
Dog policy, bylaw and regional park access rules 2025

Q2 Policy and bylaw matters

**(Q2H. Remove outdated information in Schedule 2: Dog
access rules)**

Comments sorted by submitter's local board

Date published: Monday, 7 April 2025

Local Board	Page #
Albert-Eden	3
Aotea/Great Barrier	NA
Devonport-Takapuna	3
Franklin	3
Henderson-Massey	4
Hibiscus and Bays	4
Howick	5
Kaipātiki	5
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	6
Manurewa	6
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	6
Ōrākei	6
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	8
Papakura	8
Puketāpapa	9
Rodney	9
Upper Harbour	10
Waiheke	10
Waitākere Ranges	10
Waitematā	10
Whau	10
Undeclared local board	11
Outside Auckland	NA
Regional organisation	NA

Sub #	Q2H Remove outdated information in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2H Tell us why
ALBERT-EDEN LOCAL BOARD		
2275	Do not support	Again, a waste of money.
2871	Do not support	Too restrictive
3598	Support	it can be confusing as a dog owner when there is no map to indicate the area which it is acceptable for a dog to be off leash eg piha beach there are no images on the council website of the markers to stay between
4141	I don't know	Only as advised by the Dog Walkers Association - they will know what is appropriate.
4182	Support	It seems obvious to do this. The information needs to be up to date. No point having landmarks or other site conditions that no longer exist mentioned in the policy
4412	Support	As long as this isn't creating additional regulation, anything that provides clarity and more simplicity would be good.
4520	Support	I don't agree with adding further limits to what is currently in by-law however I do agree with clarification.
5130	Support	Best practice consistent law rules essential
DEVONPORT-TAKAPUNA LOCAL BOARD		
2107	Do not support	You have not explained what you mean by this? Which landmarks? Why?
3688	Do not support	The is no need to update these laws as it is not a issue that is effecting people in a hugely negative way
4260	Support	Once again. Clarity is key If you expect dog owners to follow the rules, make them clear
4773	Support	This should be updated more regularly perhaps bi annually?
FRANKLIN LOCAL BOARD		
779	I don't know	Haven't you narrowed down the access landmarks enough!
1475	Support	More owners are breaking the rules. More people walking dogs that do not belong to them. population has increased and changed so clear rules now need to be written up with clear consequences and actions.
1539	Support	I support change, there are laws preventing dogs from being off lead in parks but no one to make sure it happens. I had my dog put to sleep at age two due to being attacked by an off-lead dog in an on-lead park. no dog should be off lead unless in a closed space like a dog park fully fenced. rules need to be kept too, if its a lead park then that needs to be acted upon. I can report dogs loose to Auckland council but they say they don't have staff to deal with it
3101	Do not support	Removing controls serves no purpose and may have unintended consequences
3378	I don't know	I don't know this detail
3923	I don't know	I dont have any problems understanding the current rules

Sub #	Q2H Remove outdated information in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2H Tell us why
4428	Do not support	I am appalled at this suggestion. "Outdated Landmarks" as you call them, are well known by their original names to most New Zealanders. If you really feel you have to call a "landmark" by its new name then please put the "outdated" name in brackets alongside it. I, for one, am not going to Google the "new landmark name" to find it just because you have decided to change the name.
5906	Do not support	The rules to prevent dogs from beaches, bush walks, reserves and gardens seek only to punish good dog owners. Owners of unregistered, unneutered, menacing dogs do not walk their dogs on or off leash at these places. They instead let their dogs roam the streets. Stop punishing good dog owners.
6746	Support	Support this as long as it doesn't change the rules or change what was previously set
HENDERSON-MASSEY LOCAL BOARD		
940	Support	If the information is incorrect / outdated then it needs to be corrected
998		I support clarifying current access rules, but not imposing more rules
1666	Support	Again, its a question of the appropriateness of the location to support dog walkers. Have bins provided for dog droppings, enforce the rules that are in place and make it pleasant for all visitors. I visit Kakamatua off lead dog beach and I see less dog droppings there than I do at my local park. Most people are responsible.
4924	Do not support	It is hard to ask for support or not for all. Generally, I do not want to remove dog access to beaches and parks. What I do want is more control.
6105	Support	The current system is confusing, and information is hard to find. This definitely needs streamlining to help dog owners find and understand this.
HIBISCUS AND BAYS LOCAL BOARD		
319	Support	Any rules and policies need to be updated regularly.
579	Support	As above
771	Support	Only after discussion with stakeholders and those experienced in the industry
776	Support	Reasons for supporting this should be obvious.
3446	Support	As stated above keep it simple & straightforward. All dogs on leashes in Public areas at all times except for designated, fenced Dog Parks
3824	Support	If the information isn't current it makes it difficult for dog owners to do the right thing. Most dog owners are responsible and respectful people.
3842	Do not support	Why does the council make it hard for people to find out the information in this survey? Why is there not a link for each question to the specific area being changed so that people can easily find the proposed changes. Instead they have to search online. It's almost like you are deliberately making it difficult to dissuade people from commenting.
4354	Support	I was bitten by a medium size petagree, dog Las year off of lesh
4760	Support	Clearer guidelines on times need to be specific

