



TE KAUNIHERA Ā-ROHE O  
**Whanganui**  
DISTRICT COUNCIL

# Dog Control Policy & Dog Control Bylaw

Submissions received

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 138

Not speaking

First name: **Malcolm**  
Last name: **Affleck**

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
<p><b>Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?</b></p> <p>..</p> <p><b>Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.</b></p> <p>..</p> <p><b>Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.</b></p> <p>..</p>	
<hr/> <b>Supporting documents:</b>	

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 2

Not speaking

First name: **Colin**  
Last name: **Anderson**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

Any alterations to the bylaw or policy must be in line with Government legislation and amendments to it. It was very difficult to find the current bylaw in its entirety to comment on it. The inclusion of a hot link would be very helpful.

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

Dogs should be restrained on a leash in all locations except in Council designated dog exercise locations or the owners full fenced property. Unfettered access from the street to the front door must be provided by the owner. In designated exercise areas the dogs must be under the owners control at all times.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

Animal control officers need to enforce and be supported in their enforcement of the Bylaws.

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 3

Not speaking

First name: **Brenda**  
Last name: **Anderson**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

It was difficult to make an informed submission owing to difficulty in finding current bylaw information. Any alterations to the bylaw must be in line with Government legislation and any alterations to it.

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

Dogs should be on a leash at all times, except in Council designated dog exercise locations or in a secure fenced area on owners property. Owners must provide unfettered access from the street to the front door for visitors. In the Council provided exercise areas, dogs must be under the owners control at all times.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

Animal Control Officers need to enforce and be supportive in their enforcement of the bylaws.

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 87

Not speaking

First name: **Dora**  
Last name: **Baker**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

My main concern is the issue of people letting dogs off to roam at night, coming in and fouling my lawns and garden. most of my neighbourhood are responsible owners and I love the animals and get on very well with all of them. BUT someone is NOT!! What actions can be taken in law for these type of people??? I cannot sit up all night to catch the culprit. But I am considering taking other action. Enough is enough!!

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

Generally I think things are managed well here in Wanganui. I have been a dog owner.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 55

Not speaking

First name: **James**  
Last name: **Barron**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

With Whanau in Northland I'm aware of the issues some council's face and the reasonableness/necessity of legislative changes to support them. Whanganui Council's position should be more supportive of proposed legislative changes to address dog control issues experienced by other councils and less "we're OK mate"

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

A casual walk around the Saturday river market shows the ban of dogs in the city to be unnecessary and (correctly) widely ignored.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 102

Not speaking

First name: **Carol**  
Last name: **Baxter**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

More control of dogs in main street

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 154

Not speaking

First name: **Russell**  
Last name: **Bell**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

It needs to be more stringent

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

All public spaces, particularly where children are, should require leads as mandatory. Dog breeds with a history of violence towards other dogs and humans must be muzzled in public spaces

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

no

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 47

Not speaking

First name: **Kay**  
Last name: **Benseman**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

The area of the awa near the Sailing Club where our kūaka migrate to should be a dog free or only leashed area. This space needs to be protected. Info panels explaining why would also help.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 143

Not speaking

First name: **Glen**  
Last name: **Blythe**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

Why is it dog control dosnt go to the streets that gang members or low society are to sort roaming dogs?

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

Yes the fact dog control dosnt interfer with dogs that belong to low society and gang members

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 119

Not speaking

First name: **Maree**  
Last name: **Boyack**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

At parks, beaches and walkways. These are shared public spaces to be enjoyed by all. Leashes should be mandatory in these areas.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 70

Not speaking

First name: **Tanya**  
Last name: **Chaplow**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

We still see dogs within the city limits. Is this because people don't really realise they aren't allowed in certain places?? Especially visitors??

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

## Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 43

Not speaking

First name: **Kees**  
Last name: **Crawford**  
Organisation: **N/A**

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
<p><b>Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?</b> Same as prior.</p> <p><b>Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.</b> N/A</p>	
<hr/> <b>Supporting documents:</b>	

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 126

Not speaking

First name: **Sophia**  
Last name: **Cullen-Quigley**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

As a recent dog owner. (Last 12 months) I found it a little confusing figuring out where I could bring my dog on and off lead. The interactive map on the website doesn't integrate well with android mobile phones.

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

Castlecliff Beach. It's very unclear where dogs are allowed on and off lead and how to access these areas. I also noticed during the summer when swimming between the flags that other families had dogs in this area off lead. It was frustrating to deal with and not something the young life guards could handle. Better signage and support for life guards to contact animal control would be awesome.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

I have also noticed using the Otamatea dog park an increase in individuals using long leads (like you would for a horse.) causing a trip hazard for other users of the park. While most of these dogs are on a lead they are not under control and dart everywhere amongst other people and dogs. This needs addressing before an elderly person is knocked off their feet. (It's bad enough when it's a young person.) As an occasional user of Gonville domain I also like to see more playground type facilities for kids here. So they can play while I walk the dog. Some better refuse bins and access to water for dogs and humans. (And maybe dispensers for poo bags like Otamatea.) That in mind I have stopped using the domain regularly as it can often feel unsafe. (I have been approached by a person who was clearly using drugs and felt quite isolated)

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 9

Speaking

First name: **Arnja**  
Last name: **Dale**  
Organisation: **RNZ SPCA**

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

<b>Supporting documents:</b>	yes
------------------------------	-----



**Submission by the  
Royal New Zealand Society for the  
Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Inc.**

**on**

**Whanganui District Dog Control Policy and Bylaw**

**3 May 2026**



## Executive Summary

- SPCA broadly supports the updated policy and bylaw, in particular the explicit recognition of Council’s proactive role in promoting responsible dog ownership.
- SPCA supports dog-friendly communities, including appropriate provision of off-leash exercise areas, provided dogs are under control and managed in a way that protects wildlife, other animals, and public safety. Access to suitable exercise areas is an important component of dog welfare and can improve compliance with Council rules.
- SPCA commends Council’s animal control team for their year-on-year reduction in dog attack complaints.
- SPCA encourages councils to provide a pathway for review of “menacing by behaviour” classifications where owners take steps to demonstrate responsible dog ownership over a set time period.
- SPCA recommends that decisions about dog risk and classifications are based on consistent, evidence-based behavioural assessment tools rather than subjective judgement.



