

Findings Report - Review of Council's Control of Dogs Bylaw and Dog Control and Owner Responsibility Policy

- 1.1 Territorial Authorities (TAs) are required to adopt a policy in respect of dogs under section 10 of Dog Control Act 1996 (the Act). The intention (as stated by the then Minister of Local Government) was to “*stimulate wider community debate*”.¹ In adopting such policy, TAs were to have regard for:
- a) *the need to minimise danger, distress, and nuisance to the community generally,*
 - b) *the need to avoid the inherent danger in allowing dogs to have uncontrolled access to public places that are frequented by children, whether or not the children are accompanied by adults,*
 - c) *the importance of enabling, to the extent that is practicable, the public (including families) to use streets and public amenities without fear of attack or intimidation by dogs, and*
 - d) *the exercise and recreational needs of dogs and their owners.*
- 1.2 TAs are required to give effect to such a policy by making a bylaw under section 20 of the Act. The scope is much wider than what had been permitted since 1955, which was limited to ‘*requiring dogs to be tied up or otherwise confined during a specified period*’.² The Act also prescribes a range of matters which dog owners must comply with, resulting in some overlap between what is enforced under the bylaw and what is specified under the Act.
- 1.3 Section 34 of the Act requires every TA to maintain a register of dogs registered with it, and section 36 requires everyone who owns a dog to register it. Such a requirement dates from 1849³. Section 35A of the Act established the National Dog Control Information Database to which the Council must provide specified information and pay an annual levy towards the cost of maintaining the Database.
- 1.4 Section 20(4) of the Act specifies that bylaws made under that section are deemed to have been made in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA). Section 159 of the LGA requires a review of such a bylaw no later than ten years after it was last reviewed. Section 160A provides that if the bylaw is not reviewed within the specified time period it will be revoked two years after that date.
- 1.5 The Council’s Control of Dogs Bylaw (the Bylaw) is due for review by 26 May 2026. The Control of Dogs Bylaw must be consistent with the Council’s Dog Control and Owner Responsibility Policy in accordance with section 10(7) of the Act.

Process for review:

¹ Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), Volume 554, p.111.

² Dog Registration Act 1955, section 30.

³ An Ordinance to abate the Dog Nuisance , 1849 [Province of New Munster] The annual registration fee was 10 shillings; ‘all unregistered dogs may be destroyed by any person belonging to the Constabulary Force’.

- 1.6 Section 10AA(2) of the Act requires the Council to make the determinations required by section 155 of the LGA *'in the context of the matters in section 10(4) of 'the Dog Control Act'.*⁴ Those matters are:
- (a) *the need to minimise danger, distress and nuisance to the community generally,*
 - (b) *the need to avoid the inherent danger in allowing dogs to have uncontrolled access to public places that are frequented by children, whether or not the children are accompanied by adults,*
 - (c) *the importance of enabling, to the extent that is practicable, the public (including families) to use streets and public amenities without fear of attack or intimidation by dogs, and*
 - (d) *the exercise and recreational needs of dogs and their owners.*
- 1.7 The determinations required by section 155 of the LGA, before making a bylaw, are:
- i. *whether a bylaw is the most appropriate way of addressing the perceived problem, and (if that is the Council's determination)*
 - ii. *whether the proposed bylaw is the most appropriate form of bylaw and gives rise to any implications under the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990.*
- 1.8 Expert external advice is that the nature of the review is a reconsideration of the matters required by section 155. If the Council does agree that a bylaw is the most appropriate way to solve the problem, it makes that determination, and this concludes the review process as far as the LGA is concerned.
- 1.9 Since the Council has a statutory requirement to make a bylaw to give effect to the policy (section 10(6)(a)), no other consideration is needed in making determination (i).
- 1.10 For determination (ii), alignment with the purposes specified in section 20(1) will provide assurance that the bylaw is the 'most appropriate form of bylaw'. As action taken by Council following the issue of an infringement notice proceeds under legislation administer by the Justice Department, the bylaw does not give rise to any implications under the Bill of Rights Act 1990.⁵ A recommendation is included to provide for these determinations.
- 1.11 Section 156 of the LGA requires Council to consider whether the proposed amendment to the bylaw *'concerns a matter identified in the local authority's policy under section 76AA as being of significant interest to the public'* or whether *'there is, or is likely to be, a significant impact on the public'* due to the proposed bylaw or changes to it. If so, then the special consultative procedure (as specified in section 86) must be used. The Council's Significance and Engagement Policy repeats that phrase, so it is suggested that the special consultative procedure is used. It is also acknowledged that recent media