Sub #	Q2H Remove outdated information in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2H Tell us why
5015	Support	Web sites and social Media must have the correct and actual information needed for Dog Access rules
6494	Do not support	seriously- outdated landmarks?? This is the first question where you have used an example that we can attach relevance to. What are the wider implications of what you are asking?????
HOWICK LOCAL BOARD		
407	Support	Ban pitbull type dogs
521	I don't know	Again, more information needed.
541	Do not support	Rules should not be changed as a result of complaints against a few negligent dog owners spoiling it for the remainder of decent dog owners!! Instead, the Council should be targeting and educating the negligent and problematic dog owners!!
4225	Do not support	What is Policy Schedule 2 Dog Access Rules? I just googled it on the Auckland Council website: "Policy Schedule 2 Dog Access Rules: And this is what I got: https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-policies/Pages/policy-on-dogs.aspx How would anyone know this was Policy Schedule 2 - please keep this simple for all.
5855	Support	Many areas where dogs can be walked are not clearly sign posted or have outdated signage.
6051	Support	There is old signage at some parks with incorrect dog access times, confusing for visitors and public and as dog walkers we look like we are breaking the rules.
6555	Support	Found consultation papers hard to follow and cross reference. - so cannot be clear in answer. Make policy flow and clear and include educative explanation as necessary!! Esp where it may well attract argument and avoidance.
KAIPĀTIKI LOCAL BOARD		
1679	Do not support	who is determining what is outdated - that sounds like fancy words for a rule change by stealth
2779	Support	Remove as very confusing
4741	Do not support	I think common sense needs to be applied with what is the cost of changing signage etc vs what is the likely benefit. Too often I see irrelevant council signs and it's clear no one has considered what is the cost vs. The benefit of putting this signage in place like "beware of tree roots" when walking in a forest.

Sub #	Q2H Remove outdated information in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2H Tell us why
6092	Support	Removing outdated information is practical, but any updates should ensure that no important access information is lost or changed without proper consultation with dog owners.
MĀNGERE-ŌTĀHUHU LOCAL BOARD		
590	I don't know	What is an "outdated landmark" makes no sense
2150	Support	Same as above Its hard to know where and where dogs can/cannot access. So much conflicting information on the internet.
MANUREWA LOCAL BOARD		
1755	Support	Because dog owners get aggressive when reminded they're letting their dogs off in areas that are not off leash. It makes it better for me as a walker and runner to know where I should be safe from out of control or unexpected dogs. If I'm running over a rise I'm always worried I'll startle a dog and it'll get aggressive. I'm sick of having to worry about dogs
4166	Do not support	Stop wasting taxpayers money. If the landmark is gone, then clearly the information is mute and therefore doesn't require the council to spend thousands of tax dollars just to re-write it.
MAUNGAKIEKIE-TĀMAKI LOCAL BOARD		
639	Do not support	Just remove the rules
909	Support	Yes update
990	Do not support	Hidden away in the Table on Page 10 of Appendix C: Comparison Table of existing and Proposed Policy, Bylaw, regional park and local dog access rules- https://hdp-au-prod-app-ak-haveyoursay-files.s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/8117/3688/7874/Appendix_C_Comparison_Table.pdf is the only place I can find in all of your documentation that you are proposing to change Big King (Te Tatua) from off leash to on leash. We live in Mt Wellington and Big King is the only fully contained and safe to use off leash park for our dog. Most dogs cannot be fully exercised unless they are allowed to be off leash and explore at their pace. We have been using Big King for the past 4 years and have never had any issues with the dogs or people that take their dogs there for off leash exercise. Dogs that do not get fully exercised are liable to become agitated and bored and problematic at home. I implore you to not change Big King from off leash to on leash.
2047	Support	Fully admit I don't know much about this but similar to my comment above - I find the rules really difficult to interpret and sometimes it's because local landmarks are referred to (dogs allowed after Monkey Rock at Piha?) which send me scrambling to google to try and decode what they mean.
4470	Do not support	How ridiculous, remove outdated information. Why is it outdated?
ŌRĀKEI LOCAL BOARD		

