

REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF GORE DISTRICT COUNCIL'S POLICY AND PRACTICES IN RELATION TO THE CONTROL OF DOGS FOR THE YEAR 1 JULY 2009 TO 30 JUNE 2010

DOG CONTROL IN THE GORE DISTRICT

The total number of registered dogs in the Gore District as at 30 June 2010 was 3216. The majority of these dogs are pets domiciled in the urban areas of the Gore District.

Dog control in the Gore district is performed by an independent contractor. This contractor, Mrs Rae Evans, employs one Animal Control Officer to assist her in delivering an effective dog control service to the Gore District.

DOG CONTROL ENFORCEMENT PRACTICES

During the year under review the Council received nine formal complaints both in regard to the behaviour of dogs and/or their owners. The nine complaints concerned dog attacks. The complaints were the subject of an investigation and action to address the concerns of the complainants was implemented.

- A dog, namely a Labrador X rushed out and jumped up at a lady walking on the footpath. The dog was classified as menacing due to its aggressive behaviour.
- A man and his dog out running past a property in town when two dogs rushed out and attacked the man's dog. Unfortunately the man was not prepared to take the matter further.
- A dog bit a policeman while carrying out a search of a property in town. The dog was euthanased.
- A staffy attacked a terrier after breaking through a hedge onto a urban property. The dog was badly injured and required veterinary attention. The dog was euthanased.
- A pig dog attacked a Papillion whilst the owner was walking along the river bank. The Papillion had to be euthanased due to the serious nature of its wounds. The pig dog was euthanased.
- The Council's Animal Control Officer was bitten by a Staffy X whilst carrying out a routine property check. The Staffy was classified as dangerous.

- Two Staffy X dogs rushed at an elderly couple walking their dog. The man was knocked to the ground. One staffy was euthanased and the other classified as dangerous.
- Another Staffy was constantly out wandering and displayed aggressive behaviour to anyone who approached it. This dog was classified as menacing and has since been run over and died.
- A Bull Terrier bit a child on the face whilst they were playing in the backyard of an urban property. The dog was classified as dangerous and has since been euthanased.

The Council's contractor is impounding more and more dogs that are not being claimed by their owners due to the cost of registering the dogs and the cost of pound fees. These dogs are placed with new owners if they are suitable, otherwise they are taken to the vet for euthanasing.

During the year a total of 66 infringement notices were issued. The Council instigated a tougher line for repeat offenders who did not register their dogs. Warrants are obtained from the Courts and with the aid of Police the relevant dog owners are visited and informed that their dogs were being uplifted for non registration. In most cases the registration fees are paid and the dogs left with the owners.

No prosecutions were initiated by the Council for breaches of the Dog Control Act.

DOG REGISTRATION AND OTHER FEES

A comparison of the dog registration fees for the year ending 30 June 2010 with the previous year is as follows:

	08/09	09/10
Registration Fee – Urban Dog	\$110.00	\$110.00
a. Less - fenced on a controlled property	-\$20.00	-\$20.00
b. Less – no dog complaints, impoundments or infringements within a two year period	-\$30.00	-\$30.00
c. Less – neutered or spayed	-\$7.00	-\$7.00
Registration Fee inclusive of a, b and c	\$35.00	\$35.00
Licence Fee – three or more dogs	\$100.00	\$100.00
Registration Fee – Rural Dog	\$11.00	\$11.00
a. Add – dog complaints, impoundment or infringement within a 2 year period	\$15.00	\$15.00
Late Registration Fee		
Urban Dog	\$15.00	\$15.00
Rural Dog	\$5.00	\$5.00
Poundage		
First impoundment	\$80.00	
First impoundment: dogs with current GDC registration		\$50.00
Unregistered		\$80.00
Every subsequent impoundment	\$150.00	\$150.00
Destruction costs for known owners of dogs	\$50.00	\$50.00
Sustenance – per day	\$10.00	\$10.00
Additional Fee for impounding or releasing dogs at weekends, public holidays or outside Council office hours	\$30.00	\$30.00

The Council takes a vigilant approach in regard to non-registration of dogs. Dogs not registered are the subject of prosecution under the Dog Control Act should owners not heed the urgings given via letter, personal visit and the issue of an infringement notice prior to these proceedings being instituted

DOG EDUCATION

The Council's contractor issues owners with information on how to prevent dogs barking incessantly and also offers advice on how to keep dogs from wandering. The Council's staff and contractor put a concerted effort into clamping down on unregistered dogs in the District especially in the Mataura area where wandering and unregistered dogs seem to be an on-going problem. More regular patrols are carried out in Mataura which appears to have made a positive difference with wandering dogs in the area.

MENACING AND DANGEROUS DOGS

In the year under review, three dogs in the Gore district was deemed to be dangerous and two declared menacing after complaints were received from residents regarding dog attacks. In other cases reported to the Council the owners took the responsible action and had the dogs euthanased.

There are twelve dogs in the district classified as menacing under Section 33C (by breed) of the Dog Control Act 1996, six under Section 33A (by behaviour) and four classified as dangerous under Section 31(1)(b).

STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Pursuant to Section 10A(2)(a) of the Dog Control Act 1996, attached is a schedule detailing relevant statistics covering dog control issues in the Gore District for the year ending 30 June 2010.

Stephen Parry
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

23 November 2010

CATEGORY	AS AT 30 JUNE 2010	FOR PERIOD 1 JULY 2009 to 30 JUNE 2010
1) Total # registered dogs	3221	Not required
2) Total # probationary owners	0	0
3) Total # disqualified owners	0	0
4) Total # dangerous dogs		
➤ Dangerous by owner conviction under s33(1)(a)	0	0
➤ Dangerous by sworn evidence under s3(1)(b)	4	4
➤ Dangerous by owner admittance in writing Under s31(1)(c)	0	0
5) Total # menacing dogs		
➤ Menacing under s333A(1)(b)(i) – ie by behaviour	6	6
➤ Menacing under s333A(1)(b)(ii) – ie by breed characteristics	0	0
➤ Menacing under s333C(1) – ie Schedule Breed 4	12	12
6) Total # infringement notices	Not required	66
7) Total # complaints received	Not required	9
➤ TA Complaint category 1	Not required	
➤ TA Complaint category 2		
8) Total # prosecutions taken	Not required	0