⁴ There is an inconsistency with section 160 of the Local Government Act 2002. While section 160(1) requires a local authority reviewing a bylaw (under section 158 or 159) to make the determinations required by section 155, section 160(5) provides that 'this section does not apply to any bylaw to which section 10AA of the Dog Control Act 1996 applies'. Section 160 was an amendment made in 2006.

⁵ Schedule 1 of the Dog Control Act lists the infringement offences and the prescribed fees; section 65 specifies that a person alleged to have committed such an offence may be proceeded against under section 14 of the Criminal Procedure Act 2011 or served with an infringement notice under section 66, which is done under section 21 of the Summary Proceedings Act 1957.

focus on dog attacks in other parts of the country may mean that members of the public may have a heightened interest in the control of dogs at present.

- 1.12 Section 10AA(3) of the Act requires the Council to amend the Policy, if appropriate, in terms of any amendments made to the Bylaw. Section 10(8) of that Act allows the Council, at any time, to adopt, in accordance with the special consultative procedure, an amended policy. The discretion available for the review of the Bylaw does not apply to reviewing the Policy.
- 1.13 There is no statutory requirement specifying when the Policy adopted under the Dog Control Act 1996 must be reviewed. However, the Policy as adopted by Council in 2016 specified a review ten years after adoption (i.e. by 26 May 2026). Given the statutory requirement to use the special consultative procedure, it is suggested that the Committee recommend a six month extension to this date to enable consultation to be undertaken, submissions considered, and a decision made on any amendments to the Policy. Proposed changes to the Bylaw would be included in the same consultation and deliberations process.

2. Discussion and Options Considered

Performance:

- 2.1 Section 10A of the Act requires the Council to report on the administration of its dog control policy adopted under section 10 and its dog control practices. While the total number of registered dogs has been fairly stable since 2019/20, the number of good dog owners has declined by about 11%, and service requests/complaints have increased by around 9%. The number of attacks in 2024/25 is just slightly higher than 2019/20 and lower than each one of the intervening years.⁶

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
Service requests/complaints	750	966	976	894	949	819
Attacks (human and animal - includes rushing)	57	65	86	95	77	60
Barking	129	167	202	171	153	122
Wandering/Stray (includes stock)	130	288	260	112	261	280*
Animal welfare/Property investigations	41	41	37	43	34	23
Found	112	101	94	116	102	97
Lost	98	107	98	102	96	73
Other (e.g. microchipping, good dog owner status)	183	197	199	153	170	164
Number of dog owners	2313	2537	2353	2328	2384	2356

⁶ These reported numbers do not reveal the number of unregistered dogs involved

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
Total registered dogs	5091	5088	5058	5065	5080	4969
Working dogs	2382	2551	2519	2526	2514	2440
Good Dog Owners	2132	2050	2012	1968	1951	1900
Non-working dogs	377	487	527	571	615	629
Total Probationary Owners	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Total Disqualified Owners	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Total Dangerous Dogs	4	3	3	5	2	3
Total Menacing Dogs	63	53	44	40	40	36
Total infringement notices	45	39	83	32	46	50

*Wandering/stray dogs in 2024/25 were 155

- 2.2 The 2024/25 report is cautious about the reasons for the decline in total complaints, suggesting that proactive enforcement of registration compliance and targeted follow-ups on previously identified non-compliant properties may have improved overall owner accountability. However, the report notes that some members of the public increasingly use social media platforms to resolve lost or wandering dogs directly rather than contacting Council - *"This may reduce the number of formally recorded service requests without necessarily reflecting a proportional decrease in underlying incidents."* It is noted that this trend is unlikely to affect the number of reported attacks by dogs.
- 2.3 The 2023/24 and 2024/25 reports note that a graduated enforcement approach is employed for all unregistered dogs, progressing from property inspections to verbal or written warnings, infringement notices and impounding (section 42 of the Act) as a final measure.

