

5. HEARING PANEL REPORT ON THE PROPOSED DOG CONTROL POLICY AND BYLAW

Officer responsible:	Programme Manager Strong Communities
Author:	Dog Control Policy and Bylaw Hearing Panel

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. This is a report of the Dog Control Policy and Bylaw Hearing Panel. It summarises the submissions received on the proposed Dog Control Policy and Bylaw and contains recommendations from the Panel altering the proposed Policy and Bylaw in certain respects. The proposed Policy and Bylaw (with the recommended changes highlighted) are **attached** to this report as Appendix 1B and 1C.
2. This report recommends the adoption of the Christchurch City Council Dog Control Policy 2008 and the Christchurch City Council Dog Control Bylaw 2008, as **attached** Appendix 2A and 2B.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. On 28 February 2008, the Council adopted the proposed Dog Control Policy and Bylaw for consultation. Submissions on the proposed Policy and Bylaw were open between 26 March and 28 April. Two hundred and forty-five submissions were received. Thirty-six people requested to be heard by the hearing panel in support of their submissions.²³ The hearings were held on 5 and 7 May. The Panel deliberated on 14 May. The Panel was chaired by Councillor Sue Wells, and the Panel members were Councillors Claudia Reid, Yani Johanson and Mike Wall.
4. The Proposed Dog Control Policy and Bylaw would:
 - Set the framework for dog registration fees and classification of owners;
 - Identify mechanisms for promoting responsible dog ownership and interaction with dogs;
 - Set the framework for issuing of infringement notices and impounding of dogs;
 - Specify the requirement for neutering of dogs classified as menacing or dangerous;
 - Provide adequate opportunities to fulfill the exercise and recreational needs of dogs and their owners;
 - Set the framework for categories of dog control;
 - Notify areas where specific dog control status has been designated for reasons such as health and safety, hygiene, protection of wildlife, animals, stock and/or safety of people;
 - Identify the matters to be covered by bylaws.
5. The proposed policy and bylaw contain many of the same clauses as the previous Council's documents. However there are also changes included to conform with the Dog Control Act 1996 and its amendments, to establish one dog control policy and bylaw to cover the whole of the Christchurch and Banks Peninsula area and to enhance the control of dogs in particular areas.
6. The Council received 245 submissions (this included one petition of 281 signatories) on the proposed Dog Control Policy and Bylaw. These comprised submissions from:
 - Individuals (229)
 - Area related committees/Trusts (5)
 - Organisations (8)
 - Community boards (3)
7. Overall written submissions on the Policy were largely focussed on:
 - Background and objectives
 - Registration fees
 - Classification of Owners
 - Education and Awareness programmes
 - Dog Obedience

²³ Thirty six indicated they wished to be heard, 33 confirmed for the 2 days of hearings. Twenty one appeared (1 by conference call) and were heard by the panel and 12 did not appear (of these 3 gave apologies and 9 did not show).

- Issuing of infringement notices
- Enforcement of dog control
- Designated dog exercise areas
- Categories of dog control on areas
- Beaches and bathing areas
- Specific areas under section 13 of the Policy
- Clarification/or correction of some inconsistencies

8. Written submissions on the bylaw were largely focused on:

- Limitation on number of dogs
- Control of dogs on roads and private ways
- Dogs to be confined during hours of darkness
- Dogs on vehicles
- Exemptions for working dogs
- Female and diseased dogs
- Fouling by dogs

9. Twenty-one people appeared in support of their submissions at the hearings. Sixteen individuals appeared, four groups or organisations were represented, one Community Board was represented by two people. Those who appeared in support of their submissions largely reiterated their written submissions.

10. A summary of the written submissions received on the proposed Policy and Bylaw can be found in the 'background' section of this report. A detailed outline of the Changes to the Policy and Bylaw recommended by the Hearing Panel can be found in Appendix 1.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO THE POLICY AND BYLAW

11. The hearing panel deliberated on the issues raised in submissions, and as a result, made several changes to the Policy and Bylaw now being recommended to the Council. The most significant of these were focused on:

- Preamble – clarifying the objectives and context of the Policy;
- Clause 9 Enforcement of Dog Control (and related clauses in the Bylaw):
 - Removing the activity precedence from clause 9(b)
 - Revising the proposed permit requirements for keeping two or more dogs on properties less than 4 hectares, clause 9(d)
 - Removing the clause on confinement of dogs overnight 9(e)
 - Reviewing the exemptions for working dogs;
- Clause 11- Clarifying category definitions (and related clauses in the Bylaw); and
- Clause 13 - Revising dog control status for some established and proposed areas;
- Minor corrections to spelling and to ensure consistency of information throughout the Policy and Bylaw.

