
Dog policy, bylaw and regional park access rules 2025

Q2 Policy and bylaw matters

**(Q2D. Clarify what areas in Auckland require a licence to
keep multiple dogs on a property)**

Comments sorted by submitter's local board

Date published: Monday, 7 April 2025

Local Board	Page #
Albert-Eden	3
Aotea/Great Barrier	4
Devonport-Takapuna	4
Franklin	5
Henderson-Massey	7
Hibiscus and Bays	9
Howick	11
Kaipātiki	13
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	14
Manurewa	14
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	16
Ōrākei	17
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	19
Papakura	20
Puketāpapa	20
Rodney	22
Upper Harbour	24
Waiheke	25
Waitākere Ranges	25
Waitematā	26
Whau	27
Undeclared local board	28
Outside Auckland	29
Regional organisation	NA

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
ALBERT-EDEN LOCAL BOARD		
69	Do not support	This should be actioned on a case by case basis, taking into account any past history.
116	Support	I went through this process many years ago, and had to get signatures of six neighbours to achieve it. I did it, but agreement could have easily been withheld by one person. Meanwhile, I live next to someone with a tiny single dog that barks incessantly which seems somewhat inconsistent.
176	Support	In my experience, even dog owners don't this requirement currently exists. Perhaps you can work with vets and pet stores to promote
507	Support	So many unsafe doggy daycares in Auckland. I've been trying to find a decent one for over a year and there is only one so far. One daycare was a tiny backyard in Greenlane with over 20 dogs. It was unsafe and filthy
636	Support	I think a by law like this cannot be limited to areas, it should apply to the whole of Auckland. Applying a law like this to limited areas just creates bad feeling and dissension. For example, it is unlikely the by law would not be applied to "Remuera" but very likely it would be applied to "Otara".
721	Support	All areas
770	Support	Multiple dogs are a nuisance unless registered breeding.
778	Support	Some areas seem to have a large number of dogs unregistered, and apparently kept for 'protection' rather than family pets. Multiple dogs in these situations would increase the risk of attacks, and increase the potential severity if they act as a pack. .
863	Support	Spaces in Auckland should be appropriately sized for numerous dogs.
960	Support	Need to specify what number is multiple, 2 or more, 3 or more etc
1129	Support	Many people are not aware of this
1595	Support	All areas should require permission for more than 2 dogs. I now have streets in my area (Ōwairaka) that I cannot walk on, with or without my dog, due to properties having too many dogs, especially when they have a litter of puppies, and the adult dogs and puppies are then very noisy, intimidating, and often left alone during the day. They bark and the larger numbers mean this is more noise pollution.
1622	Do not support	Have it as a universal rule, and extend it to other animals as well, there are always concerns if people have too many animals, not just dogs, and their ability to properly care and control them.
2141	Do not support	All properties, even farms, with more than one dog should be licensed.
2257	Support	All areas of Auckland except rural zoned should be covered by the license to keep multiple dogs.
2275	Do not support	Sounds like a waste of time and money, not a priority.
2524	Do not support	Will we get reduced dog registration fees if you limit what we can dog with our dogs - no.
3062	Do not support	why the fixation on number of dogs, as long as they are under control - it should be all good?
3523	Support	All areas should require licenses.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
4154	Support	The biggest issue is owners who do not license their dogs anyway. These owners will also not get a multiple dog license. The responsible dog owners will and they are NOT the issue. It is high time the council puts massive fines on owners who do not license their dogs and even ban them from owning dogs and other pets...
4158	Do not support	These good people are just trying to make a living
4368	I don't know	Dangerous territory! Yes, a range of dog problems tend to be postcode issues, but what purpose would this serve? Once again it is context specific. I know some people with multiple dogs who maintain the highest standards of guardianship, while others think it is OK to life chain one poor animal.
4520	Support	Multiple dog ownership is a responsibility that can cause conflict with the modern life style. those that choose this path may need to seek perhaps a license for this? Im uncertain how this would look. However I do agree with it being considered.
4689	Support	These areas should only be outside of urban boundaries. Dog barking is a nuisance in urban and suburban areas.
5181	Support	I think this chnage makes sense, but people who own multiple dogs already, should be grandfathered into this or provided the liscence free of charge
5485	Support	Working farm dogs and the like should be exempt. One size does not fit all. The real problem areas are not policed properly because of the obvious difficulties. Applying the same set of rules to areas where roaming unregistered menacing dogs live and inner city pampered pooches does not make sense. The problem areas should activate a more demanding set of regulations like up north where the visiting runners were attacked recently.
