

Summary of Submitter Feedback

The Railway Reserve

The majority of submitters requested dogs off leash at all times. The following submitters suggested dogs being on leash option during commuter hours: 8, 10, 60, 193, 209, 222, 225, 356, 418 and 498. At the hearing Bridget Gardner (submitter 564) also supported this approach. The following submitters supported dogs on leash at all times: 4, 33, 52, 63, 112, 180, 181, 234, 271, 287, 290, 336, 435, 471 and 587.

Working Dogs Definition

The Brook Sanctuary Manager requested an amendment to section 2.4 of the proposed policy to broaden the exemption for access to these areas *“for specific feral animal control purposes”*, to *“for specific conservation purposes”*.

The Brook Sanctuary Manager also requests an addition to section 7 of the proposed bylaw as follows:

“Council shall issue special purpose permits for a dog to enter the Brook Conservation Reserve for specific conservation purposes if either:

- The dog has successfully undergone weka, kiwi, or other wildlife aversion training, or is muzzled; and is micro-chipped; and has been fitted with an approved radio transmission device; or*
- The dog and its accompanying handler are approved by the Department of Conservation for indigenous species conservation purposes.”*

The Department of Conservation (DoC) had concerns about the rules about dogs prohibited areas not applying to working dogs while they are engaged in or being used for their working purpose (as set out in clause 2.3 of the policy and clause 7.1 of the bylaw).

DoC requested the following change to clause 2.3 of the proposed policy:

“A working dog, as defined in the Dog Control Act, may be exempted from clauses 2.4 and 2.5, subject to conditions, while ...”

DoC requested additional clauses to section 7 of the proposed bylaw:

“Clauses 7.1 and 7.3 do not negate the need to apply for a dog control permit from the Department of Conservation where such a permit is required to take a dog onto land administered by the Department of Conservation.”

Amend clause 7.3 as follows:

“ ... such as pest control or the management of indigenous wildlife.”

Add a new clause as follows:

“The taking of any dog into the Nelson City Council Water Works Reserve, Brook Conservation Reserve, Haulashore Island, Oyster Island, Haven Holes Reserve, the beaches and estuary flat of Nelson Haven, the fenced area of Paremata Flats, or the part of the Marsden Valley Reserve to the east of the Barnicoat Walkway, in accordance with clauses 7.1 or 7.3, must comply with the following conditions:

- The dog must be on a leash; or*
- The dog handler has provided certification that the dog has undertaken bird aversion training, and the dog has an approved radio tracking collar.*
- Where the dog is being used for the purpose of indigenous wildlife management, the dog and handler must have approval for this purpose by the Department of Conservation.”*

Level of Enforcement

A number of submitters requested more proactive enforcement of the rules. Submission 110 requested a clear plan on how the Council is going to ensure the Dog Control Bylaw is taken seriously by dog owners, including signage and other means of raising awareness of the rules, and how follow up enforcement action will be taken against those who continue to take their dogs to 'dogs prohibited' areas.

At the hearing Helen Bailey (submitter 145) noted that Dog Control Officers used to visit dog owners once a year to look at welfare of dogs and fencing. At the hearing Karen Dean, representing the Residents Association (submitter 566), suggested Parking Wardens could also be Dog Control Officers.

Doggy-Do Dispensers and Rubbish Bins

A number of submitters made suggestions for placement of new doggy do dispensers – at Centennial Park (342), Orphanage Creek (401), at the start of the BMX track on the way to Back Beach (358), Railway Reserve - both near the Stoke Shopping Centre and at Saxton Field (159), Saxton Field (64), Wigzell Park and the Grampians Walkway (298), at all dog exercise areas (130), at Neale/Guppy Park (148).

In addition, submitters requested new rubbish bins, at Centre of New Zealand (402) and at Neale Avenue Reserve (403), at Saxton Field (64), along cycle lanes (96), Maitai Bowling Club (316), Cable Bay beach (361) and Marsden Reserve (496). At the hearing submitter 493 (Joe Hay) requested doggy do dispensers and rubbish bins be made available at the Maitai swimming holes where dogs are permitted to swim.

Dog Parks

A number of submitters requested the development of a fenced dog park where dogs can run freely and safely (submitters 13, 56, 95, 137, 178, 179, 215, 295, 299, 334, 405, 436 and 458). They suggested the following areas for this park: Maitai Valley exercise area, former tennis court area in Rutherford Park, Miyazu Reserve, Branford Park and Saxton Field. Submitter 13 requested a fenced area in each of Nelson, Stoke and Tahunanui. Submitters advised there were successful dog parks in Rolleston, Victoria Park in Christchurch, Wellington, and Westport. At the hearing submitter 295 (Bob Hancock) referred to the popular dog park in the Selwyn District Council area, where a dog club had formed to look after this park. He suggested having a dog park in the Marsden Valley area opposite the cemetery.

Multiple Dogs Policy

The following submitters supported the proposed policy for multiple dogs (30, 78, 83, 85, 106, 107, 126, 139, 165, 173, 277, 365 and 555). Submitters 78 and 555 both requested clear standards for considering whether more than two dogs are acceptable, including consultation with neighbours as part of this consent process.

Three submitters opposed the multiple dogs policy: submitters 156, 364 and 408. Submitter 156 considered it to be a disincentive to register all dogs within a household. They pointed out that some of the best dog owners act as foster carers to rehabilitate dogs and if this policy was seriously being considered, a three dog limit as of right might be more appropriate. Submitter 408 considered the limit should apply to dogs per adult, not dogs per property.