12. A detailed outline of the submission issues and the Hearing Panel response can be found in Appendix 1A. The following sections highlight the main issues raised by submitters:

Preamble – Clarifying the Objectives and Context of the Policy

13. Some submitters expressed concern that the objectives stated in the policy preamble were not met by the substance of the policy; in particular objective 5 '*To provide adequate opportunities to fulfil the exercise and recreational needs of dogs and their owners*'. Submitters considered that the control status restrictions introduced in the proposed policy severely limited the opportunity for dog owners to freely run their dogs for fitness and fun on accessible local areas, particularly those suitable for exercising large dogs.

14. Other submitters considered the proposed control status breached Iwi Customary rights, in particular the restraint of dogs in cemeteries and the prohibition of dogs from certain beaches or wildlife areas.

15. Submitters also commented on the 'brief' reference to the protection of wildlife in the objective 7, and noted that wildlife protection was the basis for many of the proposed restrained or prohibited areas. Many also noted the restraints on dogs but the lack of redress to the issue of domestic cats and the damage they cause and the damage caused by 4WD vehicles.
16. The Hearing Panel recommends the inclusion of a statement highlighting the focus areas of the Policy in relation to areas with significant values that require protection. The Panel also recommends that the policy be reviewed sooner than the statutory 10 years to enable better alignment with other related Council policies.

Clause 1 – Registration Fees

17. Concerns were raised by some submitters regarding the issue of responsible dog owners, who register and control and care for their dogs, subsidising dog owners who are less responsible and do not register their dogs. They consider many of the issues are related to unregistered dogs or irresponsible dog owners, and that there was a need to address this directly rather than through the registration fees of those that register their dogs.
18. Some submitters also suggested in the inclusion of a reduced registration fee for "pensioners".
19. The Hearing Panel recommends that the issues raised (as noted in this report, clause 51), in particular the Responsible Dog Owner category, be considered as part of the proposed 2010 review of the Dog Control Policy.

Clause 2 – Classification of Owners

20. The issue of expanding the classification of owners was discussed by some submitters. Two key suggestions focused on the establishment of sub groups within the Responsible Dog Owner (RDO) Status. Some submitters promoted the inclusion of NZ Kennel Club Canine Good Citizen Certificate as a mechanism for offering a reduced registration fee for those Responsible Dog Owners whose dogs who have completed the certificate.
21. Two submitters requested the inclusion of a "pensioners" category within the Responsible Dog Owner status with a reduced registration fee for those in this category.
22. The Hearing Panel considers that the Responsible Dog Owner classification needs to be reviewed, in particular the criteria for achieving this status. The Panel suggests the inclusion of site visits as one of the criteria for RDO be investigated.
23. The Panel recommends the Classification of Owners clause remains as proposed, with issues being fully investigated and reviewed as part of the proposed 2010 Policy review.

Clause 9(B) - Activity Precedence

24. Some submitters considered the activity precedence list set over dogs exercising off the leash, is inconsistent with objective 7 in the preamble. They also noted that many families included their dog in their outings and the activity precedence may restrict this or prohibit current practice. Some submitters noted that the activity precedence list may cause confusion and be hard to determine, implement and enforce. Some general submissions highlighted the value of exercising dogs as a means of getting humans up and engaged in exercise; while others noted that the issues needing address are about human behaviour not dog behaviour.
25. The Hearing Panel recommends that the precedence sub-clauses be removed from clause 9(b).

Clause 9(D) - Permit for Two or More Dogs on Less than 4 Hectares

26. Submissions on this clause noted two areas of concern; the requirement to gain a permit if you have two or more dogs; and, the size of the land package that triggers the requirement for a permit.

27. Currently there is no permit requirement under the BPDC Dog Control Policy. However, under the CCC Policy the owner or occupier with two or more dogs is required to gain a permit for any property zoned commercial, industrial, residential, or rural residential in the Christchurch City District Plan.
28. Concerns were raised over the need for the permit being set at two or more dogs – this is a completely new consideration for Banks Peninsula dog owners and a surprise for some Christchurch residents. Most submitters considered that two dogs kept each other company and presented less of a public nuisance (barking etc) than a dog on its own with no company. Some concern was also expressed about the cost of acquiring a permit from the Council and what would happen in the event of having a friend's dog to stay while they were on holiday (eg six weeks overseas). The majority of submitters considered that the clause should apply for those with "more than two dogs".
29. The introduction of a property size limit triggering the need for a permit was a new concept for Banks Peninsula residents, and the submitters were not supportive of. For Christchurch residents the change from the City Plan zoning to 4 hectares was viewed by submitters as too small an area and they considered the zoning should stay as it is in the current Policy.
30. The Hearing Panel acknowledge that the proposed clause requires further review and revision and refer this issue to the proposed 2010 Policy review for investigation and resolution.
31. The Hearing Panel recommends that the proposed clause (in both the Policy and Bylaw) revert back to the current clause for city residents (ie relate size to City Plan Zonings) and exempt Banks Peninsula from this clause.