**Table of Contents**

Executive Summary ..... 1

Introduction ..... 3

Submission ..... 3

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy?.....3**

**SPCA broadly supports the updated policy and bylaw. ....3**

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different?.....4**

**SPCA supports dog-friendly communities.....4**

**SPCA encourages councils to consider feedback from local residents regarding adequate provision of appropriate dog exercise areas. ....4**

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? .....5**

**SPCA commends Council’s animal control team for their year-on-year reduction in dog attack complaints. Below we provide additional feedback in relation to menacing classifications.....5**

**SPCA encourages councils to provide a pathway for owners of dogs with a menacing by behaviour classification to request a review of their dog’s classification, provided they take specific steps to demonstrate responsible dog ownership. ....5**

**SPCA recommends councils assess risk based on the behaviour of the individual dog, using standardised methods to assess severity of injury and risk of reoffending.....6**

**SPCA encourages councils to consider impacts of menacing classification, and the high rates of error in visual identification of cross breeds, when determining their criteria for classifying dogs as ‘menacing’ based solely on appearance. ....7**

Conclusion ..... 8

References..... 9



## Introduction

The following submission is made on behalf of The Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (trading as SPCA).

SPCA is the preeminent animal welfare and advocacy organisation in New Zealand. The Society has been in existence for over 150 years with a supporter base representing more than 100,000 New Zealanders across the nation.

The organisation includes 27 Animal Welfare Centres across New Zealand and approximately 60 inspectors appointed under the Animal Welfare Act 1999.

SPCA welcomes the opportunity to submit on the consultation on the Whanganui District Dog Control Policy and Bylaw.

## Submission

SPCA advocates for responsible dog ownership. In this submission we address the questions on proposed changes to the Dog Control Policy and Bylaw set out in the feedback form, including additional suggestions to promote responsible dog ownership. We also provide background information and research in support of our submission.

### **Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy?**

***SPCA broadly supports the updated policy and bylaw.***

In particular, we support the addition of statements that make explicit Council's broader role beyond enforcement including:

- Supporting responsible dog ownership and dog welfare
- Providing funding or grants to organisations working with dogs
- Delivering education and awareness programmes



SPCA has developed educational materials which may assist Council with their education and awareness programmes, including SPCA's Dog Safety resources for both families and teachers. You can read more about these [here](#).<sup>1</sup>

SPCA would also like to make Council aware of the dog tethering regulations introduced last year which prohibit harmful, long-term tethering (based on presence of indicators of suffering due to prolonged tethering) and prohibit the tethering of specific categories of dogs, including female dogs in estrus and puppies. More information can be found [here](#).<sup>2</sup>

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different?**

***SPCA supports dog-friendly communities.***

New Zealanders overwhelmingly consider their companion animals part of their whānau (Companion Animals New Zealand, 2020). Creating dog-friendly communities facilitates socialisation of puppies and dogs. Dogs which have been adequately and appropriately socialised are less likely to show undesirable behaviours, such as barking and aggression (Dietz et al., 2018).

***SPCA encourages councils to consider feedback from local residents regarding adequate provision of appropriate dog exercise areas.***

There is a legitimate need for safe, appropriate designated off-leash areas to provide alternatives to those areas where the presence of off-leash dogs is potentially detrimental to wildlife, farmed animals and other users of public lands.

Legally, all dog owners must meet the physical, health and behavioural needs of their animals, and providing sufficient exercise is a part of this requirement. Some dog owners may be reluctant to exercise their dogs if they have less flexibility about where they can do this within their local area. Provision of alternative designated dog exercise areas to compensate for those

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.sPCA.nz/news-and-events/news-article/launches-dog-safety-programme>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.sPCA.nz/news-and-events/news-article/dog-tethering-regulations-fags>



removed, is likely to improve compliance with the introduced restrictions and allow dog owners to meet their physical, health and behavioural needs.

On-leash exercise is not a substitute for off-leash exercise. Dogs walk faster than people and providing off-leash time allows them to work off excess energy. Research suggests that off-leash dog exercise areas can benefit owners' and dogs' physical and social health, as well as community connectedness (Cutt et al., 2007; Eldering & Martin, 2017; Toohey et al., 2013). Canine obesity is now considered to be the number one health concern in companion dogs worldwide (Kipperman & German, 2018). Dogs walked less often and for a shorter time are more likely to be obese; this can shorten their life and put them at risk of health complications such as diabetes and heart disease (German et al., 2017).

Dogs not provided an appropriate outlet for their energy can develop problem behaviours such as nuisance barking and destructive behaviours or depression (Instone & Sweeney, 2014). Exercise is an easy, inexpensive, welfare-friendly tool to assist with nuisance barking (Righetti, 2005). Thus, provision of off-leash exercise opportunities is a key component of the Council's obligations to prevent or abate nuisances.

### **Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy?**

***SPCA commends Council's animal control team for their year-on-year reduction in dog attack complaints. Below we provide additional feedback in relation to menacing classifications.***

Under the Dog Control Act 1996, dogs may be classified as menacing due to behaviour (section 33A) or due to appearance (section 33C).

***SPCA encourages councils to provide a pathway for owners of dogs with a menacing by behaviour classification to request a review of their dog's classification, provided they take specific steps to demonstrate responsible dog ownership.***

This approach has been successfully adopted by other Territorial Authorities (for example, see Auckland Council Dog Bylaw), which provide an opportunity to apply for review after 12 months



of holding this classification. This incentivises human behaviour change and adoption of responsible dog ownership practices.

***SPCA recommends councils assess risk based on the behaviour of the individual dog, using standardised methods to assess severity of injury and risk of reoffending.***

The Dog Control Act 1996 currently lacks clear, consistent guidance for councils on how to classify dogs as ‘menacing’ or ‘dangerous’ based on their behaviour. This absence of national standards can result in inconsistent decisions across Territorial Authorities, which may undermine both public safety and animal welfare.