Pre-engagement Survey

- 2.4 Officers ran a pre-engagement survey from 22 December 2025 through to 20 January 2026. A total of 23 submissions were received.
- 2.5 The following table summarises the submissions and notes potential considerations for the Policy and Planning Committee:

	submitters	Potential considerations for the Committee
1. What is working well		These views demonstrate that some elements of the current approach are meeting community expectations. The Committee may wish to consider how these strengths can be maintained while addressing areas of concern raised by other submitters.

Dog management generally working well - no significant issues	4	
Positive and prompt response from Council staff	3	
Availability of dog friendly spaces (e.g. Wilson Park and Bulls Domain/river area)	3	
Good dog owner framework is affordable and works well	2	
Positive view of Animal Control Team and clear communication with dog owners	2	
2. Roaming, aggressive and uncontrolled dogs		The Committee will need to consider whether existing enforcement mechanisms, containment requirements, and leash controls are sufficient, or whether amendments to the Bylaw or operational practices are required to address these concerns.
Concern about roaming dogs within residential streets, rushing gates, intimidating pedestrians and being loose in public spaces	6	
Concern about aggressive behaviours, including biting incidents, attacks on livestock, and fears for the safety of children and vulnerable residents	4	
Repeated incidents of dogs being off-leash in areas designated as on-leash only, particularly at the Tutaenui Reservoir	4	
Barking and noise issues, including concerns about multiple dogs being kept on urban properties	3	
Concern about availability of Animal Control Team in Taihape	1	
3. Dog waste		The Committee may wish to consider whether infrastructure changes (e.g. bins or dispensers), increased education, or enhanced enforcement would improve compliance, and whether these measures are proportionate to the level of concern expressed.
Concern that dog waste is being left in parks, reserves and on footpaths	6	
Request installation of dog bag dispensers in public areas to improve compliance	4	
Request for additional rubbish bins (noting that removal of bins may contribute to increased dog waste being left behind)	2	

Stronger enforcement measures for owners who fail to carry bags or remove dog waste	2	
4. Dog exercise areas and infrastructure		
Current exercise areas are suitable	17	
Request for fully fenced dog parks to promote safer off-leash opportunities	4	
Request for a fenced off-leash space in Marton, noting limited current provision	2	
Request for establishing a dedicated dog area in Hunterville	2	
Suggest formalising or recognising the Bulls River address area as a dog-friendly space	2	
Request improved signage in parks and reserves to clarify dog control requirements	2	
Suggests additional seating within dog areas	1	
5. Registration and responsible dog ownership		
Request lower registration fees for responsible dog owners or a tiered registration system	6	
Introduce or strengthen longer-term compliance rewards (e.g. 'exceptional dog owner' discounts)	3	
Current registration system is easy and affordable	2	
Concern that registration costs are increasing and may discourage compliance	2	
Suggests earlier distribution of registration notices	1	
Suggests a rebate where proof of vaccination is provided	1	
Suggests working dogs should not require registration until they reach one year of age	1	
6. Enforcement and education		
Call for stronger enforcement of existing rules, particularly in relation to roaming dogs and containment	4	
Suggests random Animal Control team visits to leash-only areas to improve compliance	1	
Suggests stronger consequences for repeat offending dogs or owners following harm incidents	2	
Request improved access to dog training or dog club facilities within the district	2	

Requests for fenced dog parks reflect a desire for safer off-leash environments and clearer separation between dog exercise areas and other recreational users. The Committee will need to consider land availability, cost implications, and alignment with the intent of the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy.

The Committee will need to consider whether adjustments to the fee structure would support compliance objectives, while ensuring cost recovery requirements are met.

The Committee may wish to consider the balance between enforcement and education approaches, and whether operational resourcing aligns with community expectations.

