July 2021.
- Three submissions indicated they wanted to be heard (one no longer wishing to be heard, and two attending as at 21 July).
- Eight submissions supported the draft Dog Control Bylaw as presented. 12 submissions did not support draft Dog Control Bylaw as presented.
- 11 submissions supported the draft Dog Control Policy as presented. 11 submissions did not support draft Dog Control Policy as presented.
- Seven submissions did not state a preference.
- The reasons given by submitters for their preference are provided in tables 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 Comments from those who did not state a preference are provided under section 1.3.

1.2 Summary of submitters



<u>Supports the draft Dog Control Bylaw as presented</u>		<u>Supports the draft Dog Control Policy as presented</u>		<u>Does not support the draft Dog Control Bylaw as presented</u>		<u>Does not support the draft Dog Control Policy as presented</u>		<u>Did not state a preference</u>	
Submitter name	Page number	Submitter name	Page number	Submitter name	Page number	Submitter name	Page number	Submitter name	Page number
Barnett, Lindsay	5	Barr, Kathryn	6	Avnit, Adi	4	Avnit, Adi	4	Aldwin, Stacey	3
Brake, Greg & Elaine	7	Brake, Greg & Elaine	7	Barr, Kathryn	6	Barnett, Lindsay	5	Burgess, Robin	9
Bruorton, Adair	8	Bruorton, Adair	8	Dron, Sharon	15	Dron, Sharon	15	Central South Island	10
Cullimore, Heather	13	Cullimore, Heather	13	Galbraith, Jodene	16	Gardiner, Allan	17	Fish & Game Council	
Hall, Carol	19	Galbraith, Jodene	16	Hallenstein, Ben	18	Hall, Carol	19	Doel, Len	14
Lake Clearwater Hut holders Association	25	Hallenstein, Ben	18	Hunt, Annette	23	Howden, Jacqui & David	21	Elms, Dianne	43
McIntosh, Tessa	35	Howden, Jacqui & David	21	Hunt, Gavin	24	Lewthwaite, Sam	26	Hoare, Charlotte	20
Quinn, Marie	37	Hunt, Annette	23	Lewthwaite, Sam	26	McAtamney, Megan	28	Ruth, Hannah	39
		Hunt, Gavin	24	McAtamney, Megan	28	Prince, Sam	36		
		Lake Clearwater Hut holders Association	25	Prince, Sam	36	Trotter, Duane	40		
		McIntosh, Tessa	35	Trotter, Duane	40	Woods, Rachael	41		
		Quinn, Marie	37	Woods, Rachael	41				

1.2.1 Submitters who support the draft Dog Control Bylaw and/or Policy as presented

Submitter name	Page number	Summary	Staff comments
Bruorton, Adair Hall, Carol McIntosh, Tessa Quinn, Marie	<p>8</p> <p>19</p> <p>35</p> <p>37</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thinks it is good to have more dog exercise areas. (McIntosh) • Believes the policy is reasonable and practical. (Bruorton) • Agrees with the proposed changes to keep people safe. Notes that most dogs are nice but not all, and thinks it is a shame that the few spoil it for everybody. (Quinn) • Agrees that dogs should be kept under the control of their owners. (Hall) • Agrees that dogs should not be allowed onto playground areas. (Hall) 	<p><i>Strategy and Compliance:</i></p> <p>Supports this stance and thanks the submitters</p> <p><i>Open Spaces:</i></p> <p>Supports the stance if dogs not being allowed onto playground areas.</p>
Cullimore, Heather	<p>13</p>	<p>Submitters support North East Ashburton exercise area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks Council for acknowledging concerns of owners and proposing new dog park off Company Rd. States that it is particularly relevant given the dog park on the river will be out of action for the foreseeable future. (Cullimore) • Requests rubbish bins, drinking water for dogs, identifiable parking and seating for owners at the new exercise area. (Cullimore) • Proposes the area is named the “Tom Stapleton Dog Park”, as Tom was one of the most frequent visitors to the area with his dogs and has since passed away. (Cullimore) 	<p><i>Strategy and Compliance:</i></p> <p>Thanks the submitter for their support.</p> <p>Dog Parks are large fenced areas specifically designed for dogs to be exercised long term in a secure area and are therefore provided with such facilities as water supply and identifiable parking. Whereas dog exercise areas enable owners to let their dogs off leash when out walking in public, as long as the dog(s) can be kept under effective control in that area. Exercise areas are therefore not normally afforded the extensive facilities of a dog park but where budgets allow we will provide bins and waste bags in support. The suggestion for naming the area would require further discussion.</p>
Brake, Greg & Elaine Bruorton, Adair Lake Clearwater Hut holders Association	<p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>25</p>	<p>Submitters support Lake Clearwater & Camp prohibited areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the inclusion of Lake Clearwater shores, as it means there is consistency with Department of Conservation policy. (Bruorton) 	<p><i>Strategy and Compliance:</i></p> <p>Supports this stance and thanks the submitters.</p>