SPCA recommends councils assess risk based on the behaviour of the individual dog, using standardised methods to assess severity of injury and risk of reoffending rather than subjective or inconsistent interpretations of incidents. Well established tools, such as the Ian Dunbar Dog Bite Scale, support objective, evidence-based assessments.<sup>3</sup> The Ian Dunbar Bite Scale offers advantages as it provides insights into the prognosis for a training intervention and objective assessment of future risk. A consistent, evidence-based, behaviour-focused approach would:

- Promote fairness and clarity by ensuring that similar incidents are treated with equivalent seriousness
- Improve public safety through more accurate identification of genuinely high-risk dogs and identifying opportunities for early intervention through proportionate measures to reduce future risk
- Support animal welfare by reducing arbitrary or disproportionate restrictions on dogs who pose little or no threat

---

<sup>3</sup> Ian Dunbar Bite Scale (2017) <https://apdt.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/ian-dunbar-dog-bite-scale.pdf>



***SPCA encourages councils to consider impacts of menacing classification, and the high rates of error in visual identification of cross breeds, when determining their criteria for classifying dogs as ‘menacing’ based solely on appearance.***

SPCA understands that councils are required to comply with the Dog Control Act 1996, which currently requires classification of dogs listed in Schedule 4 (as assessed based on visual assessment of the dog’s physical characteristics) as “menacing”. SPCA strongly opposes breed specific legislation, such as New Zealand’s Dog Control Act 1996, as evidence shows that targeting specific dog breeds or types is subjective, does not reduce the risk of dog bites, and places additional obligations on responsible owners.

The Act does not contain a definition of what constitutes an “American Pit Bull Terrier type” and thus it is left up to each Territorial Authority to determine how they establish reasonable grounds for believing a dog is wholly or predominantly one of the impacted dog breeds or types. SPCA cautions that research has clearly and repeatedly shown that visual assessment of the breed make up of mixed breed dogs is highly inaccurate, even when conducted by experts such as shelter workers, veterinarians and dog control officers (Hoffman et al., 2014; Olson et al., 2015; Voith et al., 2013).

We note that, of the dogs classified as menacing in the most recent Whanganui District Council Annual Dog Control Report, more than half were classified based on “breed or type” alone. Only 1 dog was classified as menacing due to both breed and behaviour, highlighting that appearance is a poor predictor of behaviour.<sup>4</sup>

Classification as menacing has serious consequences for a dog’s welfare and can impact responsible dog owners in terms of their access to housing, services and pet insurance costs. We encourage Council to be mindful of these impacts when considering their guidelines for classifying dogs based on their visual appearance.

---

<sup>4</sup> Whanganui District Council <https://www.whanganui.govt.nz/files/assets/public/v/1/reports/annual-dog-control-report-2024-2025.pdf>



## **Conclusion**

SPCA appreciates the opportunity to contribute to the on Whanganui District Dog Control Policy and Bylaw consultation. Our organisation is happy to discuss this matter if further information is required.



## References

Companion Animals New Zealand. (2020). *Companion animals in New Zealand 2020*. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5d1bf13a3f8e880001289eeb/t/5f768e8a17377653bd1eebef/1601605338749/Companion+Animals+in+NZ+2020+%281%29.pdf>

Cutt, H., Giles-Corti, B., Knuiiman, M., & Burke, V. (2007). Dog ownership, health and physical activity: A critical review of the literature. *Health and Place*, 13(1), 261–272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2006.01.003>

Dietz, L., Arnold, A.-M. K., Goerlich-Jansson, V. C., & Vinke, C. M. (2018). The importance of early life experiences for the development of behavioural disorders in domestic dogs. *Behaviour*, 155(2–3), 83–114. <https://doi.org/10.1163/1568539X-00003486>

Eldering, L., & Martin, S. (2017). The association between dog ownership and physical activity in adults – a brief review. *The Journal of Health Design*, 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.21853/jhd.2017.17>

German, A. J., Blackwell, E., Evans, M., & Westgarth, C. (2017). Overweight dogs exercise less frequently and for shorter periods: Results of a large online survey of dog owners from the UK. *Journal of Nutritional Science*, 6, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jns.2017.6>

Hoffman, C. L., Harrison, N., Wolff, L., & Westgarth, C. (2014). Is That Dog a Pit Bull? A Cross-Country Comparison of Perceptions of Shelter Workers Regarding Breed Identification. *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, 17(4), 322–339. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888705.2014.895904>

Instone, L., & Sweeney, J. (2014). *Placing companion animals in the city: Towards the constructive co-habitation of humans and dogs in urban areas* (Issue November). Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, The University of Newcastle, Australia.



Kipperman, B. S., & German, A. J. (2018). Companion animal obesity. *Animals*, 9, 1–9.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/ani8080143>

Olson, K. R., Levy, J. K., Norby, B., Crandall, M. M., Broadhurst, J. E., Jacks, S., Barton, R. C., & Zimmerman, M. S. (2015). Inconsistent identification of pit bull-type dogs by shelter staff. *Veterinary Journal*, 206(2), 197–202.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tvjl.2015.07.019>

Righetti, J. (2005). Barking problems solved: Examples of successful management of barking problems in the urban environment. *Urban Animal Management Conference Proceeding*, 125–126.

Toohey, A. M., McCormack, G. R., Doyle-Baker, P. K., Adams, C. L., & Rock, M. J. (2013). Dog-walking and sense of community in neighborhoods: Implications for promoting regular physical activity in adults 50 years and older. *Health and Place*, 22, 75–81.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2013.03.007>

Voith, V. L., Trevejo, R., Dowling-Guyer, S., Chadik, C., Marder, A., Johnson, V., & Irizarry, K. (2013). Comparison of Visual and DNA Breed Identification of Dogs and Inter-Observer Reliability. *American Journal of Sociological Research*, 2013(2), 17–29.

<https://doi.org/10.5923/j.sociology.20130302.02>

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 1

Speaking

First name: **Mish**  
Last name: **Davenport**

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

Yes. Mostly for clarification, but also to highlight where the Dog Control Policy and bylaws fail to meet intended objectives due to the extreme difficulty in enforcement.