Suggests additional education for children on dog safety	1	
7. Other matters raised		
Request that injured dogs collected by Council are assessed by a veterinarian prior to euthanasia decision	1	While some of these matters fall outside the direct scope of the Dog Control Bylaw, they reflect broader community concerns regarding animal management and public safety. The Committee may wish to note these matters for consideration in related policies or operational planning.
Requests improved online access to dog control rules for visitors travelling with dogs	1	
Concern about footpath safety in Hunterville, noting limited safe walking options	1	
Concerns about feral cats and requests greater control measures	2	

Alignment with Statutory Requirements:

- 2.6 As noted above, the Dog Control Act 1996 specifies the content of the Council's Policy and the purpose for the Council's Bylaw. *Attachment 1* provides a table which sets out the alignment for the Policy and the Bylaw. Comments below are based on that analysis.
- 2.7 The Policy generally complies with the statutory requirements, clearly identifying which public places are prohibited to dogs (other than working dogs carrying out their functions), which public places are off-leash dog exercise areas, and requiring dogs to be controlled by a leash in all other public places.⁷ However, the Policy provides discretion to a Senior Dog Control Officer (now the Manager - Animal Control) to require a classified menacing dog to be neutered rather than specifying '*the matters taken into account*' in requiring such a dog to be neutered.⁸
- 2.8 The Bylaw also generally complies with the purposes set out in clause 20, repeating the requirements over public places specified in the Policy, but adding a fifth dog exercise area, the Turakina Reserve⁹ and allows a 48-hour exemption for dog shows. It specifies the minimum standards of accommodation,¹⁰ limits the number of dogs at any property, requires dog owners to immediately remove faeces left in a public place, extends the requirement to confine bitches in season to dogs suffering from an infectious disease, and provides for impounding of dogs and the procedures for release or disposal.¹¹ However, while requiring a dog owner to provide the means of confining the dog within the owner's property,¹² the Bylaw does not require such confinement during a specified period which section 20(1)(g) allows.
- 2.9 The Bylaw does not reflect the Policy's position over neutering menacing dogs. Nor does it provide for requiring neutering of a dog which has not been kept under control on a number of occasions. However, the Bylaw does allow Council to issue a notice to a dog

⁷ The policy does not identify any public places where leashes are not required (apart from designated dog exercise areas) but that is redundant since the policy requires that a dog must be on a leash in any public place which is not prohibited.

⁸ Section 33E and 33EB of the Dog Control Act allow the Council to require neutering of any dog classified as menacing..

⁹ Added by Council resolution, 28 June 2018: 18/RDC/248, in response to a request from the Turakina Reserves Management Committee.

¹⁰ This aligns with section 54(1) of the Dog Control Act

¹¹ This aligns with section 69 of the Dog Control Act.

¹² Required by section 52A(2)(b) of the Dog Control Act.

owner where a dog (or dogs) on the property have become (or a likely to become) a nuisance or injurious to health. Potential requirements could extend to reducing the number of dogs or repairing the kennel or constructing a new one. Neutering is not mentioned in this context.

- 2.10 The Bylaw prohibits any person (not just a dog owner) from aggravating a dog leading to behaviours in breach of section 5 of the Act, i.e. nuisance, barking, causing injury to an animal or person. However, that section of the Act is limited to dog owners.

Comparison with policies and bylaws of surrounding TAs:

- 2.11 The Bylaw is the enforcement mechanism for the Policy (but as noted above the Act is also an enforcement mechanism¹³). Since the legislators intended that the community engage with the Policy, there will be differences between councils, both in the Policy and the Bylaw. Examining policies and bylaws of other councils has the potential to provide useful perspectives. *Attachment 2* analyses the current policies and bylaws adopted by Manawatū, Tararua and Whanganui District Councils. *Attachment 3* provides a comparable analysis of the bylaws of those three councils.
- 2.12 Manawatū District Council (MDC) emphasises that dogs should be ‘*under control*’ by their owners at all times, including dog exercise areas. This is defined as ‘*either controlled by a leash that is being held by someone that is capable of restraining the dog, under direct control such as being held, or controlled by voice command where the dog must be within sight and obeys commands without hesitation*’.
- 2.13 Whanganui District Council (WDC) distinguishes dog exercise areas from other off-leash areas on the basis that dog owners are the priority users. However, this does not mean an exception from the requirement for dogs to be under continuous control.
- 2.14 MDC explains in its Policy the reasons for identifying public places which are prohibited to dogs. There are more opportunities in Manawatū (and in Whanganui) for dogs to be permitted under leash. This could be one of issues raised in consultation i.e. identifying some areas now prohibited where dogs on leash would be permitted.
- 2.15 MDC and WDC exempt dogs herding or driving stock on a road from the faeces removal requirement. While a valid clarification, it seems unnecessary since such dogs will be in an environment where there are faeces from stock.
- 2.16 Tararua District Council (TDC) defines what ‘*adequate accommodation*’ for a dog is, comparable to what Rangitikei requires. MDC and WDC do not do this (although MDC specifies that a dog must be kept at least 1.8 metres from a boundary fence (unless an exemption is given by the Council). Such a requirement could reduce the likelihood of nuisance to neighbours or (if a street boundary) passers-by.
- 2.17 TDC reflects the confining requirement specified Section 52A of the Act, but Council, MDC and WDC do not specify this requirement. This is a significant requirement and including it in the Bylaw ensures greater profile, however, including wording from legislation verbatim can create unnecessary repetition and can also lead to issues if the wording in the legislation is amended or replaced.