Clause 9(E) - Confinement of Dogs Overnight

32. Many submitters expressed concern over the proposed requirement for dogs to be confined overnight and considered the clause to mean they could not walk their dogs after dark. This is not the intention of the clause.
33. The Hearing Panel is of the view that the issue is already covered by the Dog Control Act and therefore recommends that the clause is deleted from both the Policy and Bylaw.

Clause 11 - Clarifying Category Definitions

34. Some submitters considered that the intent of the terms 'restrained' and 'not specified' were not clear to the general public and suggested these be clarified and the term used have an "obvious" meaning.
35. The Hearing Panel recommends the Policy and Bylaw documents be edited to reflect change in terminology: restrained = leashed; and not specified = under effective control.

Clause 13 - Revising Dog Control Status for some Established and Proposed Areas

36. The Hearing Panel acknowledged the potential difficulties experienced on grazed land associated with dogs off the leash, for example difficulties arising from uncontrolled dogs amongst stock and managing public access to grazing lease land. The Hearing Panel also acknowledged the request from submitters to provide areas where dogs can exercise at large off leash, in particular in the Port Hills and parks in eastern suburbs.
37. Eighty-three submissions were received on the proposed control status for the Wigram East Retention Basin. Discussion with those being heard on this issue highlighted a limited public understanding of the current control status areas and confusion over the proposed status and the areas these will apply to.
38. A petition was submitted from Southshore 281 residents, and other residents appeared at the hearing, opposing the proposed control status areas outlined on the Southshore map. After the publication of the Policy, staff noted some key errors in the Southshore region map and had this corrected and redrawn. The revised map was presented to and subsequently supported by those who appeared at the hearing.

39. Many submissions were received from individuals and groups on the proposed control status for specific areas. Many submitters submitted on more than one park or area, while others submitted on a single park or area.
40. The Hearing Panel recommendations for each area are documented in Appendix 1A.

Minor Corrections

41. Further minor changes to the Proposed Policy and Bylaw have been made in order to correct spelling of some place names, ensure consistency of information for specific areas where they have been noted more than once in the Policy and to clarify the meaning or intent of certain clauses. These changes are noted in the **attached** documents.
42. The specific changes recommended by the Panel can be found in Appendix 1A of this report and are highlighted in the **attached** Policy (Appendix 1B) and Bylaw (Appendix 1C).

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

43. The Special Consultative Procedure took place from 26 March to 28 April 2008. The consultation documents were sent directly to all registered dog owners, a number of known unregistered dog owners, a range of groups, organisations and individuals, as well as public notices appearing in relevant newspapers, and the consultation documents being made available at service centres, Council libraries and on the internet. Additionally, information sessions were held around the district for interested people to drop-in and talk to staff. Submissions were open from 26 March to 28 April and hearings were held on 5 and 7 May, which were open to the public.
44. Role of hearing panel in relation to Council decision-making: A bylaw hearing panel has no decision-making powers, but can make recommendations to the Council as a result of considering written and oral submissions.²⁴ The Council can then accept or reject those recommendations, as it sees fit. However, the Local Government Act states that the views presented during consultation should be received by the Council with an open mind and should be given "due consideration in decision-making".²⁵
45. NZ Bill of Rights Act 1990: The Legal Services Unit considers that the form of the bylaw, as proposed, is the most appropriate form, and that the bylaw does not give rise to any implications under the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 (in accordance with section 155 of the Local Government 2002).
46. The Local Government Act²⁶ requires that the Council give public notice of the making of a bylaw as soon as practicable after the bylaw is made. A recommendation has been made to this effect.
47. It is appropriate to resolve that the Policy and Bylaw will come into effect on 1 July 2008, which is the date proposed that the current bylaws would be revoked.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

48. The Hearing Panel has identified that it is critical for funding for additional signage be made available for the Proposed Dog Control Policy and Bylaw to be enabled. Without signage the status of the areas will not be locally publicised, the users may be unaware of the status of specific parks or areas making enforcement practically impossible. The cost of additional signage has been estimated by CCC Greenspace as \$100,000. This figure is only an estimate and will vary depending on the style, material and design of signs which is currently being reviewed as part of the Greenspace Signage Review.

²⁴ Clause 32 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 expressly prohibits the power to make a bylaw from being delegated

²⁵ Section 82(1)(e). This is also supported by the Council's Consultation Policy, which states: "we will receive presented views with an open mind and will give those views due consideration when making a decision".

²⁶ Section 157

49. Financial consideration need also be given to resourcing the Animal Control Team to work in the additional areas identified in the Policy. The implementation of the proposed Policy could be managed from an enforcement perspective on a respond and investigate approach as issues arise in these areas. This can be done within existing resources/FTE's. However, there will be a need for Animal Control to monitor the number of complaints/instances over a 12 month period to determine the true service demand that the new prohibited and restrained areas will create. During this 12 month period it is intended to utilise other Council staff such as Regional Park Rangers, to assist with monitoring compliance of the policy and bylaw. Should there be a substantial increase in service demand then the 12 month monitoring period will allow a business case to be created to gain additional resources (ie Animal Control Officer FTE's).
50. To enable a more proactive dog control approach then the best estimates as to the additional cost of this proactive approach is two FTE's or \$120-\$140,000 pa (salary plus equipment cost for two additional FTE animal control officers required to monitor and enforce the additional specified dog areas). A more proactive approach would involve a patrol and education based service with regular visits to these areas, therefore preventing issues before they arise. This proactive approach is currently provided in some high public use areas within Christchurch City but not all prohibited etc areas within the district.

