

REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF GORE DISTRICT COUNCIL'S POLICY AND PRACTICES IN RELATION TO THE CONTROL OF DOGS FOR THE YEAR 1 JULY 2005 TO 30 JUNE 2006

DOG CONTROL IN THE GORE DISTRICT

The total number of registered dogs in the Gore District as at 30 June 2006 was 3104. This is 236 dogs less than what was recorded at the same time the previous year. The majority (i.e. approximately 70%) 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.

A significant feature of the year under review was preparing for the implementation of Section 36A of the Dog Control Amendment Act 2003 in regard to the micro-chipping of certain categories of dogs. Following discussions with Council staff, the Council's Animal Control Contractor and the local vet it was decided to impose a standard charge of \$36 (incl. GST) per dog for micro-chipping.

The Council staff and the Dog Control Contractor attended a training day in Dunedin on 4 April which included a session on micro-chipping requirements.

Leading into the new year the proposed approach of the Council to micro-chipping was:

- a. the provision of appropriate training to the Dog Control Contractor and her staff to allow for the safe micro-chipping of unregistered dogs before leaving the municipal pound;
- b. the provision of the Council's micro-chipping certificates to the local veterinary surgeon;
- c. the verification of dogs that have been micro-chipped and the maintenance of a record of micro-chipping certificates for all dogs implanted with a micro-chip; and
- d. the active follow-up of micro-chipping all newly registered dogs as well as any dogs classified as menacing or dangerous.

DOG CONTROL ENFORCEMENT PRACTICES

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

During the year a total of 35 infringement notices were issued.

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

DOGS PROHIBITED, LEASH ONLY AND DOG EXERCISE AREAS

In the Gore district, dogs are prohibited from being on playgrounds. During the year signage was introduced to playgrounds warning owners that dogs were not allowed in these areas. These signs were installed in direct response to dogs being seen using the playgrounds as an exercise area.

The Main Street of Gore has a leash only rule for dogs, which has generally been well respected by dog owners. The off lead areas adjacent to the Mataura River in Gore and Mataura have been very popular for dog owners to exercise their dogs. Very little problems have been caused by these dog exercise areas.

DOG REGISTRATION AND OTHER FEES

A comparison of the dog registration fees for the year ending 30 June 2006 with the previous year is as follows:

	04/05	05/06
Registration Fee – Urban Dog	\$77.00	\$77.00
a. Less - fenced on a controlled property	-\$20.00	-\$20.00
b. Less – no dog complaints, impoundments or infringements within a two year period	-\$15.00	-\$15.00
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	\$80.00
Every subsequent impoundment	\$110.00	\$110.00
Destruction costs for known owners of dogs	\$36.00	\$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 AND DOG OBEDIENCE COURSES

The Council's contractor has assisted teachers in schools with "The Dog Box", which is an excellent programme put out by the Department of Internal Affairs providing instruction on how to keep safe around dogs. The Council's contractor also issues owners with information on how to prevent dogs barking incessantly.

MENACING AND DANGEROUS DOGS

In the year under review, no dogs in the Gore district were deemed to be dangerous. However, there were three dogs which were classified as menacing under Section 33A(1)(b)(i) of the Act. There was not any incidence of a serious attack on a member of the public during the year.

The owners of dogs that have been given the menacing classification have respected the conditions imposed when walking or exercising their dogs.

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 2006.

Steve Parry
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

CATEGORY	AS AT 30 JUNE 2006	FOR PERIOD 1 JULY 2005 to 30 JUNE 2006
1) Total # Registered Dogs	3104	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)	0	0
➤ 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	3	3
➤ Menacing under s333A(1)(b)(ii) – ie by Breed Characteristics	0	0
➤ Menacing under s333C(1) – ie Schedule Breed 4	6	6
6) Total # Infringement Notices	Not required	35
7) Total # Complaints Received	Not required	1
➤ TA Complaint Category 1	Not required	
➤ TA Complaint Category 2		
8) Total # Prosecutions Taken	Not required	0

Complaints received – Len Mitchell, Debbie Hollands barking dog.