¹³ With one exception, the infringement offences specified in Schedule 1 of the Act relate to provisions in the Act. The exception is breaches of the bylaw.

- 2.18 TDC's Policy requires microchipping of all dogs classified as dangerous or menacing and all dogs first registered after 1 July 2006. This repeats section 36A(1) of the Act. MDC and WDC do not mention this in their respective policies.
- 2.19 The policies of MDC and WDC are specific in allowing impounding of a dog found wandering after a first such incident. TDC's Policy does not specify such a transition, thus implying impounding could occur at the first instance.
- 2.20 All three councils describe their procedures in addressing barking dogs. MDC details how Council defines 'persistent' and 'loud' barking and 'howling' – terms used in section 55 of the Act, but not explained further there.
- 2.21 TDC does not allow more than two dogs at an urban property unless a 'Three Plus Permit' has been issued. The equivalent limit imposed by MDC is two (not specified in the Policy but included in the Bylaw), and in Whanganui the limit is three. These councils have formal procedures for allowing a greater number.
- 2.22 TDC and WDC provide a process for recognising responsible dog owners with a particular status ('Preferred Dog Owner' in Tararua, 'Responsible Dog Owner' in Whanganui) and discounted fees. MDC's Policy provides for a reduced registration fee for selected owners, but does not elaborate on how that status is achieved.

Improving the effectiveness of the policy and the bylaw

- 2.23 The comments made by those who participated in the pre-engagement survey point to the Animal Control Team being responsive and good communicators.
- 2.24 A key question for the Committee is what amendments to the Policy and Bylaw could reinforce what the Team is doing and make the Bylaw more effective. Some improvements/amendments for the Committee to consider are listed below:
- a) Improve the scope by:
 - adding 'Under Control' (as provided by MDC) to make explicit owners' responsibility, even in dog exercise areas;
 - explaining why certain public places are prohibited to dogs;
 - setting requirements for boarding and breeding kennels;
 - allowing access to premises and public places for disability assist dogs accompanying a person with a disability; and
 - Under 'standards of accommodation' include reference to the requirements under the Animal Welfare (Care and Procedures) Regulations 2018. While enforcement of these regulations sits outside Council, such a reference makes explicit Council's expectations of responsible ownership.
 - b) Provide additional public places where dogs under leash are permitted (i.e. amending the areas of prohibited public places). While Council is able to determine additional off-leash dog exercise areas by resolution, the proposed consultation on the amended Bylaw and Policy would provide information to inform that decision.
 - c) Require all dog owners to carry (and use) a waste bag when taking their dog into any public place where control under a leash is required, to 'immediately

remove the faeces and dispose of them in a sanitary manner'. Clause 7.2.6 of the Policy has this requirement, but it needs to be provided for in the Bylaw so that non-compliance becomes an infringement offence under section 20(5) of the Dog Control Act. This change will help address the concern raised in the pre-engagement survey.

- d) Allow discretion to the Animal Control Team to require neutering to when the dog has a series of behavioural issues.