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

Dog Control Policy 4.0 Roads, Private ways, Walkways, Shared Pathways and Car Parks: I think a sub clause should be added to prohibit dog owners from 'walking' their dogs while cycling or on an electric scooter, but particularly on footpaths and roads.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

Not so much omissions (though an aspect of 'neglect' may be missing - see final observation), but elements of existing policy and bylaw are often ignored (around Gonville, anyway) although I accept they are almost impossible to enforce:

1. Dog control: It is relatively common for folk to walk their dogs off-leash around Gonville. Although the policy and bylaw are clear that dogs should be kept on a leash, Policy Section 5.0 includes voice commands, hand signals and whistles as being methods of control, which could arguably be considered an inconsistency. Although I don't think this would make any difference to attitudes, clarification in the interpretation could remove a possible get out clause if an off-leash dog attacks someone or another animal.
2. Nuisance: Excessive and prolonged barking and howling are a real problem during the day and into mid-evening around the part of Gonville where I live. The policy and bylaw are reasonable, but so many dog owners kick their dogs outside during the day while they are at work, with little or no care for neighbours. Some barking is to be expected and is normal, but some poor dogs get very lonely and cry/howl incessantly. See my final observation about 'neglect'.
3. Dog faeces: We have a significant problem with dog faeces littering berms and footpaths are Gonville, particularly where I live. Some of this is bound to be from strays, but some owners (in my experience usually those who don't use a leash) don't care. Challenging them is never well received.
4. Possible omission: 'Neglect'. I don't think neglect is quite the right term, but I can't think of a better one right now. Many dog owners around here keep their dogs outside when they go to work, allowing them back in the house in the evening. Some of these poor animals get very lonely and howl and cry incessantly, while others just bark off and on throughout the day. Obviously they are bored. Sadly, I don't have the knowledge to suggest useful options, other than perhaps making 'Responsible Dog Ownership' mandatory over time, to include keeping dogs indoors, warm and watered during the day when the owners are out. Sadly, I've come to the conclusion that while Whanganui prides itself on being a city of dog lovers, I think it is more accurate to describe Whanganui as a city with a large minority of people own dogs because it was a good idea at the time.

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 31

Not speaking

First name: **Michelle**  
Last name: **Excell**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

In the CBD. It's ridiculous that we can't walk dogs through the CBD. I take my dog to the office which is in the CBD. Many businesses in the CBD are dog friendly. There needs to be an evaluation of the current rules for a dog-free CBD to assess whether they are still valid, and new rules potentially drafted. Happy to speak to this if you are taking the CBD rules into review at this stage.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

## Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 104

Not speaking

First name: **Nichole**  
Last name: **Ganley**  
Organisation: **N/A**

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
<p><b>Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?</b> Remove dogs from the Saturday morning markets. They are unnecessary in a small area where food and children are.</p> <p><b>Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.</b> Saturday markets, there is no need for dogs to be here.</p> <p><b>Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.</b></p>	

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 22

Not speaking

First name: **Lynn and Stuart**  
Last name: **Gillespie**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

Yes, we believe that Otamatea Reserve should be changed from Designated Dog Exercise area to just an off-leash area like other parks . Our submission is quite long so it has been sent by email.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

**From:** Lynn Gillespie

**Date:** 3 May 2026

**Subject: Re: Change of designation of Otamatea Reserve**

What is Otamatea Reserve?

In the council website it is listed as a “Designated Dog Exercise Area - a place where dog owners are the priority user. Owners may take their dogs off a leash ( including dangerous dogs) but they must be under control at all times”.

But what does “dog owners are the priority user” actually mean? We will endeavour to explain why this designation is so unsuitable for a multi-purpose space like Otamatea Reserve.

There are small green signs in a yellow font to blend into the surroundings (go figure) around the park which state 3 rules that apply to use of the area. We are dog owners who walk our dog in the reserve every day, and to illustrate the absolute inefficiency of this signage, not a single person I have spoken to ( including several friends who have walked their dogs there for years) has been aware of what the signs actually say!

The first ‘rule’ is that you should not allow your dog to be a nuisance to the neighbours by allowing “loud, consistent or regular barking” - we will address separately with the council the issue of barking and how that impacts on our lives and those of our neighbours.

The second is “your dog must be under your control at all times”. Unfortunately only a small percentage of dogs walked in the park are under their owners’ control. A number of dogs in the majority are small non-threatening ones, but of course it also includes larger dogs, some of which have in the past attacked other dogs. The last owner to take her dog to the vet with injuries incurred at the reserve was told by the vet that they see more dog bite injuries coming out of Otamatea than any other park. The reaction of any owner made aware that there may be a dangerous dog roaming the park off leash is always one of disbelief - a dangerous dog is very unlikely to be under control once it decides to attack another dog, or a person.

Which brings us back to the issue of what exactly is the intended use of Otamatea Reserve. This reserve has always been used for purposes other than dog walking - children flying kites, playing with a cricket or rugby ball, or learning to ride a bike, and elderly people from local resthomes or retirement villages on walkers or in wheelchairs. This is the great thing about the space, it’s such a lovely asset for this area - but there is definitely some confusion among those who use it. A couple of years ago a concrete path was laid which connects to the existing path and makes a continuous circuit of the park. This has created a bit of a problem and we wonder what the rationale was behind spending this money as it makes no logical sense. Since it was laid there has been a big increase in the number of children on the path using scooters, bikes and rollerblades which is great, except that these activities do not mix well with dogs running around off-leash. The park is not such a relaxing place to walk your dog now that the number of ‘wheels’ has increased. One dog owner, who misinterpreted the little signs which show a picture of a motorbike being prohibited, and

who's dog had its dew claw ripped off in the wheel of a bike it chased, told the child they shouldn't be on their bikes in the 'dog park'.