AOTEA/GREAT BARRIER LOCAL BOARD		
2952	Support	I have noticed that the amount of dogs over the past few years in my area has grown significantly, I find myself increasingly being bothered by dogs coming on to my property as well as in public. Local dog owners that have constant complaints about their animals are still breeding their dogs.
DEVONPORT-TAKAPUNA LOCAL BOARD		
181	Support	Limits to dog ownership in urban areas, particularly high density.
598	Support	I don't understand why this needs clarifying, surely it is something that is visible to dog-owners throughout Auckland already?
1620	Support	maybe look to limit number of dogs in rural areas verses urban, say in urban no more than 4 and in rurual say no more that 8? But all working dogs should be registered, why DO YOU NOT make farmers register working dogs how dumb are you!
1758	Support	All areas should require licensing
1852	Support	The sections of properties are getting smaller which means it is harder to have big dogs. Should stop wrecking Auckland with these type of builds and push the immigrants that dont respect NZ culture back to there homelands
2107	Do not support	You haven't clarified which areas you're talking about so how can we comment?

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
3469	Support	Any one keeping more than one dog on a property should have to have a permit.
3762	Do not support	You should be able to keep dogs where you want and how ever many you want as long as they have enough space and care
4260	Support	Having clear information for all dog resulted things is long overdue Make it easy for the dog owners to comply by having clarity is a good thing
4375	Support	All of Auckland should be covered for multiple dogs. Any more than two dogs per residential property. Working dogs if more than two necessary can be licensed. Properties need to be suitable for dogs, properties without outdoor spaces, such as units/apartments should have more restrictions including the requirement not to keep dogs if sufficient welfare of dog not considered
4569	Do not support	No justification has been provided for this rule. Obviously, if the dogs are causing real problems or being mis-treated, then restrictions are justified. But otherwise you shouldn't pick on responsible dog-owners, especially while not having restrictions on cat owners.
4773	Support	All areas in Auckland should have a license for multiple dogs especially on farms in case of an accident or if emergency services need to go onto the property so they know about the animals and can take the appropriate risk management procedures.
5124	Do not support	It's racial and social bias.
5144	Support	Any densely occupied residential zones should have firm limits so as not to impinge on the rights of non-dog owners as well as dog owners. It's lack of control/training from owners that is the real issue
5151	Do not support	Every person must be free to keep as many pets as they want, always complying with the laws and displaying responsible behavior.
5192	Support	Everywhere in Auckland should have the same rules regarding dogs and make all people feel safe.
5346	Support	Dense housing areas should not be able to keep multiple dogs.
6725	Support	As dogs are pack animals I think that; multiple dogs in one property might be more likely to become aggressive. I do not know which areas require this and what criteria are used but many factors would be involved.
FRANKLIN LOCAL BOARD		
51	Do not support	ANYONE in ALL Auckland having multiple dogs should have a license, that being more than two
318	Support	I would support a rural / residential classification, but not by suburb.
350	Support	Feel like this is fairly self explanatory already - anything rural does not need a licence and residential does.
799	Support	Change the pricing for chihuahua vs pitbull
958	Support	All areas of Auckland, and NZ and those in areas where there is a lot of animal abuse and neglect.
1475	Support	Signs need to be clear plus be meaningful. No good saying you will be fined when there are no patrols or wardens to manage areas or phone numbers for people to call if they see bylaws being broken.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
1485	Support	I think this important as I suspect many don't care
1493	I don't know	All dogs should be registered whether you have one dog or more but in saying that who wants a neighbor who has multiple dogs that bark morning and night and having to smell poop on a daily basis if the owner doesn't clean up after them
1772	Do not support	Too many people have more than one dog more than 2 in a residential area and 3 in rural areas with farms not having a restriction
1922	Support	All places should have permits for dogs full stop...the general public are completely uneducated about dogs and their behaviour plus certain ethnic groups don't know any different about keeping dogs on their property
1946	Support	What about cats? What about people who own multiple cats? And why don't cat owners need to register their cats like dog owners. Cars kill more native wildlife than dogs so why aren't they required to be registered / pay council registrations like dog owners ?? Surely this must apply to cat owners too
2242	Support	Make the same rules for the biggest apex predator- CATS.
2737	Support	Was difficult to find information when we moved from rural Waikato to Auckland
2739	Do not support	Why do you need a license to own dogs? We already have to pay annual fees for dog registration.
3376	Support	I missed this part of the proposal so don't know the details but in our tight living environments I don't think we should allow multiple dogs, for many of the same reason as the group walkers. It's too crowded, too dangerous, too much poop (plus the potential noise for the neighbor).