ISSUES RAISED BY THE HEARING PANEL

51. A key issue identified through the hearing process was the requirement for signage in parks and reserves with specific dog control status requirements eg leashed or prohibited areas. This is required to notify the public/users of the areas of the control status of a specific area. To be effective it would also be beneficial for the signage to explain the reason for the specific control status – this would assist with the education of the public in such areas. The Hearing Panel considers there is a need for:
 - improved and consistent signage in existing prohibited and leashed areas
 - all designated control areas need to be signposted so users are informed
 - the use of interpretative/educational signage in protected areas to assist with public understanding and compliance.
52. The Hearing Panel recommends that the Dog Control Policy be reviewed sooner than the statutory requirement of 10 years (2018), to enable better alignment with:
 - Local Government Act 2002
 - Urban Development Strategy and increasingly intensified living conditions
 - Open Space Strategy (once adopted by Council)
 - Biodiversity Strategy (once adopted by Council)
53. The Hearing panel considered that some of the points raised in submissions required investigation and review and as such could not be addressed within the timeframe of this proposed Policy, but could be addressed for a review in 2010. In particular these review areas include:
 - (a) The introduction of a Responsible Dog Owner sub-category for older persons (pensioners). Access to this reduced fee category would be predicted on the applicant having no previous infringement history.
 - (b) Review the criteria to gain Responsible Dog Owner status, with the inclusion of a requirement for a property inspection. An investigation into the feasibility and resourcing of implementing the new criteria would need to be undertaken.
 - (c) The requirement to keep two or more dogs and developing criteria that is appropriate and will accommodate both the rural and urban areas within the district.
 - (d) Investigate the concept of Honorary Dog Rangers in local communities particularly in Banks Peninsula where there is limited local resourcing by the Enforcement Team. The focus of these rangers would be on managing general nuisance and non-serious complaints, and working on 'dog control' education of dog owners and within the community.

- (e) Clarify and document the criteria and decision process for determining the establishment of designated dog parks or dog exercise areas.
 - (f) Investigate the possibility of establishing a specified dog exercise beach(es) – where dogs are able to run freely under effective control and are signposted as such so people know that dogs will be on the beach unleashed.
 - (g) Investigate the possibility and impacts of removing areas on the Port Hills out of grazing lease to establish future dog exercise areas.
 - (h) When establishing or reviewing children’s play area infrastructure, consideration be given to locating handy ‘dog hitching posts’ to enable users to bring their dogs to the area but tie dogs away from playground areas.
 - (i) The Department of Conservation is currently reviewing and working through the process of gazetting Controlled or Open Dog areas under the Conservation Act 1987, or National Parks Act 1980. The Hearing Panel acknowledges that this review of conservation land may result in the need for discussions between DoC and CCC in relation to the control status of Council land adjoining conservation land to ensure complimentary practices.
54. The Panel recommends that this review be undertaken post the next Council election, either in late 2010 or early 2011, and that the cost of the review not be shouldered by dog owners this time around.
55. The Hearing Panel suggests that there may be a need to address the funding split between dog owners and general rates (currently 92:8). The basis for this review is that as wider objectives have a greater influence on the dog control policy.

HEARING PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Hearing Panel recommends that the Council:

- (a) Resolves to adopt the Christchurch City Council Dog Control Policy 2008 (Appendix 2A) and the Christchurch City Council Dog Control Bylaw 2008 (Appendix 2B), as amended;
- (b) Resolves that the necessary funding be allocated for signage to enable the implementation of the Dog Control Policy
- (c) Resolves to review the Dog Control Policy 2008 in 2010 with consideration given to:
 - (i) Establishing a Responsible Dog Owner sub-category for older persons (pensioners).
 - (ii) The inclusion of a property inspection as a criteria for Responsible Dog Owner status.
 - (iii) Investigating and resolving the ‘Limitation on Dogs’/permit requirements for the Christchurch District.
 - (iv) The introduction of Honorary Dog Rangers in local communities particularly in Banks Peninsula.
 - (v) Documenting the criteria and decision process for determining the establishment of designated dog parks or dog exercise areas.
 - (vi) Investigating the possibility of establishing a specified dog exercise beach(es).
 - (vii) Releasing some areas in the Port Hills out of grazing lease to establish future dog exercise areas.
 - (viii) The inclusion of ‘dog hitching posts’ near children’s playground areas.
 - (ix) Liaison with the Department of Conservation regarding their Controlled or Open Dog areas under the Conservation Act 1987, or National Parks Act 1980.
- (d) Gives public notice as soon as practicable, that the Christchurch City Council Dog Control Policy and Bylaw has been adopted by the Council, that it comes into effect on 1 July 2008, and that copies of the bylaw will be made available.
- (e) Sends copies of the Policy and Bylaw to those people or organisations that made submissions, and sends a letter to those to whom the consultation notification was initially sent, advising them of the outcome.