- 2.25 Although there is concern expressed in the pre-engagement survey about roaming dogs and dogs not on leash where they should be, it is not proposed to specify mandatory impounding for any dog at large in breach of the Bylaw, which is the case in Manawātū and Whanganui (noted above, para. 3.19). Such a Policy potentially undermines Rangitikei's compliance-focussed framework which prioritises education and voluntary compliance before enforcement action. The experience of the Animal Control Team is that only a small proportion of roaming dogs encountered are repeat offenders. Clause 7.13.7 of the Policy, which provides discretion to the Animal Control Team to return a roaming dog with a warning or infringement notice, would be retained.
- 2.26 These changes must be reflected in an amended Bylaw as well as the Policy.
- 2.27 There are currently several provisions in the Bylaw which are not identified in the Policy. Examples are standards for accommodation, limits on the number of dogs kept at any property, confinement of a dog suffering from an infectious disease, dispensations for approved dog shows.
- 2.28 The lack of off-leash dog exercise areas in urban areas like Rātana, Hunterville and Mangaweka warrants consideration, but this does not necessarily need to be addressed in the proposed consultation of an amended Policy, as Council is able to determine additional dog exercise areas by resolution.

Attachment 2

Comparison of neighbouring council Dog Control Policies

Section 10(3) Dog Control Act 1996	Manawatu District Council, 2019	Taranua District Council, 2022	Whanganui District Council, 2023
<i>Every policy adopted under this section:</i>			
.	Clause 1.1: 'The Council is also obliged to adopt a bylaw.... to give effect to this policy' Clause 5.2: 'The Bylaw provides for the enforcement of matters outlined in this policy.'	[Not specified]	Clause 1.4: 'Following the adoption of the Policy, Council is required to adopt a Bylaw to give effect to it.'
(b) shall identify any public places in which dogs are to be prohibited, either generally or at specific times, pursuant to a bylaw made under section 20	Clause 7 specifies the three control areas - prohibited public places, dog exercise areas, dog on leash areas. Clause 9 describes the reasons for identifying prohibited public places for dogs. Schedule 1 list the prohibited places.	Schedule 1 describes prohibited areas, exemptions to dog prohibited areas, leash controlled areas, unleashed areas (but under continuous control).	Clause 16 describes the five types: prohibited areas, on-leash areas, off-leash areas, designated dog exercise areas, time and season areas (where dog access rules will vary depending on time of day during summer). Schedule 1 identifies prohibited areas, exemptions to dog prohibited areas, leash controlled areas, and unleashed areas (but 'under continuous control'). Schedule 2 set out dog access rules for specific places
(c) shall identify (i) any particular public places and(ii) any areas or parts of the district in which dogs (other than working dogs) in public places are to be required by a bylaw made under section 20(1)(a) to be controlled by a leash	Clause 11 and Schedule 3.	ditto	ditto
(d) shall identify those areas or parts of the district in respect of which no public places or areas are to be identified under paragraph (b) or paragraph (c)	[Not relevant]	[Not relevant]	[Not relevant]

(e) shall identify any places within areas or parts of the district specified in paragraph (c)(ii) of this subsection that are to be designated by a bylaw under section 20(1)(d) as dog exercise areas in which dogs may be exercised at large	Schedule 2. Clause 10.4 is explicit in requiring dogs without a leash must be under control.	as in (b) above	as in (b) above
(ea) must state whether dogs classified by the territorial authority as menacing dogs under section 33A or 33C are required to be neutered under section 33E(1)(b) and, (i) if so, whether the requirement applies to all such dogs , and (ii) if not, the matters taken into account by it in requiring any particular dog to be neutered.	Clause 15.2	Clause 5.1 specifies that dogs classified as menacing must be neutered and microchipped. Clause 5.2 extends that dogs classified as dangerous	Clause 15 describes e requirements for neutering - all dogs classified as dangerous and dogs classified as menacing
(eb) must state whether dogs classified by any other territorial authority as menacing dogs under section 33A or 33C are required to be neutered under section 33E(1)(b) and, (i) if so, whether the requirement applies to all such dogs , and (ii) if not, the matters taken into account by it in requiring any particular dog to be neutered.	Clause 15.2	[Not specified]	Clause 15.2