The majority of people who go to Otamatea Park to exercise their dogs are good responsible owners who cause no trouble at all, but there is definitely a perception that the reserve is a 'dog park', which it is not, as that is not its exclusive use. Some owners use this as an excuse for any undesirable behaviour, such as allowing unrestrained barking, allowing their dogs to rush at other dogs or people, and not picking up their dog's poop. "It's a dog park, get over it" is the stock standard reply to any comments re the above. For a long time now the amount of dog poop left lying around has become an issue and is a revolting result of people just not bothering to pick up after their dog, or not watching their dog at all times. Picking up after your dog is the third 'rule' on the signs, but this is more and more often completely ignored. It's a privilege to have a beautiful space like Otamatea to walk your dog - respect and consideration should be mandatory when using it.

In summary, with the reserve being multi-use we consider it not appropriate to have it as a "designated dog exercise area" and that it should be amended to be the same as any other area where dogs are allowed off-leash.

Whanganui however does definitely need a fully-fenced area specifically for dogs - not frequented by children on bikes and the elderly, and definitely not in close proximity to homes! Dog ownership is huge in Whanganui and a 'proper' dog park would be a major asset, and take the pressure off the other areas.

We trust that the Council, as owners of the reserve, will take these concerns seriously, and on reflection of what the current designation actually means, agree that a change of designation makes sense, especially with safety around dogs currently being a major issue.

New improved signage, i.e, large clear signs, impossible to miss stating that this is NOT a dog park, along with the required behaviours in a residential neighbourhood ( in more punchy language than the existing signs) would also hopefully go some way to making it safer and more enjoyable for everyone who uses or lives beside Otamatea Reserve.

## Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 130

Not speaking

First name: Liz  
Last name: Goodrich

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
<p><b>Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?</b> So long as the review enables nuisance and dangerous dogs to be impounded and destroyed as necessary with costs being charged to the owners of such dogs.</p> <p><b>Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.</b> No, the areas seem to work quite well</p> <p><b>Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.</b></p>	
<hr/> <b>Supporting documents:</b>	

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 80

Not speaking

First name: **Barbara**  
Last name: **Gray**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

It's regurgitating the same old platitudes to make us believe things are improving. We need to be bold and decisive and make sure the dogs' welfare is paramount.

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

All pathways should see dogs on leads as there is very little wriggle room should things not go as planned. It is basic manners for all users.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

All dogs should be desexed and microchipped and a good start is not returning lost dogs until that has been done. Only registered breeders can be exempt and subject to regular inspections. I don't know why that is so hard to do. We keep making excuses and things never improve.

---

**Supporting documents:**

## Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 135

Not speaking

First name: **John**  
Last name: **Hulley**

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
<p><b>Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?</b> Current policy seems to work</p> <p><b>Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.</b> No</p> <p><b>Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.</b> No</p>	
<hr/> <b>Supporting documents:</b>	

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 115

Not speaking

First name: **Trish**  
Last name: **Hungwe**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

Children's playgrounds - some people dont have their dogs on a leash. Public roads - leash please. An elderly family member was bit by a dog not on a leash on a public road.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 122

Not speaking

First name: P S  
Last name: Jones

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

## Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?

### Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.

Submission - That: The restricted "no dogs allowed" zone in central city be extended to include the areas of Moutoa Quay, in particular 1. that area used as the Saturday market and also with reference to - 2. the fishing area further south past the bridge along the wharf area. Reason - 1. Dogs on leashes present a trip hazard [as witnessed several times] as owners do not keep their dogs beside them on a short leash when standing around talking or looking at market stalls. 2. this fishing area is frequently used by families with young children, playing or fishing and often dog excrement is not picked up. What is picked up does not clean up entirely. This is a social and health hazard. I have had to clean up a young children with dog faeces on them. These faeces can contain e-coli, salmonella and campylobacteria resulting in illnesses like diarrhea, cramps and vomiting. Children are especially vulnerable. We would particularly like to see both of these area a no-go area for dogs with really good visible signage at eye height. It is suggested that an advertising campaign in the local paper would be of benefit should you accept this submission.

### Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.

Just as an aside it is noted that there are 'No Dogs Allowed' signs in the central city but the signs are useless as they are not low enough to attract attention. Thank you for taking the time to consider this submission.

---

### Supporting documents:

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 147

Not speaking

First name: **Jason**  
Last name: **Lane**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

I generally support the changes.

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 144

Not speaking

First name: Yvonne  
Last name: Malaquin

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

I believe the dog control policy needs to be kept current. Nuisance and roaming dogs ARE an issue in Whanganui.

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 54

Not speaking

First name: Nicola  
Last name: McDonald  
Organisation: Companion Animals NZ

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
<p><b>Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?</b> Please see the attached file 'Whanganui Submission May 2026'</p> <p><b>Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.</b> Please see the attached file 'Whanganui Submission May 2026'</p> <p><b>Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.</b> Please see the attached file 'Whanganui Submission May 2026'</p>	
<b>Supporting documents:</b>	yes

1 May 2026

Policy Team  
Whanganui District Council  
101 Guyton Street  
Whanganui 4500  
[policysubmissions@whanganui.govt.nz](mailto:policysubmissions@whanganui.govt.nz)

### **Submission on the Proposed Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy 2026**

Companion Animals New Zealand (CANZ), formerly the New Zealand Companion Animal Council, is a respected animal welfare charity committed to positive welfare for companion animals. As custodians of the New Zealand Companion Animal Register (NZCAR), we actively promote the importance of permanent identification and reunification through microchipping and registration. The New Zealand Companion Animal Register (NZCAR) is NZ's leading microchip database for pets with more than 1.5 million total records and over 1000 Approved Users nationwide incl. vet clinics, SPCA and shelters. We connect companion animals with their guardian details to ensure swift repatriation in case of separation, and we offer a lost-and-found service through our platform, LostPet. Our mission is that all companion animals in New Zealand should enjoy a 'Good Life'.

CANZ welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on Whanganui District Council's proposed Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy 2026. The Government has recently announced a comprehensive review of the Dog Control Act 1996, prompted by a number of serious dog attacks across New Zealand. The Government has acknowledged that the current Act is outdated and is limiting councils' ability to manage dog control effectively. The review is expected to cover areas including penalties for non-compliant dog guardians, desexing obligations, stronger powers for animal control officers, and the removal of provisions that place unnecessary barriers or resource pressure on councils. Whanganui District Council may wish to monitor the outcomes of this review, as its findings are likely to be directly

relevant to the direction of this Bylaw and Policy and may warrant further amendments once the review is complete.