BACKGROUND

56. Below is a table which summarises the written submissions received on the proposed Policy and Bylaw, followed by a detailed outline of the changes to the Policy and the Bylaw recommended by the Hearing Panel.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

57. Written submissions were received on the following clauses in the Policy and Bylaw:

Clause/section header	Number of submissions	Key Themes
General comments about policy / bylaw	2	Suggests dogs should be on leash unless in a designated area for dogs to be off leash(1) Concern over accessibility into designated areas for Guide Dogs(1)
	1	Supports all clauses(1)
General comments about policy / bylaw	2	Add collection of faeces to clause 14(1) More rubbish tins(1)
General comments about policy / bylaw	68	Concern with 'wildlife values' and dogs verse cats, new housing subdivisions(5) Question re CCC role to maintain wildlife values on land acquired for purpose of recreation(4) Concern with contradiction in values - dogs not allowed but 4WD / grazing allowed(1) Concern controls breaching Iwi customary rights(4) Query interpretation of Dog Control Act in relation to "imposes obligations on owners..."(4) Suggest there is not need to have one policy and one bylaw for the CCC area(4) Noted (p2 para3) distinction between dog owners and general public terms(4) Feels this policy and bylaw will not mitigate any effects of dog attacks(4) Notes CCC needs to enforce current policy and bylaw rather than enacting new(4) Notes CCC not meeting Obj 5 p7 - re exercise for dogs and owners(5) General opposition to 'controls' noted(5) Support dogs restrained in cemeteries(1) Prohibit dogs in cemeteries(1) Historical cemeteries should allow dogs off leash as this helps protect the area from negative behaviour(1) Request for Little Port Cooper (LYT/MTH) to be prohibited(1) Request dogs prohibited from Lyttelton Recreation Ground(1)
General comments about policy / bylaw	68	Suggests trial period in restrained areas where dos can be exercised off leash at specific times of day(1) Concern dogs being treated like criminals(1) Request public health and safety not be used as general term - but each area evaluated on case-by-case basis(1) Areas that do not have specific endangered wildlife have multi-use status(1) People gain exercise with dogs - limiting where they can go works against this and the work being done by other agencies to promote exercise(1) Signage needs to clearly state the status of each park - not specified to prohibited(1) CCC need to accommodate large population of dog owners(4) More areas needed where dogs can be exercised off lead(4) Request clarification of terminology(1) Issues appear to be more about owners than about dogs(2) Queries whether CCC are meeting their own objectives with this policy and bylaw(1) Canadian Geese are polluting Children's Bay dog area(1) Suggested mission(1) Proposed Nuisance Value Scale and boundaries/consequences of breaching them(1) Need to promote where dogs can go to get people and dogs mobilised(1) Support proposed changes / information(8) Thanks to Council / Dog control for what they do(6) Reminder to CCC to give twice as much positive as negative...(1)

Clause/section header	Number of submissions	Key Themes
General comments about policy / bylaw	68	Objection to expensive booklet(1) More enforcement Officer needed(2) Change wording to bylaw slogan(1) How will CCC manage dogs intruding on others private land(1) Plover St Playground needs new track to beach for dog owners(1) Problem tends to be unregistered dogs/owners(1) Consultation does not need to be carried out to these expensive lengths(1) Need bylaw to limit dog size in Living zone areas(1) Bylaw needs to be enforced(1) Concluded that CCC should have consulted before this document went out(4)
General - Objectives	2	Policy does not provide for objective 5(1) Proposed bylaw tends to come down heavily on dogs and while trying to promote responsible dog ownership - has the opposite effect(1)
Registration fees	6	Concern over cost to low income(2) Suggested decrease in Registration fees for retired(1) Reduced fees for second dog(1) Need to focus on unregistered and problem dogs/owners(1) Concern over perceived link of obedience course into registration fees - cost issue(1) Fees higher here than other councils(1)
Classification of Owners	3	Relate classification to practical dog control training(3)
Education Awareness	4	Need more information on how and what Council plans(2) Suggestion of website for FAQ's and other information(1) Need for everyone to be responsible(1)
Dog Obedience	4	Support for owner training and links into reduced registration fees(2) Suggestion of linking NZ Kennel Club Canine Good Citizen Certificate into registration(2)
Infringement notices	1	Concern that fine is not high enough(1)
Infringement notices	4	Concern that there is no fine for not clearing up fouling (2) Concern over possible conflict that may arise for Officers enforcing infringements(1) Question over resources to enforce and also leniency over infringement(1)
Infringement notices	1	No info on microchipping in bylaw(1)
Infringement notices	1	Barking dogs should be mentioned(1)
Infringement notices	3	Concern infringement fine not sufficient for lack of care...(3)
Infringement notices	2	Support criteria to carry leash(1) Oppose Criteria to carry leash(1)
Infringement notices	1	Concern fine is to low(1)
Dog Shelter	1	Questions provisions in place when dogs leave shelter(1)
Neutering of Dogs	2	Support efforts to control menacing/dangerous dogs(2)
Enforcement	9	Owners of dogs who attack should be liable for costs(1) Concerns about lack of enforcement or resourcing to enforce(6) Concerns over dogs taking precedence(1) Ned higher penalties for unregistered than registered(1)
Enforcement - dogs on roads	3	Support proposal(1) Request that dangerous dogs be muzzled(1) Suggestion that all dogs outside owners property be muzzled(1)
Enforcement - dogs on roads	3	Opposes in Banks Peninsula area(2) Supports(1)