Submitter name	Page number	Summary	Staff comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes it will be simpler for dog owners to understand that they are unable to bring their dogs into the settlement and whole foreshore area at Clearwater. (Bruorton) • Believes it will help to better protect the wildlife on the Lake and foreshore of Clearwater, in particular the crested grebes. (Bruorton) • Supports the current policy for no dogs around Lake Camp reserve area, Lake Clearwater hut area, and Lake Clearwater shores. Notes that this helps in protecting wildlife in the area. (Lake Clearwater Hutholders Association) • Supports the bylaw prohibiting dogs at Lake Camp, Lake Clearwater and reserve and village areas. Would like to see this policed as hutholders and lots of visitors still bring dogs up there. Notes that it is well known that the Council won't do anything about it. (Brake, Greg & Elaine) 	

1.2.2 Submitters who do not support the draft Dog Control Bylaw and/or Policy as presented

Submitter name	Page number	Summary	Staff comments
Avnit, Adi	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that Council cannot manage the current law. (Trotter) 	<p><i>Strategy and Compliance:</i></p> <p>1. Animal control staff regularly conduct patrols to monitor and enforce compliance of legislation. Additionally, when a breach of legislation is reported to Council, animal control staff will investigate and take action accordingly.</p> <p>2. Within the district there are a range of areas where owners may wish to take their dogs, however for specific reasons (e.g. health and safety, hygiene, wildlife and environmental protection) dog access controls are considered necessary, this also includes dogs being prohibited from</p>
Galbraith, Jodene	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to prohibited areas as they are supposed to be 'family friendly' and the dog is part of the family. (Lewthwaite, Galbraith) 	
Gardiner, Allan	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would rather leave existing bylaw and policy in effect. (Avnit) 	
Lewthwaite, Sam	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes all dogs should be compulsory micro-chipped. (Gardiner) 	
Trotter, Duane	40		

Submitter name	Page number	Summary	Staff comments
			<p>any public place not under the control of council.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p> <p>4. The Dog Control (microchip transponder) Regulations 2005 requires all dogs first registered from 1 July 2006 (except working farm dogs) to be microchipped. Additionally requires all unregistered dogs that are impounded to be microchipped on release as well as dogs classified dangerous or menacing.</p>
<p>Barnett, Lindsay McAtamney, Megan</p>	<p>5 28</p>	<p>Submitters opposed to North East Ashburton exercise area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes the north east area has been underutilised since Council started enforcing leash rules. (Barnett) • Does not agree with North East Ashburton exercise area – no parking on Company Rd. (Barnett) • Does not see why the business estate is unsuitable. Questions how many incidents have occurred there. (Barnett) • Submitter believes that without the area being fenced off, the space continues to be part of the public area used by many people with or without dogs. Notes that dogs can be unpredictable and that safety cannot be guaranteed for other users in the area. (McAtamney) • Submitter states that there are many conflicting activities and believes issues will not be alleviated without fencing as these occur on the sealed pathway included in the proposed area. (McAtamney) • Does not believe that owners will use the area correctly. (McAtamney) • Believes the Council does not need to make changes just because a petition was received. Notes that this is a health and safety matter and that we will continue to see a trend of serious incidents in the future. (McAtamney) 	<p><i>Strategy and Compliance:</i></p> <p>Dog exercise areas enable owners to let their dogs off leash when out walking in public areas, providing the dog(s) can be kept under effective control in that area. This area will be patrolled to ensure compliance of the above.</p> <p>To fence off the area and designate it as a dog park would deter the general public from using the area.</p>
<p>Galbraith, Jodene</p>	<p>16</p>	<p>Submitters opposed to Ashton Beach being prohibited</p>	<p><i>Open Spaces:</i></p> <p>This prohibited area does not apply to the whole of Ashton Beach.</p>