3473	I don't know	RDOL should be able to keep any number of dogs provided the space and fencing is safe and suitable. Menancing breeds should be monitored.
3923	I don't know	Do not make any reduction to the 2 dog per propoerty policy.
4342	Do not support	Anyone should be able to have multiple dogs, why should different suburbs have different rules.
4428	Do not support	You should not be making a blanket decision just on "area". Consideration on this should be given individually dependent on size of property, size of dogs and if there are noise issues.
4690	Support	Not clear currently and even when it is it is not enforced.
5038	Support	All people should require an outdoor sizeable area fit for a dog to run around. It's not fair to the animal to have no outdoor area. High risk areas of animal abuse and dense housing should definitely have licenses to own a dog, as well as people on the benefit should peove how they can provide for the animal eg vet bills, food, when they can't provide for themselves. All breeders and repeat people selling puppies should need licenses and be regulated.
5161	Do not support	All areas require this license.
5377	Support	I think this is reasonable- any responsible dog owner would be happy to have a licence to keep multiple dogs.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
5574	Support	A secondary problem apart from menacing dogs is large numbers of dogs kept on a property with constant barking and a risk that the dogs will get free and become a menacing pack: go to many countries and you'll see the outcome of roaming dogs
5828	Support	all public walk areas - dogs must be on a leash.
6073	Support	That's fair
6746	Support	This should be clarification only, not a change or introduction of policy.
HENDERSON-MASSEY LOCAL BOARD		
239	Do not support	My neighbour looks after small dogs for friends and neighbours. They shouldn't be punished for doing a good deed (when my other neighbour gave birth, they were able to look after their 2 dogs on a whim).
275	Do not support	One rule for all
832	Support	This should apply to all residential areas, equally.
940	Do not support	It doesn't need to change there are already regulations around urban and rural housing and the numbers of dogs etc. Doesn't need to change needs to be enforced
998	Do not support	I support the current status
1351	Support	Where rules aren't clear, people may be inadvertently breaking the law, and end up losing their dogs through ignorance.
1426	Support	Whether you own 1 or own 3, you should require a license
1450	Do not support	I don't believe that would be effective as most of the time those who don't register their dogs are the ones who have multiple ones. And this will just increase the registration to the owners who are responsible. It should be across the board or not at all.
1609	Support	This is supported. Most dog owners are responsible, however numerous dogs can become a problem for owners who are irresponsible. Community and animal welfare is paramount.
1666	Do not support	Again, it's horses for courses, a person who lives on a lifestyle block, has extensive space and experience with dogs should be allowed to have multiple dogs on the property and should not have a restriction. Whilst a backyard breeder in South Auckland, who chains his animals and has minimal space, who inevitably does not even bother to register his dogs in the first place, should not be allowed to have dogs at all. BAN THE CHAIN do not penalise great dog owners by restricting them from taking care of multiple dogs.
2449	Support	All areas in Auckland should require a permit for more than 2 dogs as it's a safety issue and hazard.
2920	Do not support	All areas in Auckland should carry the same dog regulations.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
3336	Do not support	To Whom It May Concern, I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed law concerning dog walking regulations in Auckland. While I understand the intention behind the proposed measures, I believe it unfairly penalizes responsible dog owners and professional dog walkers while doing little to address the actual causes of the city's dog-related issues. The primary concern with this proposal is that it targets responsible dog owners and professional dog walkers who are abiding by the rules and ensuring their dogs are well cared for, exercised, and socialized. These individuals provide a valuable service to the community, particularly for those who cannot provide their dogs with the necessary time and exercise due to various personal or professional commitments. Penalizing these responsible dog owners will only further discourage proper dog care and will ultimately hurt dogs who rely on these services. Auckland's roaming dog problem is not caused by the number of dogs being walked by responsible dog walkers. Rather, it stems from irresponsible dog owners who neglect or disregard the rules and regulations set in place for safe pet ownership. This law does not address these individuals, and as such, it will not solve the root causes of the issues we face in our community. In addition, this proposal could severely limit the ability of professional dog walkers to operate effectively, particularly those who currently provide a vital service to responsible dog owners like myself and many others. By removing such services, responsible dog owners may be left without essential support, ultimately
3636	Support	Housing development in Auckland is becoming increasingly more dense. One dog can be a nuisance, creating noise, fear and danger. Multiple dogs compound this risk and can make daily life ***** for neighbours. Most residential properties in Auckland are NOT suitable for multiple dogs on one property. I've lived in neighbourhoods where dogs have resided on separate surrounding properties. The owners are at work all day Once one dog starts barking, they all start up and it goes on for hours and becoming more and more distressing for those of us at home.