Clause/section header	Number of submissions	Key Themes
Enforcement - dogs on public places	10	All dogs should be on a leash when outside owners property(4)All dogs should be muzzled when outside owners property(1)Questions over interpretation of clause(5)
Enforcement - dogs on public places	1	Suggests word 'sign' is changed to 'signal'(1)
Enforcement - consultative procedure	5	Concern that more information on consultation procedure was necessary(5) Council giving itself power to prohibit access without proper consultation(5)
Enforcement - permits	32	Permits should be for more than 2 dogs Concern that size (4 hectare) is too large (Suggested rewording/sizes)
Enforcement - permits	17	Oppose proposed clause as it is(17) Oppose - suggest limit be more than 2 dogs Oppose - suggest limit 3 or 4 or more dogs Oppose - should just be for dangerous breeds Suggest neighbours need to be consulted in permit process Suggests phased implementation and extension for length of dogs natural life Suggests responsible dog owners excluded Should not be an extra charge over registering dogs Should not be annual/regular fee Don't limit rural zoned Banks Peninsula people Concern about dogs being looked after while friends are on holiday Object to / concerns over permit fee
Enforcement - confined	16	Perceived that confinement means that dogs cannot be walked off sections after sunset(16) <i>Need to reword to clarify intention</i>
Enforcement - confined	9	Oppose - reasons as above(9)
Enforcement - on vehicles	2	Oppose - dogs should be tethered(2)
Enforcement - on vehicles	1	Working dogs should not be exempt from clause 11(dogs on vehicles)(1)
Enforcement - diseased, bitches on heat	5	Need for owner education (1) Request 'diseased' be defined (4) and that with permission of legal owner of land dogs can wander on private land
Enforcement - diseased, bitches on heat	2	Oppose working animals wholly confined on farming land(1) Define diseased(1)
Enforcement - play equipment	3	Request for dog hitching post at playground(1) Increase distance to 3 metres(1) Request Bromley Park play area be fenced(1)
Enforcement - play equipment	1	Opposes - either a dog is safe to be there or not(1)
Enforcement - signage	5	More / improved signage(2) Consistent signage(2) Improved signage and info in Lyttelton(1)

Clause/section header	Number of submissions	Key Themes
Enforcement - working dogs exempt	2	Support all dogs tethered on vehicles(2)
Enforcement - working dogs exempt	1	Working dogs should not be exempt from clause 11(dogs on vehicles)(1)
Designated dog exercise areas	15	Request new area in Sumner(2) Request for Fendalton/Waimairi exercise park investigation(1) Promoting dogs and exercise value(2) Why does Orton Bradley not have a dog area?(1) Exercise area for Inner Harbour/Eastern Bays - Akaroa(4) Suggested age limit (12 yrs) on dog exercise parks(1) Support for Exercise areas(3) Change of wording to bylaw slogan(1)
Categories of dog control areas	3	Clarification of terms restrained (to on the leash), prohibited and not specified(2) Comment on restrained dogs causing problems(1)
Beaches - Sth New Brighton	2	Oppose proposed status
Beaches - Sumner	4	Request name correction to Clifton Beach(1) Need monitoring to support changes(1) Confused with first paragraph on page(1) Thanks for relaxing times(1)
Beaches - Southshore Beach Park	5	Suggests dog permitted on estuary, spit and spit reserve at any time(1) Agree with proposed status/times(2) Oppose proposed status(2)
Beaches Akaroa Foreshore	4	Oppose proposed status (prohibit all year)(4)
Beaches - Le Bons Bay	1	Concern over area shown on map as covers nesting area(1)
Beaches	10	Comments about values of beaches as dog exercise areas Improved signage in beach areas(2) Concern on leash when passing through is flouted so should be removed (1) Concern families/people cannot take their dogs to the beach when they go during day(2) Support change hours in Chch beach areas(3) Request that some areas be open to dogs(2)
Beaches - Port Levy	2	Clarification about times (error in one part of policy)(1) Listed in AKA/WAI ward as well(1)
Beaches - Purau	1	Clarification about times (error in one part of policy)
AKAROA/WAIREWA		
Area - Akaroa Cemetery	5	Oppose(5)
Area - Britomart Memorial	5	Oppose(4) Notes inconsistency between status and rationale
Area - Britomart Reserve	4	Oppose (4)
Area	3	Support retention of all exercise areas in Akaroa(2) Request for keeping open areas and questioning use of registration fees(1)
Area - Garden of Tane	7	Oppose(7)
Area - Misty Peaks Reserve	4	Oppose(4)