### **Proposed Dog Control Bylaw 2026:**

We note that the Bylaw states under clause 4(2)(a) that the council may:

- a. *Support responsible dog ownership and dog welfare: Develop, support, or work with others to deliver services or programmes that promote responsible dog ownership and the wellbeing of dogs.*
- b. *Provide funding and support: Provide grants or other assistance to organisations or groups that care for dogs, support their training or welfare, or educate people about responsible dog ownership.*
- c. *Provide information and education: Promote the purposes of the Act through public information, education, and awareness activities.*

We support the council's efforts in promoting responsible dog guardianship. At Companion Animals NZ, we believe that responsible dog guardianship encompasses a commitment to the lifelong health, safety, and wellbeing of dogs. We encourage dog guardians to adopt the following practices, and councils to support them:

- Microchipping and Registration: Microchipping and registering dogs on the National Dog Database (NDD) as well as the New Zealand Companion Animal Register (NZCAR) - this is one of the most important steps guardians can take. Lost dogs are three times more likely to be reunited with their families when microchipped and registered.
- Early socialisation: The window between 3 and 14 weeks of age is a critical period in a puppy's development. Positive, safe exposure to a wide variety of people, animals, environments, and experiences during this time lays the foundation for a confident, well-adjusted adult dog. Ensuring that safe, suitable spaces exist in the Council region for this to happen is an essential part of supporting dogs and their guardians to get it right.

- Ongoing care and education: Responsible guardianship means providing for your dog's physical and emotional needs throughout their life - including proper nutrition, regular veterinary care, enrichment, mental stimulation, exercise, and a safe, loving home environment.
- Keeping dogs under control: Dogs should be kept under effective control at all times, both for their own safety and the safety of others. This includes complying with local bylaws around on-leash requirements and ensuring dogs do not roam or pose a risk to the public, the environment or other animals.
- Desexing: As a general rule, we promote the desexing of companion animals where appropriate, given its important welfare and population management benefits. However, a blanket approach is not suitable for all dogs, as the right timing can vary depending on breed, size, and individual circumstances. We encourage all guardians to have an open, informed conversation with their veterinarian about when desexing is the right step for their dog.

With this in mind, we encourage Council to ensure that education and information materials are available in accessible formats across the full diversity of the community, and where possible, in languages other than English. An inclusive approach to education will help ensure that the community members who most need support around responsible guardianship are able to access and benefit from it.

Companion Animals NZ offers a variety of educational online resources designed specifically to support dog owners on their responsible guardianship journey. Our online library at [www.companionanimals.nz](http://www.companionanimals.nz) features evidence-based articles, and we regularly host free webinars and videos covering topics such as dog behaviour, behaviour modification, and the use of ethical training aids including longlines, which are available as recordings on our Youtube Channel: <https://www.youtube.com/@companionanimalsnewzealand341>. We encourage you to make use of these resources to help educate your community.

Where educational presentations or behavioural assessments of dogs are required, we recommend that Whanganui District Council prioritise engaging qualified, accredited dog behaviour professionals who follow ethical and humane standards. In particular, we

encourage the use of professionals accredited through the CANZ Accreditation scheme, who are required to meet rigorous standards and adhere to the CANZ Code of Ethical Conduct. These professionals apply humane, science-based methods grounded in a sound, modern understanding of animal behaviour and learning. For more info, go to:

- <https://www.companionanimals.nz/canzaccreditation>

### **Other feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw 2026 includes:**

- Clause 8 - Numbering Error

Clause 8 appears to contain a numbering error: either clause 8(1) is missing entirely, or clause 8(2) has been misnumbered. This should be corrected before the bylaw is adopted to avoid ambiguity in interpretation and enforcement. The reference to clause 8(1) in clause 8(3) will need to be updated accordingly.

- Clause 8(3)(c)(ii) - Dogs on Vehicle Flat Decks

The current wording requires that a dog be securely tied to the flat deck of a ute or truck in a manner that prevents it from reaching the edges. While this addresses the risk of a dog falling from a moving vehicle and the safety of people walking past the vehicle, it does not adequately address broader animal welfare concerns. A dog could remain technically compliant with this clause while still being exposed to conditions that cause genuine harm or distress. We suggest that clause 8(3)(c)(ii) be amended to also require that the dog be protected from injury, distress and extreme weather, with sufficient space to adopt a natural resting position, bringing it into alignment with the Animal Welfare Act 1999 and reflecting a more complete standard of care.

- Clauses 10 and 11 - Absence of Reference to 'Menacing Dogs'

Neither clause 10 nor clause 11 makes any reference to dogs classified as 'menacing' under the Dog Control Act 1996. This is a notable gap. As a general principle, wherever this bylaw references dogs classified as 'Dangerous', it should also reference dogs classified as

'Menacing'. This is particularly notable given that the Menacing classification is included in the definitions section of this bylaw (clause 6) yet does not appear anywhere else within it. This omission is inconsistent with the approach taken by the many other New Zealand territorial authorities, which explicitly address both classifications together in their bylaws and policies.

### **Proposed Dog Control Policy 2026:**

We are not positioned to comment on the dog access rules for specific places under Schedule 2, but we broadly support approaches that enable responsible dog guardians to participate in community life with their dogs, provided effective control requirements remain in place. We defer to local community feedback on these matters. We do, however, wish to draw Council's attention to the importance of adequate off-leash exercise provision, particularly where access restrictions are introduced or extended in some areas. Promoting exercise through providing dogs (and their humans) with safe, appropriate spaces to walk contributes to better overall health and behaviour, and prevents obesity in dogs (Hurley *et al*, 2011). New Zealand's Code of Welfare for Dogs emphasises the importance of exercise for canine physical and mental well-being, warning that insufficient activity, or space for exercise can lead to behavioural and health issues, that may be problematic for humans, other animals and the community. We also note that some dog guardians may be reluctant to exercise their dogs if they have limited flexibility about where they can do so. Ensuring that off-leash exercise areas are available, well-maintained, well signposted, and accessible across the Council is therefore likely to improve overall compliance, as guardians are better able to meet their animals' needs within the framework Council provides.