(f) shall include such other details as the territorial authority thinks fit including but not limited to, details of the policy in relation to (i) fees or proposed fees, (ii) owner education programmes, (iii) dog obedience course, (iv) the classification of owners, (v) the disqualification of owners, and (vi) the issuing of infringement notices	Clause 6 describes the process for setting fees (No fee to register a Disability Assist Dog). Clause 6.4 notes that a reduced registration fee applies to selected owners. Clause 12 notes access for dogs may be controlled by other legislation (e.g. for parts of land administered by the Department of Conservation). Clause 13 describes how Council will intervene when barking becomes a nuisance (potentially taking enforcement action under ss55-56 of the Act). Clause 14 describes Council's approach to wandering dogs, including impounding after a first offence. Clause 16 describes a Council's approach to rehoming dogs, using its relationships with known registered shelters. Clause 17 describes Hearing procedure, Clause 18 outlines the procedures for issuing and	Clause 5.3 sets out the procedure for declaring a dog to be a working dog. Such dogs issued with a microchip exemption. Clause 6.1 specifies actions (including impounding) where a dog is a nuisance (includes through barking. Clause 6.2 allows impounding of a dog roaming or no owner direct control Clause 7.2 specifies mandatory registration and microchipping of a dog registered for the first time after 1.7.2006. Clause 7.3 describes the Three Plus Permit which allows more than two dogs at a premises. Clause 8 defines obligations of boarding or breeding kennel owners. Clause 9 describes recognition given to responsible dog owners ('Preferred Dog Owner') Clause 10 requires immediate removal of dog waste.	Clause 6 describes fees. Clause 7 sets out criteria for Responsible Dog Owner classification. Clause 8 require owners to remove faeces. Council may provide dispensers/containers at high-use sites. Clause 9 set out when barking may become a nuisance leading to Council action under sections 55 and 56 of the Act (written notice, impounding) Clause 10 specifies no more than 3 dogs at an urban premises. 4 or more after Council approval. Clause 11 sets out procedures for wandering dogs - impounding after first instance. Clause 12 describes rehoming procedures. Clause 13 notes Council's promotion of education.
--	--	--	--

(f) continued	Clause 19 describes Council's promotion of dog control/training programmes.	Clause 11 notes Council encourages attendance at dog obedience course. Clause 12 states neutering requirements. Clause 13 sets out the procedure for rehoming of dogs from the Council pound. Clause 14 describes how a dog owner becomes disqualified and the obligations from that. Clause 15 describes how a dog owner becomes a probationary owner and the obligations from that. Clause 16 describes Council fee-setting requirements. Clause 17 notes information available at Council, Clause 18 describes impounding and release procedures at the pound. Clause 19 notes Council's ability to issue infringement notices under the Act for breaches of the Act or bylaw. Clause 20 requires a review of the policy every five years.	Clause 14 describes how a dog owner is classified as disqualified or probationary and the obligations from that.
---------------	--	---	---

Attachment 3 Comparison of neighbouring council Dog Control Bylaws

Dog Control Act 1996	Manawatu District Council 2019	Tararua District Council 2022	Whanganui District Council 2023
Interpretation	Includes 'Under control' - either controlled by a leash that is being held by someone that is capable of restraining the dog, under direct control such as being held, or controlled by voice command where the dog must be within sight and obeys commands without hesitation. Clause 5.1 requires every owner to keep their dog under control in all public places and at all times.	A longer list of definitions, including 'boarding kennels', 'breeding kennels', 'diseased', (affected by any communicable disease), 'mangy' (to have any sort of mite or parasite infection)	Includes 'private way'
20(1)(a) Prohibited places	Schedule 1 - specific places identified.	Schedule 1C specifies public reserves, wildlife reserves, sports grounds, sports stadiums, children's playgrounds, Council public libraries, public swimming baths and Council cemeteries. Exemptions include any guide dog, hearing ear dog or companion dog, Police or security guard dog and any dog present for search and rescue.	Clause 7, refers to Schedule 1 of the policy - Council playgrounds, Council sports surfaces, Council cemeteries, Whanganui Airport (unless confined for carriage or a disability assist dog), and Schedule 2 - Town Centre, Lakes and premier parks (listed) and several specified
20(1)(b) Where leash required	Schedule 3 - includes Victoria Park (not the playing fields), Johnston Park, Kitchener Park, the Kowhai Park access route, and some specified sections of Feilding CBD (except during organised events)	Schedule 1B describes the leash controlled areas, including all streets in the residential, commercial or industrial areas of Dannevirke, Norsewood, Ormondville, Pongaroa, Eketahuna, Pahiatua and	Clause 8, refers to Schedule 1 of the policy - includes all roads, private ways, walkways, cycleways, shared pathways, and Schedule 2 - includes specified parts of beaches and specified
20(1)(c)	[Not required]	[Not required]	Clause 9, refers to Schedule 2 of the policy - specified parts of beaches and listed areas
20(1)(d) Dog exercise areas	Schedule 2 - identifies places in Feilding and other places - Himatangi Beach foreshore at least 400m from the mouth of the Kaikokopu Stream, Pohangina Valley Road reserve, Mt Stewart reserve, Sanson Domain (except when used for organised events) etc.	Schedule 1A describes the places where dogs may be exercised unleashed - specifically in Dannevirke and Pahiatua - and generally any areas of the District not listed in Schedule 1B or 1C	Clause 10, refers to Schedule 2, clause 7.
20(1)(e) Accommodation standards	{Not specified} Clause 10 requires dogs to be kept at least 1.8 metres of a boundary fence without first obtaining an exemption.	Clause 11.1 requires 'adequate accommodation' and defines this.	[Not specified]