Submitter name	Page number	Summary	Staff comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes there are already limited places to take dogs on family friendly adventures. (Galbraith) • Notes that not all dogs enjoy dog parks and that no dog parks have water for dogs to swim. (Galbraith) • Notes that the Ashburton River is unsafe for dogs with algal blooms, and believes Lake Hood is in a bad state. (Galbraith) 	<p>The prohibited area is part of a small part of an Area of Significant Conservation Value (ASCV A65) identified in the District Plan. The District Plan states this is because there are nationally significant populations of a number of bird species within this area with a wide range of species concentrated at the river mouth. This is supported by a recent Ashburton Rivermouth Bird Monitoring report (attached). The presence of dogs is more likely to disturb the breeding and resting behaviours of birds in this area.</p> <p><i>Strategy & Compliance:</i></p> <p>The provision of sufficient water for dogs to swim in would create health and safety risks for both the general public and animals.</p> <p>Council staff are regularly informed by ECan and Public Health of algal blooms and will post media warnings and signage to alert the public.</p>
<p>Hallenstein, Ben Howden, Jacqui & David Lewthwaite, Sam Trotter, Duane Woods, Rachael</p>	<p>18 21 26 40 41</p>	<p>Submitters opposed to Lake Clearwater / Camp / Heron areas being prohibited</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions why dogs would be allowed in the village at Clearwater but not at the lake edge? (Trotter) • Notes that people still bring dogs up to Clearwater/Camp despite the clear signs. (Trotter) • Believes Lake Clearwater and Lake Camp should not be prohibited. States that if the dog is under effective control there is no risk to wildlife. (Woods, Lewthwaite) 	<p><i>Open Spaces:</i></p> <p>Lake Clearwater and its margins are included in an Area of Significant Conservation Value in the District Plan (A40). It is described as a “significant habitat for waders and waterfowl.” Should dogs be allowed in this area, it’s unlikely they will always be under effective control and the risk is therefore too great. This is one of the few dog exclusion areas in the Hakatere Conservation Park.</p>

Submitter name	Page number	Summary	Staff comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that Heron & Clearwater are both extensive and currently well utilised by dog owners. Believes there is plenty of space for all users in these areas. (Hallenstein) Believes Lake Clearwater and Lake Camp should not be prohibited. States that if the dog is under effective control there is no risk to wildlife. (Woods, Lewthwaite) Cannot see a clear reason why dogs are not allowed at Lake Camp/Clearwater. (Howden) Notes that there is no stock surrounding the Lake Camp/Clearwater area which is why dogs were originally prohibited. States that submitters always pay rates in town and for the bach at the lakes and would just like the rules to be the same as in town. (Howden) 	
Barnett, Lindsay Burgess, Robin Hall, Carol Hunt, Annette Hunt, Gavin Prince, Sam	5 19 23 24 36	Argyle Park exercise area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter agrees with changes to Argyle Park (Hunt, Gavin) Submitter requests the top end of Argyle Park be included in the exercise area (tree line along Farm Rd and Middle Rd). Notes that this area is rarely used as a playing field and is great for dogs to run and chase balls etc. Notes that the creek also provides drinking water and is a nice place to cool off in summer. (Hunt, Annette & Gavin) Suggests fencing areas, submitter has heard that some walkers would like to walk Argyle Park without fear. (Burgess) Believes the exercise area at Argyle Park is set out incorrectly and that dogs should only be exercised between middle road and the bridge at the farm road side of the park. Notes that this would keep the kids play areas safe and ensure the sports fields are kept free of dog mess. (Prince) Believes Argyle Park exercise area should extend right around the area, plus through the centre as proposed. (Barnett, Hall) Notes that the area is a great place to walk a dog, and believes it would feel safer to be able to have dogs unleashed so that they can socialise with other dogs more naturally. (Hall) 	<p><i>Open Spaces:</i></p> <p>Dogs are not permitted on any designated sportsfields in the District</p> <p><i>Strategy and Compliance:</i></p> <p>Dog exercise areas enable owners to let their dogs off leash when out walking in public areas, providing the dog(s) can be kept under effective control in that area.</p> <p>This area will be patrolled to ensure compliance of the above.</p> <p>To fence off the area and designate it as a dog park would deter the general public from using the area.</p>
Barr, Kathryn Dron, Sharon	6 15	Dog registration tags	<p><i>Strategy and Compliance:</i></p> <p>Following concerns raised about stiff tags staff have added tips on how to soften the</p>