3786	Support	Up to two dogs should be allowed anywhere. Having two dogs provides companionship for the dogs. Also people that have a dog often will want to introduce a puppy into the family while the existing old dog is still around. More than two dogs is another matter and i think more rules around that is important.
3829	Support	All areas of Auckland should require a license to keep multiple dogs (or even a single dog) on a property. Non compliance should be punishable by a fine or loss of the animal until the fine is paid.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
3837	I don't know	I agree that suburban areas should have a limit, but when I lived in Huapai - 8 dogs on one property was not managed well by the people who lived there (which is why I moved). There should be less dogs living in rural areas too.
4381	I don't know	restrictions for no dogs on playing fields, single use play grounds, sensitive beach and dune areas is warranted. It should be noted that Auckland as a whole is not a dog friendly city. It is far behind international peers in supporting families with dogs. This has an consequence that dogs are increasingly separated from the human environments (because they are restricted from doing so), and become increasingly less likely to adapt to those settings. The policy and bylaw changes should be inspirational in allowing Auckland to step up into meeting and leading international practice and reputation for good cities, which includes inclusive arrangements for families that have dogs. Doing so requires hard work on Council's and the public's part to understand, and be responsible. Clarity in policy can help, but adding restrictions does not improve Auckland living The rule change is increasingly restrictive to dog access. Including in areas where multiple use is possible. Many areas can be used for both on-lead dog activity, and other uses (including, for instance mountain biking, etc). It is a shame when restricted areas are not used for other purposes, but could be used for dogs (on lead). This includes some beach and field areas during day time and summer hours. Those types of spaces CAN be busy, but not always. When not busy, that could be used for on lead dog access. Such a distinction could be difficult to make clear for un-informed public, dog owners and council officers. However, the benefit for working hard in education to overcome these challenges
4924	Do not support	Again, I cannot find further clarification. The current rules were fine.
5243	Support	All areas should
5352	Support	I think everyone should have a licence to own a dog. We have two dogs and have the responsible dog owner licence, but would love to foster as well. This licence is way too easy to get... just an online questionnaire. To get this licence, I think a site visit is a MUST and should be done after the online application is completed. I think going forward, everyone who newly registers a dog should have to apply for a dog owner licence and a site visit done yearly.
5419	Support	I did not know that some areas you needed a license to have multiple dogs.
5637	Do not support	There are already strict rules on where we can take our dogs, and these new restrictions further reduce the limited spaces available.
HIBISCUS AND BAYS LOCAL BOARD		

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
9	Do not support	a license to keep multiple dogs on a property should apply to the whole of Auckland, not just specific areas.
214	Support	I support this providing the change does not result in cutting back on the numbers even further. The good and responsible dog owners are always hit hard with changes whereas those that don't register and don't care carry on doing whatever they like with no penalties.
319	Support	I do not have a problem if people legally keep multiple dogs on their property, clarification of the requirements is key.
351	Support	The rules should be the same for all areas!!!!
566	Support	Make it ALL areas.
579	Support	Unless people need working dogs, do they really need multiple dogs in urban areas?
607	Support	Advertise and educate by using adverts on the TV etc that only 2 dogs are allowed on the property for over 30 days, even if you don't own all of them. The general public doesn't know that!
771	Do not support	It is often the dog more than the area
776	Support	Area should be irrelevant - people can live in one area and walk/exercise their dogs in another. 2 dogs maximum without a licence / 'pack' training.
864	Support	I wouldn't know what this would apply to now or what's considered in this decision given anyone should be able to own a dog if they responsible.
1059	Do not support	Some responsible dog owners may have multiple dogs they show, or for agility or obedience competitions and these people are more likely to look after their dogs so why should they be penalised for how many dogs they keep? Penalise the people with one dog that do not look after their dogs.
1153	Do not support	Seriously? Mind your own business.
1367	I don't know	Currently there is a "blanket" rule of no more than 2 dogs (as an example). But they do not take into account how big / small your property is or if the dogs are quiet inside bound dogs or not. For my property, 2 small / medium dogs are sufficient, but it is not really big enough for 2 big dogs. Our neighbour's property is big enough for 4 big dogs.
1634	Support	Registered breeders should be the only ones able to have multiple dogs on an urban property. Rural properties should also be limited, unless they are farm dogs.
1750	Do not support	The rule should be the same for all of Auckland
2084	Do not support	You should be able to have more than two dogs on a residential property anyway. Why should some areas of Auckland be able to have multiple dogs & other areas can't?