Clause/section header	Number of submissions	Key Themes
Area - Rue Balguerie Reserve	4	Oppose(4)
Area - Seaside Recreation Area	4	Oppose(4)
Area - Barrys Bay	3	Oppose(4)
Area - AKA/WAI	1	Plea for open exercise area(1)
Area - Birdlings Flat Esplanade Reserve	7	Oppose prohibited - suggest restrained(2) Oppose prohibited - suggest not specified(5)
Area - Birdlings Flat Regional Park	5	Oppose prohibited - suggest not specified(4) Support prohibited(1)
Area - Wairewa Esplanade Reserve	5	Oppose prohibited - suggest restrained(1) Oppose prohibited - suggest not specified(4)
Area - Duvauchelle Cemetery	4	Oppose prohibited - suggest not specified(4)
Area - Duvauchelle Domain & campground	7	Oppose prohibited/restrained - suggest not specified(5) Support prohibited(2)
Area - Duvauchelle foreshore	4	Oppose prohibited/not specified - suggest not specified(4)
Area - French Farm	4	Oppose prohibited/not specified - suggest not specified(4)
Area - Hill Top Reserve	5	Oppose prohibited/not specified - suggest not specified(5)
Area - Kaitorete Spit Reserve	6	Support proposed prohibited(1) Oppose prohibited - suggest not specified(5)
Area - Kaituna Cemetery	5	Oppose restrained - suggest not specified(5)
Area - Lake Forsyth	1	Support proposed prohibited(1)
Area - Le Bons Bay foreshore	8	Oppose change(2) Suggest river mouth sandbar and estuary not specified all year(5) Suggest dog exercise areas too close to prohibited areas to have any effect, need to look after the wildlife(1)
Area - Le Bons Bay cemetery	5	Oppose restrained - suggest not specified(5)
Area - Little Akaloa cemetery	4	Oppose restrained - suggest not specified(4)
Area - Little River cemetery	4	Oppose restrained - suggest not specified(4)
Area - Oashore Bay	4	Oppose prohibited/not specified (24 hrs between 1 Sept 1 Mar) - suggest no change from previous status(4)
Area - Okains Bay Cemetery	4	Oppose restrained - suggest not specified(4)
Area - Port Levy	2	Clarification about times (error in one part of policy)(1) Listed in AKA/WAI ward as well(1)
Area - Takapuneke Reserve	2	Oppose restrained - suggest not specified(2)
Area - Beach Rd Park	1	Oppose restrained - suggest not specified(1)

Clause/section header	Number of submissions	Key Themes
Area - Green Point Park	1	Oppose restrained - suggest not specified(1)
Area - Te Oka Bay	1	Oppose restrained - suggest not specified(1)
BURWOOD/PEGASUS		
Area - Bottle Lake Forest	1	Request restrained - currently not specified(1)
Area - ANZAC Drive Reserve	1	Support proposed status(1)
Area - Lower Avon Saltmarshes	1	Support proposed status(1)
Area - Raupo Bay Saltmarsh	1	Support proposed status(1)
Area - Horseshoe Lake Reserve	2	Correction to text(2)
Area - New Brighton Beach Develop area	1	Correction to text(1)
Area - New Brighton Mall	2	Oppose prohibited(1) Suggest prohibited/restrained(1)
Area - South New Brighton Beach	2	Extend restrained status to entire beach(1) Oppose prohibited 1 Dec-1 Mar 9am-7pm(1)
Area - Southshore Beach Park	6	Suggest limit restricted area(1) Oppose prohibited 1 Dec-1 Mar 9am-7pm(1) Prohibit only near Godwits(1) Oppose extent of prohibited area(1) Oppose - suggest restrained only in roosting area(1) Oppose - define specific bathing area(1)
Area - Spit Reserve	2	Oppose - excessive prohibited area(1) Support prohibited area(1)
Area	1	Request 'restrained' on South Brighton Park walkway(1)
Area - Waimairi Beach Park	1	Suggest dogs prohibited(1)
NOTE: No submissions were received on specific areas in Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board		
HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD		
Area - Botanic Gardens	2	Oppose - dogs should be allowed but restrained(1) Question re rationale(1)
Area - HAG/FER	1	Suggest restrained Hagley Park(2)
Area - Charlesworth Reserve	1	Suggest dog park included in area(1)
Area - Cathedral Square	1	Suggest areas where dogs allowed to pass through on leash(1)
Area - City Mall	1	Suggest areas where dogs allowed to pass through on leash(1)
Area - INNER CITY	1	Suggests CCC moves to prohibiting dogs from the inner city by 2018(1)
Area - Ferrymead Esplanade Reserve	1	Supports proposed status(1)
Area - PORT HILLS	1	Suggests consideration of some areas where dogs can be off leash(1)