Submitter name	Page number	Summary	Staff comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agrees ‘in part’ to new clause stating that dogs must be wearing current registration tags on any land that is not their own. (Barr) • Notes that dog tags are incredibly hard to attach. (Barr & Quinn) • Questions if Council could address the difficulty attaching tags by having disc tags that could clip on to collar. (Barr) • Submitter notes that there are safety issues around dogs having to wear registration tags – e.g. they could get caught on branches etc. (Dron) • Submitter’s dogs compete in agility and dogs are not allowed to compete with a registration tag on their collars to ensure that they do not catch onto any of the equipment. (Dron) • Questions why a registration tag is necessary if dogs are already microchipped. (Dron) • Questions how this will be enforced. (Dron) • Notes that the policy needs to be practical, and questions how many dog control officers are needed to ensure every dog off its property is wearing a tag. (Dron) 	<p>registration tags in our dog ownership manual circulated to dog owners and available on our website.</p> <p>The alternative disc tags are attached by a wire ring to the collar and are renowned for being easily pulled off by the animal and lost.</p> <p>It is suggested that owners use collars with a safety clasp which can easily snap open if a dog gets caught in branches.</p> <p>Under the Dog Control Act 1996 all dogs upon the age of 3 months are required to be registered. Whereas the Dog Control (microchip transponder) Regulations 2005 does not require working farm dogs to be microchipped.</p> <p>Section 46(2) of the Dog Control Act 1996 also requires dog owners to ensure that the registration label issued by Council is attached to a collar worn on the neck of the dog.</p> <p>Animal control staff regularly conduct patrols to monitor and enforce compliance of legislation, including dog registration requirements. Additionally, when a breach of legislation is reported to Council animal control staff will investigate and take action accordingly.</p>
<p>Gardiner, Allan Dron, Sharon</p>	<p>17 15</p>	<p>Dog fouling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter questions whether requiring dog owners to carry bags ensures that the owner will use it. Does not think this is the case. (Gardiner) • Notes that it is impossible to police this issue and that owners know that and that’s why they ignore it. (Gardiner) 	<p><i>Strategy and Compliance:</i></p> <p>Animal control staff regularly conduct patrols to inform, educate and enforce compliance of legislation.</p>

Submitter name	Page number	Summary	Staff comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that dog poo is common on footpaths. (Gardiner) Questions the purpose of a rule making everyone carry a poo bag, notes that responsible dog owners already do this. (Dron) Questions how this will be enforced, and what will happen if you refuse to show your poo bag. (Dron) 	<p>Owners who are found not complying with the requirements to clean up after their dog(s) may be issued with an infringement notice.</p> <p>Suitable dog waste bags can be purchased from ADC.</p>