Sub #	Q2H Remove outdated information in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2H Tell us why
519	Support	No access to dogs on beaches or park. Or have set timming so people can also enjoy. World is not just fir dogs. Don't understand why they are given so much importance in this country, even more than humans.
610	I don't know	What does this mean??
818	Support	Why isn't outdated information already removed?
1264	Support	why has it not been done already?
1421	Support	Same as earlier - Clarity and being error free is always good - that being said access rules should generally be permissive rather than restrictive. Generally all areas should allow dogs on lead, many areas should be allowed off lead on control and it should be the exception where this is restricted not a norm.
3164	Support	As long as the outdated information doesn't change the policy
3358	Support	Make it simple.
3753	Support	I support removing outdated information however, not removing information that is still subject to discussion and review.
3963	Support	Dog walking gets many people out for a walk and social gathering
4117	Do not support	Do not understand what the Council wants to do. What are the over-arching values that guide such changes?
4691	I don't know	Please see my notes above
5520	Do not support	I would support if it doesn't reduce dog access to public area. Why are these statements so vague? It's very suspicious. Who wrote this? Someone who has a sneaky agenda?
6185	Do not support	I don't believe we need to look at outdated and spend money on this. We are a growing city, smaller housing with dogs and they need to be off leash and running too.
6456	Do not support	Which landmarks and why?
6566	Support	Makes sense

Sub #	Q2H Remove outdated information in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2H Tell us why
6596	Do not support	Policy Schedule 2: Dog Access Rules The 'policy-on-dogs-2019' sets forth guidelines for dog access in various public areas across Auckland, aiming to balance the needs of dog owners with those of other park users. The current schedule within this policy is designed to promote responsible dog ownership and ensure the safety and enjoyment of all public spaces. Current Schedule of Dog Access Rules • Designated off-leash areas where dogs can exercise freely. • On-leash areas where dogs must be kept on a leash to ensure the safety of other park visitors. • Restricted areas where dogs are not allowed, such as playgrounds and certain beaches during peak hours. The existing schedule of dog access rules has been effective in fostering a harmonious coexistence between dog owners and other park users. The policy emphasizes the importance of proper training, supervision, and responsible dog ownership, rather than imposing arbitrary limits on dog activities. By maintaining the current schedule, the council can continue to provide a safe and enjoyable environment for all park visitors. Additionally, the policy's flexibility allows for adjustments based on monitoring and feedback, ensuring that the rules remain relevant and effective over time. The 'policy-on-dogs-2019' provides a well-balanced framework for dog access across Auckland. It promotes responsible dog ownership and ensures the safety and enjoyment of all park visitors. By retaining the current schedule, the council can uphold its commitment to creating inclusive and community-oriented public spaces.
6785	I don't know	Where is the link to "Policy Schedule 2"? Without knowing what it says, I can't know what I'm agreeing or disagreeing to.
6787	Do not support	as above, I do not believe the research or documents have been approached in good faith and inline with the existing Dog policy 2019. While I would support removal of any unequivocal factually incorrect information such as landmarks, I find there to be a great many other changes being proposed that do not have sufficient evidence and therefore no changes should be supported or accepted.
ŌTARA-PAPATOETOE LOCAL BOARD		
2529	Support	Too many outdated signs. Also people don't respect the rules - maybe they need to do patrols and find those that think the rules don't apply to them.
2530	Support	NEEDS TO BE ON LEASH AT ALL TIMES NO QUESTIONS ASKED THIS IS COMING STRAIGHT FROM THE HORSES MOUTH
PAPAKURA LOCAL BOARD		