Lead pulling can be a significant welfare issue, with negative effects on a dog's health and behaviour (Townsend *et al*, 2022). A 2021 study found that popular on-leash activities often overlook the individual walking pace needed for dogs' physical, physiological, and cognitive well-being (Foltin, 2021). The research also highlighted that providing dogs with off-lead freedom, while maintaining effective control, and using longer leashes (such as longlines)

can help address behavioural concerns by allowing dogs to release energy, explore, and engage with their environment. This supports natural behaviours like sniffing, roaming, and interacting, which in turn enhances a dog's sense of safety and overall satisfaction. For the reasons outlined above, we recommend that Whanganui District Council implement measures as required to protect wildlife, natural habitats and minimise risks to people, while balancing this with the welfare and exercise needs of dogs.

### **Other feedback on the Dog Control Policy 2026 includes:**

- Clause 8 - Responsible Dog Owners

The intent and direction of clause 8 is supported. However, there appears to be a drafting error in the last statement. The clause currently reads "all dog owners must" and then lists obligations that apply to the dog itself rather than the dog owners. The likely correction is to read "all dog owners must ensure their dogs:" - this is a minor but important correction for the purposes of clarity.

- Clause 13 - Rehoming dogs

While the minimum age of 16 years for dog ownership is set by the Dog Control Act 1996, and this bylaw is therefore consistent with the Act in this regard, it is worth noting that contracts entered into by a person under 18 years of age, including adoption agreements and their associated responsibilities, may not be readily enforceable without court intervention (Contract and Commercial Law Act 2017). Given that the Government has recently announced a comprehensive review of the Dog Control Act 1996, this may be a relevant matter for that review, and Council may wish to consider raising it as part of any submission it makes to that process. Furthermore, the New Zealand Companion Animal Register (NZCAR) requires a person to be 18 years of age to register a dog, meaning a 16-year-old adopter would be unable to complete a fundamental step in responsible dog guardianship, ensuring they can be reunited with their dog should it become lost (NZCAR, n.d.).

- Clause 14 – Education about dogs

The content of clause 14 appears to be a duplication of clause 13, suggesting that the intended content for this section has either been omitted or misplaced in the draft. It is recommended that Council review and correct this before the bylaw is adopted.

- Clause 16 and 17 - Note on Menacing and Dangerous Classification:

We acknowledge that councils are required to operate within the Dog Control Act 1996 in relation to the classification of menacing and dangerous dogs, including those breeds and types of dogs listed in Schedule 4. However, we have concerns regarding the reliance on visual identification of breed or type as a basis for classification. Evidence shows that visual assessment of mixed-breed dogs is unreliable (Olson *et al*, 2015). Breed or type-based approaches are subjective and do not necessarily reduce the risk of dog bites, while placing additional regulatory burden on responsible dog guardians. We therefore encourage councils to exercise caution when applying classification criteria that rely on perceived breed characteristics. We recommend a clear review or appeal pathway for dogs classified as menacing or dangerous, allowing owners to demonstrate responsible and proactive guardianship and, where appropriate, evidence that risk can be effectively managed.

- Clause 20 – Welfare of Dogs

Clause 20 directs readers to the Animal Welfare Act 1999, which is appropriate. However, it is recommended that this clause also reference the Code of Welfare: Dogs (2018), issued under the Animal Welfare Act 1999 by the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (NAWAC). The Code of welfare provides practical and enforceable minimum standards for the care and management of dogs, covering areas including shelter, food and water, health care, and humane handling - all of which are directly relevant to the obligations of dog guardians under this bylaw. We recommend that clause 20 be amended to read something like: *"Please refer to the Animal Welfare Act 1999 and the Code of Welfare: Dogs (2018) issued under that Act."*

- Clause 21 – Housing dogs

The clause as drafted states that female dogs in season must be confined but still properly exercised, which creates a practical contradiction. Without further guidance on where and how that exercise may take place, the two requirements are difficult to reconcile. We recommend that Council add clarifications to this section.

The Far North District Council's Dog Management Bylaw 2018 provides a useful model, stating (Far North District Council, 2018):

*No bitch in season can be exercised in any public place.*

*Every person in charge of a bitch in season must ensure that the bitch is confined but adequately exercised on private land or premises.*

Adopting similar wording would resolve the ambiguity and provide clear, enforceable guidance for dog guardians.

Thanks for considering our feedback. Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions or require clarification.

Ngā mihi,



**Dr Nicola McDonald**

Animal Welfare Manager | Veterinarian  
Companion Animals New Zealand  
[welfare@companionanimals.nz](mailto:welfare@companionanimals.nz)

## References:

- Far North District Council. (2018). *Dog management bylaw 2018*. [https://www.fndc.govt.nz/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0016/20536/Dog-management-bylaw-2018.pdf](https://www.fndc.govt.nz/data/assets/pdf_file/0016/20536/Dog-management-bylaw-2018.pdf)
- Foltin, S. (2021). Exploration behavior of pet dogs during off-leash walks. *Journal of Veterinary Science & Medicine*, 9(1). <https://www.mendeley.com/catalogue/1ae9e548-ec46-395a-acf5-92a56588d637/>
- Hurley KJ, Elliott DA, Lund EM (2011). Dog obesity, dog walking and dog health. In: *The health benefits of dog walking for people and pets: evidence and case studies*. United States: Purdue University Press. p. 125–43.
- NZCAR (n.d.): *Disclaimer of liability*. New Zealand Companion Animal Register. Available at: <https://www.animalregister.co.nz/disclaimer-of-liability>
- Olson, K. R., Levy, J. K., Norby, B., Crandall, M. M., Broadhurst, J. E., Jacks, S., Barton, R. C., & Zimmerman, M. S. (2015). Inconsistent identification of pit bull-type dogs by shelter staff. *The Veterinary Journal*, 206(2), 197–202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tvjl.2015.07.019>
- Townsend, L., Dixon, L. & Buckley, L. (2022): Lead pulling as a welfare concern in pet dogs: What can veterinary professionals learn from current research? *Vet Record (191)*, e1627. <https://bvajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/vetr.1627>

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 98

Not speaking

First name: **Jessica**  
Last name: **McKenzie**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

This doesn't need adjusting, it's pretty clear and simple. Don't fix what isn't broken.