2290	Do not support	If the property isn't suitable for multiple dogs to be kept and not the area.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
3446	Support	Most residential properties are so small now that people should only have 1 or 2 dogs & either visit a Designated, Fenced Dog Park if they want their dogs to run around or walk their dog daily on a leash Rural properties, lifestyle blocks & working dogs on farms should be limited to the amount of stock on hand & electrified fences to deter exit & entry should be installed
3824	Support	More than 2 large dogs on a property can be problematic as they begin to form a pack. The same could be said for 3 or more small dogs.
3988	Support	I have a Multiple Dog License. I had an Animal Control Officer come to my home to check out my dogs were calm, happy & well contained & well looked after. I had no idea that was necessary. I don't think there should be exclusion areas. All Auckland should be treated the same!
4082	Support	Only business or "farm" should need to have so many
4354	Support	I was bitten by a medium size petagree, dog Las year off of lesh
4435	Support	Auckland is a large city. We must limit the overall number of dogs (and cats) in general residential areas. As a rate payer I do not want more noise, more litter (bagged or otherwise) or more signage.
4730	I don't know	I believe with the amount of neglected animals in certain and very well known areas of Auckland that they should require multiple dog permits. However, these are generally the people who don't abide by the rules now, so I don't see how enforcing this legislation will change the current situation in the problem areas, plus no one seems to want to enter these areas to police it. Again it would only affect the the rule abiding dog owners and mostly in the pocket.
4878	Do not support	All dog owners should licence their dogs regardless of where in Auckland they live.
5221	Support	Dogs left unattended during the day, and multiple digs on properties affects neighbours and affects their quality of life.
5479	Support	I have had neighbours that had 3 dogs. They were neglected and this also meant that they barked day and night. They disrupted the neighbourhood and frightened people passing the property
5984	Support	All areas should be included unless the animals are working dogs.
6396	Do not support	Why would there be a limitation when you have to get your neighbours permission for multiple dogs?
6431	I don't know	Depends on what you mean by multiple dogs - is that 2+ or more than 2?
6800	Support	Clearly this is a problem in certain areas of Auckland. I believe that responsible owners will easily obtain this licence.
HOWICK LOCAL BOARD		
407	Support	Ban pitbull type dogs
521	Support	Clarification is a good idea. However this must not be used as a way to change the rules without consultation.
541	Support	All areas urban areas should have a maximum of 2 dogs per dwelling.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
563	Do not support	rule should be applied to all areas
858	Do not support	Don't feel it fair to restrict families from have more than one dog as a companion does help with a single dog been lonely
1593	Support	Surely it should be one rule for all suburbs. I believe in every household being treated equally. Everyone should have to control their animals so that they are not a nuisance to anyone else, including cat owners.
2216	Do not support	Again- if someone is paying to live in a property and taking good care of these dogs then it's not up to the council to decide otherwise
2218	I don't know	what does this mean? And, what qualifies one area to have more dog ownership than another? what about people who take in foster dogs... are they able to get special licenses for this?
2516	Support	Otara, because many streets here have dogs that they do not care for I hear many dogs crying all day n night In housing Nz homes Where they're not supposed to have pets
2562	Do not support	All multiple dogs should be. It is not fair for certain the law abiding areas to be subjected to laws where other areas who don't abide get congratulated for bad dog keeping behaviour and not subjected.
2692	Do not support	Rules should be consistent across New Zealand. It's very different between Auckland and Manukau, so for someone living in Otahuhu you can be caught between different requirements. Focus on irresponsible dog owners not penalising responsible owners.
2927	Support	I think this license is a bit of joke. Free will seems to be gone.
2955	Do not support	I don't think it should be areas. There are a lot of good home doggy daycares and I think it should be open to more people to operate these. Noise control rules should apply. I think the multiple dog rules should come in over four - I think currently we need permission for two which is ridiculous.
3987	Support	Every region, not just areas, the who country should. For every dog, not just multiple. Honestly, this can even bring in revenue to the councils
4085	Support	I'd like to see foster parents exempt from this rule, they do an amazing job at keeping puppies and dogs off the streets. It should be easy for them to apply for an exemption.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
4225	Do not support	I feel this is a leading question and not specific enough. Responsible and I say RESPONSIBLE breeders need to be able to have the ability to breed their dogs responsibly and those people do. My concern is those puppy farmers, and this is a huge problem in NZ like other countries, where they breed indiscriminately and sell to unsuspecting and not dog knowledgeable families. Often these situations end in heartache through disease, deformities and problematic dogs, who then are disposed of in all different ways to other unsuspecting people. These puppy farms need to be stopped. Who is monitoring this? What difference does it make what parts of Auckland require licenses, while others do not?