20(1)(f) Limiting the number	Clause 9 sets a limit of two dogs for urban areas and five dogs in rural areas unless a multi-dog permit has been issued under clause 11. Clause 12 sets out the circumstances for revoking a multi-dog permit.	Clause 12 limited the number of dogs at any premises to two unless a 'Three Plus Permit' has been issued under clause 13.	Clause 13 sets a limit of three dogs unless approval for four (or more) has been given, on application, under clause 14. Matters to be considered are listed. Clause 15 provides for review because of change of circumstances, justified complaints, not meeting conditions of the approval. .
20(1)(g) Confinement	[Not specified]	Clause 11.4 requires the dog to be confined in the owner's land or premises so that it cannot freely leave. No time period is specified.	[Not specified]
20(1)(h) Faeces	Clause 14 Does not apply to any dog herding or driving stock on a road.	Clause 15	Clause 12. Does not apply to any dog herding stock on a road.
20(1)(i) Bitches	Clause 13	Clause 18 Clause 19 prohibits an owner from taking any mangy or diseased dog into any public place or wander free.	{Not specified}
20(1)(j) Impounding	[Not specified - either in the bylaw or policy although the Council operates an animal pound]	Clause 21	[Not specified - either in the bylaw or the policy, although the Council operates an Animal Pound]
20(1)(k) Neutering	Clause 17 requires the owner to be notified in writing of the requirements to be neutered where that is required by the Act or Council's policy.	Clause 17.3 reserves the right for Council to require a dog to be neutered other than by its classification, including behavioural issues. Clauses 17.1 and 17.2 require a dog classified as menacing to be neutered.	[Not specified] Clause 15.2 of the policy provides for neutering of each dog classified as menacing

20(1)(l) Other purposes	Clause 7 specified exemptions for Disability Assist Dogs to enter any premises registered under regulations made under section 120 of the health Act 1956 and any public place. Clause 8 allow the Council to require the owner of a dog being carried in a vehicle in a public place to remove the dog from the public place if the dog is creating a nuisance (noise or aggressive behaviour). Clause 15 prohibits an owner of a dog suffering from an infectious disease or condition to take that dog into any public place or to permit it to wander free on any other premises or public place. Clause 19 sets out how dogs will be classified as working dogs. Clause 20 requires a probationary owner to undertake a dog owner education programme or dog obedience course if so notified by the Council.	Clause 9 permits the Council CE to temporarily declare any public place to be a prohibited public place for a specified time or suspend the designation of a prohibited public place for a specified period for a specific occasion or event. Clause 14 sets out requirements for boarding kennels and breeding kennels Clause 16 allows any disability assist dog accompanying a person with a disability to enter any public place or premises registered under section 120 of the Health Act 1956 (which includes eating houses). Clause 22 sets out the role of Council's Tribunal and Hearings Committee to hear objections to classification of probationary owners, disqualified owners, menacing dogs, dangerous dogs and barking abatement notices.	Clause 11 provides for temporary changes to dog access rules, including leisure and culture; events (including dog friendly events), dog training, protected wildlife or flora that are vulnerable to dogs, pest control in any park or beach.
------------------------------------	--	--	---