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

No, we are really happy with where we can and can't take our three dogs.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

No.

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 90

Not speaking

First name: **Neil**  
Last name: **Mills**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

Harsher penalties for the useless dog owners. We register our dog, and are paying for the ones that don't. Increases yearly are not fair on the many for the sake of a few.

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

On leads at parks, never off leads. That's where the issue lays. Any place a dog is taken including the beach.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

No.

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 84

Not speaking

First name: **Donna**  
Last name: **Mummery**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

Dogs roaming in packs and killing cats and other animals should be euthanized

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

Beaches and parks should be better protected

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 18

Speaking

First name: **Graham & Lyn**  
Last name: **Pearson**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

Refer to earlier comments

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

## Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 28

Not speaking

First name: **Susan**  
Last name: **Robertson**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

If a dog is caught harming livestock or a member of the public, it should be destroyed.

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

No. Don't have a dog, therefore no knowledge of such public places.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

No aware of any.

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 142

Not speaking

First name: **Christine**  
Last name: **Ruokonummi**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

More enforcement to repeat offenders who ignore bylaws. More provision of doggy doo dispenser bags. Too many people turn a blind eye to what their dog does. If it is offleash they pretend not to see them defecate. Remove the excuse part by giving them bags. They might as well get something for their registration fees

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

Bylaw enforcement for those unable to abide by the rules of dog ownership when in areas with bylaws

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 146

Not speaking

First name: **Thomas**  
Last name: **Saldana**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

There should be much heavier penalties for dog owners who neglect to control or contain their dogs.

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

## Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 63

Not speaking

First name: **Eileen**  
Last name: **Scott**  
Organisation: **No**

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
<p><b>Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?</b> I think we need a good number of rangers to deal with so many dogs in Wanganui. Complaints have been made and rangers have been slow to act stating that the dog was back at its home after it had been roaming.</p> <p><b>Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.</b> All dogs should be on a leash on all public walkways</p> <p><b>Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.</b> No</p>	

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 133

Not speaking

First name: **Tom**  
Last name: **Seaman**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

I have seen dogs being walked at Lake Westmore both on and off lead. Dogs on leads should be allowed at the lake.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 6

Not speaking

First name: **Bill**  
Last name: **Simmons**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

Only registered breeders should be able to keep more than two entire (unsterilised) dogs in zones outside the rural production zone and if more than two entire dogs are to be held by breeders, it should be limited to properties over 2 hectares in size. We have had up to 9 dogs on neighbouring properties of 1200-3000sq metres and at times and the impact on other properties nearby has been unacceptable.

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

Mandatory desexing should be required for all non-working dogs and breeding should not be casually allowed in any zone other than rural production.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

Dangerous dog breeds should not be allowed to be bred. Rotties, Doberman, Alsation/German Shepherd, Pit Bull, Bull Terrier, etc.

---

**Supporting documents:**

## Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 139

Not speaking

First name: **Simon**  
Last name: **Skill**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

No.

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

It would be nice if leashed dogs were allowed to at least cross Victoria Avenue.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 45

Not speaking

First name: **Robyn**  
Last name: **Stafford-Bush**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

Dogs need places to run and stretch their legs. Better and more places need to be available

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 75

Not speaking

First name: Sarah  
Last name: Stephens

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
<p><b>Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?</b> No, it's too hard to read on mobiles. Your new layout/branding makes everything harder to access.</p> <p><b>Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.</b> We need more dog free spaces.</p> <p><b>Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.</b> Keep dogs out of the markets. It puts us off going.</p>	
<hr/> <b>Supporting documents:</b>	

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 137

Not speaking

First name: **Janine**  
Last name: **Stratton**

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
<p><b>Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?</b> It has no teeth! I was bitten in Pitt Street, so was an older lady. Those dogs are still loose.</p> <p><b>Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.</b> Where birds are nesting, if these areas are not already covered?</p> <p><b>Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.</b> Wardens need more power to put down dogs who bite.</p>	
<hr/> <b>Supporting documents:</b>	

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 78

Not speaking

First name: **Felicity**  
Last name: **Temple**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

Aggressive and dangerous breeds should be banned. Dangerous dogs should be banned from public spaces and a steep registration applied for those owners who keep them.

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

As above, public parks and recreational spaces eg Basin botanical gardens and mowhanau beach side should be off limits for dangerous dogs breeds.

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

Exploring additional ways to make irresponsible dog owners financially responsible for repeated breaches.

---

**Supporting documents:**

## Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 30

Not speaking

First name: **Anthonie**  
Last name: **Tonnon**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

I strongly feel we need to have dogs allowed in the city centre. While I'm not a dog owner, Whanganui is clearly a dog town, and the No Dogs signs above the parking meters feel over the top. Making the city centre welcoming to good dog owners and focusing enforcement around poor dog ownership should be our focus.

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 89

Not speaking

First name: **Carol Elizabeth**  
Last name: **Waldman**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

I would like to see a bylaw that means that if you are walking your dog in a public place that you must have a means of picking up after your dog has left faeces, this could be any suitable bag etc.. and if they dont have a bag or similar they should be automatically fined with no warning process.

---

**Supporting documents:**

# Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy

Submission # 19

Not speaking

First name: **Karen**  
Last name: **White**

---

Consultation Question	Submitter Feedback
-----------------------	--------------------

---

**Do you have any feedback on the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy?**

Dogs on leashes should be allowed in the CBD

**Are there any public places where you think dog access rules should be different? Please explain.**

**Are there any dog-related issues that we have missed in the review of this Bylaw and Policy? Please explain.**

---

**Supporting documents:**