4357	Support	Requiring a license for a set number of dogs is current policy, i don't see why we wouldnt want clarification what that means for each area - i support this change
4629	Do not support	Should apply across the city
5100	Support	If people are allowed to keep multiple dogs then they and their property should be assessed with regards to the welfare of the dogs and that they dogs are neutered to make sure they are not breeding.
KAIPĀTIKI LOCAL BOARD		
186	Support	If they are licensed and cared for wherever they are. One to two in suburbs is enough . Rural working dogs , if cared for , they may require more. All pet dogs should be neutered or speyed . No exceptions. We have enough.
238	Do not support	As I read this proposal it is too broad and possibly also discriminatory. A licence would be required on one street and not on the next one over? All areas please and not just South Auckland, which we all know is what will happen.
260	Support	It should also cover types of property, because houses with large gardens may be mixed in with apartments and townhouses. It isn't fair on dogs, owners, or neighbours to have blanket rules.
289	Do not support	It should be all areas of Auckland that require registration for multiple dogs - this makes it straight forward
550	Support	But equally you MUST be able to follow up and remove dogs easier that are chained maltreatment or abused. Dog removal laws must be loosened to keep the animal at front of mind. Our animal welfare is dismal at best.
572	I don't know	Why should there be a difference based on area? Isn't the point more about the type of housing and space available. If you pick 'area' there is a big chance it vecome.very judgmental and controlled by a minority who have the loudest voices
705	Support	far too many irresponsible people / owners. Get a dog because it's cute, unneutered, then puppies and multiple dogs.
865	Support	I think all areas of Auckland should have the same restrictions in order for this rule to be equitable.
1523	Support	There are a lot of people that do not care for their pets properly and provide to their needs. I believe an assessment should be provided for properties with multiple dogs.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
2049	Do not support	It should be one rule. Everyone should have to have a license to have more than two dogs
3286	Support	I think this is good because it imposes responsibility on owners and what it means to have and care for multiple dogs
4523	Do not support	The complaints process cover this, a number should only be placed on a person if they are receiving complaints.
5326	Do not support	Ypu should have stated what multiple means. I had 2 dogs no issues. Three or more yes I would have supported but have not supported because you just said multiple which could mean 2.
5607	Do not support	Not easily enforced.
6092	Do not support	It's important that licensing requirements don't become overly restrictive for responsible multi-dog owners. The process should be fair, accessible, and consider the individual circumstances of dog owners rather than imposing blanket limitations.
6316	Do not support	If the dogs are within the property border and are of no disturbance to the neighbours, it doesn't matter how many dogs there are.
MĀNGERE-ŌTĀHUHU LOCAL BOARD		
178	Do not support	This is very generalized and is not specific to individual circumstances and living arrangements
590	I don't know	Other than farms over a certain size multiple dogs (more than 2) should not be permitted anywhere in the urban regional Auckland area.
766	Support	I live in a area that's highly populated with dog owners who don't care about their pets. This prohibits those who are negligent and also mean less dogs wandering the streets un tethered
4270	Support	Yes areas is important but circomstances are more important ... with intensification of housing and poor infrastructure there is a lack of clarity around animal and human wellbeing.
6024	Do not support	The maximum dog limits should be readvertised, and any breaches followed up. There are many reasons for times over limit, including visitors who also own dogs.
6123	Support	I hope that all areas of Auckland (maybe except rural) should require a license for multiple dogs.
6154	Do not support	I think all areas should have the same limit of dogs except with special permissions ex farm/working dogs. This is to foster the wellbeing of animals and to prevent "puppy farm" breeding practices. I feel this policy could further marginalise already vulnerable neighbourhoods ex: 4 dogs allowed in Ponsonby, but not in South Auckland. Therefore I think everyone should adhere to the same limits unless above working or farm dogs.
MANUREWA LOCAL BOARD		
121	Support	All areas should require a license to keep multiple dogs which should put a stop to people just continuously breeding the dogs

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
2011	I don't know	While clarifying the areas in Auckland where a license is required to keep multiple dogs on a property could help improve dog management, it's important to ensure that this change does not unfairly burden responsible dog owners. The primary focus should remain on addressing the real issue: roaming dogs caused by negligent owners, rather than targeting good owners who comply with regulations and responsibly manage their dogs. Key Considerations: Focus on Accountability for Roaming Dogs: The licensing requirement should explicitly target properties where roaming dogs have been an issue or where there is a history of complaints. Responsible dog owners with secure properties and no history of non-compliance should not face unnecessary restrictions. Clear and Transparent Guidelines: Clearly define which areas require licenses, the criteria for needing one, and the application process. This will help avoid confusion and ensure owners understand their obligations. Highlight the importance of secure fencing, containment measures, and supervision in the licensing criteria to directly address roaming concerns. Avoid Blanket Regulations: A one-size-fits-all rule for multiple dog ownership could penalize responsible owners who maintain proper containment and care for their dogs. Consider a targeted approach where licenses are required only in high-risk areas or for properties with a history of violations. Recommendations for Effective Policy Implementation Tie Licensing to Responsible Ownership:
2295	Support	Again. South Auckland has numerous homes with multiple roaming dogs. It's not rocket science. Whether one or many. Keep the dogs trained and contained. All dogs should have basic obedience as requirement and prerequisite for dog ownership. This is nz. Show some class and basic common sense.