Sub #	Q2H Remove outdated information in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2H Tell us why
4455	Support	I agree to remove outdated information so long as they aren't removing things that are positive for dogs and people. I.e. more access to the community under control not further restrictions
PUKETĀPAPA LOCAL BOARD		
1057	Support	Signage needs to be clear and website updated as it is often hard to find if dogs can be on beach or park and which not.
2460	Do not support	I do not support this proposal to remove outdated information in Schedule 2 because it is predicated on the same flawed premises underlying the other proposed changes regarding dog access rules. Rather than merely adjusting details, the Council should address the fundamental issues with the existing and proposed restrictions, which lack robust evidence and fail to balance the needs of responsible dog owners.
2489	Do not support	I don't agree with removing outdated information under this flawed framework. Instead of pushing forward on small changes, the Council should correct the bigger issues and respect the needs of responsible dog owners.
6500	Support	As long as the information is out of date only, then there is support for this change
RODNEY LOCAL BOARD		
1722	Do not support	Wasting money.
1869	Support	Don't limit where dogs can't go but provide better clarification. I.e. on websites where you can walk your dog
1936	Support	Rules should be clear and accurate.
1955	Support	Surely this should be done regardless of what the public think - just do it
2638	Support	Signage must be clear and well attached as I strongly suspect dog owners have removed signage they didn't like, as the new signs disappeared!
2716	Support	I would at this point like to comment on the dog restrictions at Snells Beach. Past Sunburst ave I have always walked my dog on the path on leash and kept well clear of shore birds. Having been involved in bird protection in the past the issue here should be trapping cats ,rats, mustelids and hedgehogs. These are the major predators of shore birds.
3343	Support	All information must be up to date and best serve dogs and owners.
4311	Do not support	This whole feedback is ridiculous .. you have been extremely vague with the changes you want to make .. you need to be clear on exactly what changes you are referring to which you haven't
4640	Support	Too many examples of outdated and ridiculous signage (e.g. on Whangateau Reserve) which years of request for change have been ignored.

Sub #	Q2H Remove outdated information in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2H Tell us why
4796	Support	A big part of the issue is outdated signage. But it needs to be consistent across all regions. When the beach hours were changed a couple of years back, none of the signage was updated and you consistently were challenged by the public on whether you were allowed or not allowed. It's a bit like all the changes to speed limits on public roads - everyone is so confused because they had been use to travelling at a certain speed on that road for many years and then it changed and now you have 3 different speed limits on the same stretch of road that use to just have one. People need plain simple messaging which is consistent wherever they go in Auckland.
4821	I don't know	What does Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules mean?
5260	Do not support	Money wasting exercise. People don't read ot anyway
5717	Support	Why do we need to have a vote on removing outdated information - if nothing has changed? Update the landmark if its moved, or if you are EXPANDING an area to use... however other than that, I cannot see any reason anything might be "outdated" .
6470	Support	Provided outdated is ineffective and no longer applicable.
UPPER HARBOUR LOCAL BOARD		
846	Support	LOL, I can't believe you really need to consult on this non-issue.
WAIHEKE LOCAL BOARD		
4734	Support	A lot of policy seems outdated
4893	Support	DOGS CANNOT WALK UNLEASHED ACROSS A SAND DUNE IF WITH THEIR OWNER. THIS IS RIDICULOUS.
WAITĀKERE RANGES LOCAL BOARD		
523	Do not support	Removal of unwanted abd un needed restrictions will take care of this.
1930	Support	Removing outdated information should be standard. It is no wonder people are confused if the information is not even accurate.
2167	Support	Support this, update is much needed.
5652	I don't know	If it's just outdate information like landmarks then ok - but anything else I'd like to know what
6724	Support	Shouldn't outdated information already be removed??
WAITEMATĀ LOCAL BOARD		
560	Support	And add in new landmarks
1048	Support	All rules should be up to date
2184	Do not support	Once again vague this feedback needs to be questioned correctly
3851	I don't know	Do not understand this point
6182	Do not support	Only where material changes are not made
WHAU LOCAL BOARD		
4025	Support	First Clarity - then later change id required
5023	Support	As long as that's the only thing the Council will change....

Sub #	Q2H Remove outdated information in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2H Tell us why
UNDECLARED LOCAL BOARD		
903	Do not support	Council is overreaching and complicating something that can be really simple. Dogs can go everywhere on a short leash. Including DOC areas. Special areas to stipulate no leash required.
2102	Support	Need current and up to date information.
2584	Do not support	You are not removing outdated information or clarifying rules. You are restricting more access and causing more confusion. Redraft the changes.
5884	Support	Unnecessary and outdated information does not serve to assist with the regulation of the rules.