1.3 Other comments / those who did not state a preference

Submitter name	Page number	Summary	Staff comments
Doel, Len Dron, Sharon Hunt, Annette Prince, Sam Ruth, Hannah	14 15 23 36 39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looking forward to the new changes. (Ruth) Submitter thanks and appreciates the people who keep the supply of poo bags replenished and the rubbish bins emptied at Argyle Park. Notes that there are only few dog owners who do not pick up after their dog, otherwise it is a real asset to everyone. (Hunt) Believes greater education and enforcement of the roles within the bylaw and policy need to be applied in future. (Prince) Questions how ratepayers go about reporting unhygienic and poor dog control to the authorities. (Doel) Notes that all non-working dogs are supposed to be microchipped, questions what the compliance rate of this is. (Dron) 	<p><i>Strategy and Compliance:</i></p> <p>Thanks the submitters for their support.</p> <p>Staff will arrange for information on the bylaw and policy to be posted on our website to help educate dog owners on the impact of any changes.</p> <p>Anyone who witnesses a breach of the dog control bylaws should immediately report the matter directly to ADC on 03 307 7700.</p>
Aldwin, Stacey Doel, Len	3 14	<p>Dogs on leads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes dogs should be kept on leashes at all times to eliminate potential dog fights at dog parks or on public property. (Aldwin) Requests further clarification on 'dog control', stating that dogs should be under human control on a short leash, rather than self-control and dropping body waste on public playing fields. (Doel) 	<p><i>Strategy and Compliance:</i></p> <p>The Dog Control Act 1996 does not require dogs to be leashed at all times but they must be kept on a lead in designated pedestrian zones.</p> <p>Where dogs can be exercised off leash they must still be under effective control i.e</p>

Submitter name	Page number	Summary	Staff comments
			immediately responsive to voice commands, hand signals, whistles or other effective means.
Central South Island Fish & Game Council Doel, Len Hoare, Charlotte	10 14 20	Prohibited areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests a compulsory dog on lead law in prohibited area rather than a total ban. (Hoare) • Understands why dogs are banned from Ashton Beach etc. but thinks it is unfair to punish respectful owners as well as the bad owners. States that taking the dogs to the beach is what the submitter lives for. (Hoare) • Requests that Wakanui Beach Reserve is added to the list of prohibited areas, especially during bird breeding season. (Doel) • Requests a time period is applied to the Ashton Beach prohibited area from August-April to protect threatened river bird species. Requests that dogs are permitted for game hunting purposes from May-July. (Central South Island Fish & Game Council) 	<i>Open Spaces:</i> The prohibited area only applies to a small part of the Ashburton coastline. A time period exclusion should not be applied to the prohibition as recent bird monitoring at the Ashburton rivermouth demonstrates that large number of birds are present for most of the year. Ninety percent of the species present are non-game species (pers. comm. Andrew Crossland, July 2021) meaning this area has greater value as a sanctuary for protected native birds than a hunting area. Without water in the lagoon, Wakanui Beach does support abundant bird life. The Wakanui Beach Restoration Group are not aware of any past or current issues regarding dogs.
Burgess, Robin Quinn, Marie	9 37	Exercise areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter would like to see more dog parks or areas that are fenced off from the public as some people are frightened to use areas such as Argyle Park, and to avoid incidents. (Burgess) • Suggests fencing Melcombe St as there have been incidents / people fearing for the safety of their children. (Burgess) • Suggests a small fenced dog park. Submitter has been frightened by big dogs running up to their small dogs, despite the owners calling after their big dogs. (Quinn) 	<i>Strategy and Compliance:</i> Staff will continue to seek out suitable areas where dogs can be exercised off leash.
Doel, Len	14	Dog fouling	<i>Strategy and Compliance:</i>

Submitter name	Page number	Summary	Staff comments
Elms, Dianne	43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter requests more clear wording on dog litter, stating that it should not be dumped in inappropriate containers such as letter boxes. (Doel) • Submitter notes that there are a lot of owners that do not pick up their dog droppings, and also states that there are quite often no bags in the dispensers as they are not replaced very frequently. (Elms) 	<p>Noted –</p> <p>The provision/replacement of signage is an ongoing project for staff.</p> <p>Staff strive to provide sufficient bags to keep up with demands.</p>
Elms, Dianne	43	<p>Ashburton Domain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter requests that the signs in the Ashburton Domain are enlarged dramatically. Suggests that they need to be displayed at every entrance. (Elms) • Notes that they always see dogs running free across the Walnut Ave sports grounds. Suggests a ranger sit on the side of the road and observe the actions of some of the owners. (Elms) 	<p><i>Strategy and Compliance:</i></p> <p>Noted-</p> <p>The provision/replacement of signage is an ongoing project for staff.</p> <p>Animal control staff regularly conduct patrols to inform, educate and enforce compliance of legislation, including the Domain areas.</p>