2649	Do not support	No one should be limited to have multiple dogs or charged for it especially when dogs need housing to begin with.
3859	Support	Support, but unsure how effective it would be. Assuming there would be a cost to a multiple dog license on a property. Where I live in South Auckland, the irresponsible dog owners would just ignore the requirement, or would possibly not be able to afford to pay for the license.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
4166	Do not support	Any property, in any area of Auckland should be able to keep as many dogs as they want to. These blanket rules hurt more people than they help. The council needs to put more money and effort into helping pets and people that are actually in harms way, rather than trying to police every single household with an abundance of controlling policies.
4505	Support	I think the number of dogs should be increased to four
4843	Support	Rules must be stricter. All areas in Auckland must have stricter rules, and a multiple dog-license must be required for all areas in Auckland.
5448	Support	A great idea for Manurewa but it needs to be policed.
6215	Do not support	I strongly oppose the proposed changes to dog access laws and urge the council to keep the current policy in place. These changes are unnecessary, unfair, and target the wrong audience. The existing Dog Policy 2019 already provides a balanced approach that considers public safety, responsible dog ownership, and the well-being of dogs. The proposed restrictions will significantly reduce access to off-leash areas, despite no substantial evidence of increased risk or public concern that justifies such drastic measures. Rather than punishing responsible dog owners and well-behaved dogs, the council should focus on better enforcement and education for the minority who do not follow the rules. Blanket bans and excessive restrictions penalize the majority of responsible pet owners while doing little to address genuine issues. Additionally, changing the language of the policy to frame dogs as a “nuisance” rather than a valued part of the community is deeply concerning. Dogs provide companionship, improve mental and physical health, and contribute to vibrant local communities. Limiting their access to public spaces goes against the very principles the council should uphold Please listen to the thousands of Auckland dog owners who want fair and sensible policies. I do not support these proposed changes, and I ask the council to reconsider.
6513	Support	There should be a two dog maximum per household in all city, urban and suburban areas.
6735	Do not support	One rule for all.
MAUNGAKIEKIE-TĀMAKI LOCAL BOARD		

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
265	Do not support	(1) I don't understand why geographical areas would be the defining factor? Surely if a ruling is required it should be: (1a) Based on dog type and, (1b) Applied broadly across all of Auckland (2) The definition of "keep" is unclear to me. e.g. scenario: I look after my friend's two dogs for an evening meaning a total of 4 dogs are now present in my house. Under the proposed changes would we be required to seek approval, or does "keep" refer only to dog ownership?
639	Do not support	Unregistered and stray dogs are the big problem. Fix that first.
2023	Support	NO STATE HOUSE should be allowed to have dogs. Tougher policies need to be done here
3408	Support	See my previous comments in relation to licensing. And again the council need to ensure resources are available to enforce these rules. It simply isn't enough to just say these things.
3559	Do not support	I think all should have a licence to have more than 1 dog. This does not depend on the area. All owners should apply to have more than 2 dogs or even cats in one property. I also believe that cats should be included in the dog policy.
3726	Support	Having lived next to a house with 3 all day bakers that rushed the fenced and made enjoying my own yard impossible and made my dog fearful I think there needs to be clear rules and management
3771	Do not support	All areas should require permit for multiple dogs
4313	Support	A lot of housing NZ homes have multiple dogs a lot of the newer homes don't have sufficient yards to keep multiple dogs so a number of them in our neighbourhood get out or are let out to roam
4470	Do not support	Areas of Auckland, this leads to profiling and is bound to affect race. Do not support.
4876	Support	It would be fairer to have all parts of Auckland aligned to make moving houses around the isthmus with multiple dogs easier.