Clause/section header	Number of submissions	Key Themes
Area - McCormacks Bay	1	Supports proposed status(1)
Area - John Brittan Reserve	2	Oppose proposed restrained status and query 'grazing areas for conservation'(2)
Area - PORT HILLS	1	Suggests consideration of some areas where dogs can be off leash(1)
Area - Cave Rock	1	Supports and suggests signage at both ends allowing dogs on leash to pass through(1)
Area - Scarborough Foreshore	3	Requests clarification of area/naming(1) Supports restrained status on promenade and suggests prohibited on beach 1 Dec-1 Mar 9am-7pm(1)
Area - Sumner Beach	4	Support proposed status(1)Suggest correction in name to Clifton Beach(2)Suggests extending time to 1 April and ensuring there is enforcement(1)
Area - Taylors Mistake Beach	1	Oppose - suggests dogs prohibited(1)
Area - Woolston Pool	1	Thinks we are prohibiting Woolston Park (which is not specified)
Area -	1	Notes that Taylor's Mistake Walkway not listed
LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT		
Area - Baydon Norris Reserve	2	Spelling of name - suggests no 'y'(1) Oppose proposed status(1)
Area - Diamond Harbour Cemetery	2	Oppose proposed status(1) Supports proposed status(1)
Area - Coastal Cliff Reserve	1	Supports proposed status(1)
Area - Diamond Harbour Foreshore	1	Supports proposed status(1)
Area - Otamahua Lane Reserve	1	Supports proposed status(1)
Area - Stoddart Point Reserve	4	Supports proposed status(4)
Area - Allandale Lay-by	1	Opposes prohibition on foreshore(1)
Area - Governors Bay (tidal Zone)	1	Opposes prohibition on mudflats(1)
Area - Governors Bay jetty and foreshore	2	Opposes proposed restrained status(1) Suggests status should be prohibited(1)
Area - Lyttelton War Memorial	1	Correcting typo in policy(1)
Area - Pony Point Reserve	1	Suggest change to restrained / not specified subject to stock grazing(1)
Area - Forestry Reserve/Reserve 68	3	Oppose proposed status(3)
Area - PORT HILLS	1	Suggests consideration of some areas where dogs can be off leash(1)

Clause/section header	Number of submissions	Key Themes
Area - Sugarloaf Reserve	4	Oppose proposed prohibited status area(4)
Area - Whakaraupo Reserve	1	Oppose proposed restrained status area(1)
Area - Port Levy	2	Supports prohibited area but questions why main bathing area not included(1) Oppose proposed prohibited status on much of mudflat(1)
Area - PORT HILLS	1	Suggests consideration of some areas where dogs can be off leash(1)
Area - Purau Foreshore	4	Correction to inconsistency in text(1) Support proposed status(1) Suggests limiting horses and mess they can leave(1) Oppose proposed status(1)
Area - Sandy Beach Reserve	1	Suggests extending prohibited area to include Sandy Beach(1)
SHIRLEY/PAPANUI		
Area - Abberley Park	4	Note inconsistency in text(2) Oppose proposed restrained status(2)
Area - Brooklands Spit and Lagoon	2	Oppose proposed prohibited/restrained status(2) Note inconsistency in rationale - wildlife and hunting!
Area - Seafield Park	1	Oppose proposed prohibited/restrained status(1)
Area - Styx Rivermouth	1	Queries inconsistency - prohibiting dogs and allowing boats and jetskis(1)
Area - Groynes	2	Suggests review of access in winter(2)
Area - Waimairi Walkway	2	Oppose - requests review of status to enable loop dog track(2)
Area - Kapuatohe Reserve	2	Note inconsistency in text(2)
Area - Lorimas Road	1	Support proposed prohibited status(1)
Area - Papanui Memorial Reserve	2	Note inconsistency in text(2)
Area - Styx Mill	1	Supports keeping dog Park(1)
SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE		
Area - Huntsbury Walkway	1	Note inconsistency in text(1)
Area - PORT HILLS	1	Suggests consideration of some areas where dogs can be off leash(1)
Area - PORT HILLS	1	Suggests consideration of some areas where dogs can be off leash(1)
Area - Elizabeth Park	1	Oppose proposed status(1)
Area - Waltham Pool	1	Thinks we are prohibiting Waltham Park (which is not specified)
RICCARTON/WIGRAM		
Area - Halswell Quarry	1	Suggests dog exercise area be extended to include part or all of the hillside above current exercise area(1)
Area - Wigram East Retention Basin	83	Oppose proposed new status(82)
	1	Thanks for resource(1)