5169	Support	Not allowed to keep multiple dogs on a property. The dogs bark and too easy for them to escape
5522	I don't know	This isn't helping dog owners. Focus on stopping backyard breeding first
5572	Support	Licence required for exceeding set number of dogs on a property
ŌRĀKEI LOCAL BOARD		
447	Support	I know several people with 2-3 large dogs all well behaved. But again a good trainer would be able to make a determination
468	Support	Should be all homes that want more than one dog
495	Support	There definitely needs to be more clarify around this rule as I am aware that people are not adhering to it and trying to find loopholes
535	Support	Clarity is important if you want people to follow rules
600	Support	Strict limits within built up areas.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
610	Support	I think there is a big problem with people not registering their dogs or using loopholes to have multiple dogs on their property (ie registering dogs but registering them under a friends name)
691	Do not support	Auckland/NZ should not be divided in to areas. The rules should apply to everyone and every dog.
741	Support	Should apply to all greater Auckland
818	I don't know	What is multiple? Two, four, ten? What circumstance. This is a predictable case of trying to make one rule fit all situations.
962	Support	Restrictions to 2 dogs unless a special license is given.
1264	Support	I had a multiple dog license for my property. My neighbours did not (the rules have now changed). However the welfare laws are so poor that no one seems to care that those dogs are not being cared for adequately - they are not socialised, they are not exercised, they are not leaving the property - EVER. They have been seized by police multiple times so the council is aware there is no multiple dog license - but nothing has happened. Why are we being held to account, but not them? it is nonsense.
1421	Support	Clarity is always good. I think there should be a default maximum (say 3) but have clarity that certain areas may be an exception to this rule.
1905	I don't know	question is unclear about what is meant by clarify AGAIN. what areas are being proposed to be changed this is a terrible question.
1957	Support	Any area should be able to have multiple dogs on the property.
2122	Support	I thought everyone had to apply for a multiple dog licence? I had to here in St Heliers.
2627	Support	Two dogs living permanently in residential properties is enough. Barking and dogs toileting in backyards can be a problem with too many animals in a small space. Plus the safety of residents and visitors can be compromised when there is a pack,
2752	Do not support	This would be have to be reasonable explanations and documents to back up the proposal. Why is this even a rule being considered?
3358	I don't know	It's such a general question to ask - what do you mean - breeders (that's something that been able to continue uncontrolled for years and has allowed 'puppy farmers' to peddle their despicable trade unchecked, farms, lifestyle blocks and what about very responsible and dedicated dog owners who have two or more neutered dogs that are trained, socialised and exemplary canine citizens?
3753	I don't know	I can understand the pros and cons of this rule. Requiring a licence to have more than two dogs in one household seems overreaching, especially for those who foster and rescue pets.
3963	Do not support	Police the trouble dogs not good owners who have more than 1 dog or is this revenue gathering
3990	Support	Multiple dogs in built up areas are not a good idea. Two should be the limit. Dogs are dogs. They bark and if you have 6 dogs that is unacceptable noise.
4117	Do not support	Another solution is to apply existing rules. If a person cannot control their dogs they lose their dog licence/ability to register multiple dogs.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
4122	Support	In a built up urban environment I don't consider that multiple dogs should be allowed to be kept, due to noise disruption barking etc, intimidating behaviour and lack of suitable space for the dogs to roam when homed.
4419	Do not support	Up to 3 dogs should be allowed on a property but over that the owners should have to apply for a special dispensation
4793	I don't know	What is multiple dogs? More than 2 should require a licence.
4799	Do not support	All areas should require a license and absolute restrictions on inner city on multiple dogs
4831	Support	No issue with this so long as it is about greater clarity, not an actual change to the settings to reduce the areas.
5131	Support	Would like it to be all areas
5520	Do not support	All part of Auckland should be allowed to have multiple dogs without licence. As long as the dogs don't bother anyone and they are happy and healthy. You should target owners who have dogs that is creating issue in the neighbourhood. Don't just put a blanket rule.
6185	Support	I think more than 3 dangerous breed dogs need a license. This supports getting to know who is breeding and be able to enter a property to do an audit for continued license renewal
6229	Do not support	Stop the unnecessary government oversights - just leave us alone
6785	Do not support	I see Auckland suburbs changing. There are some full sections that could easily support 5 dogs, and other sections in the same suburb with 3 or more houses on it. Clearly those smaller sections can not support a multitude of dogs; but why shouldn't the people with the full section continue to keep their dogs all of whom are loved? No, make it dependent on the size of the section, not dependent on the suburb!
6788	Support	Multiple dogs together threaten the public, other domestic animals and wildlife. A pack strongly influences a dog's behaviour. They're social animals and look to belong to the group. It takes one aggressive dog in a pack to go into a tragic situation where the whole group is driven by predatory behaviour. People without knowledge but with long "experience" tend to trust in their experience and relax.
ŌTARA-PAPATOETOE LOCAL BOARD		
2245	Do not support	You have already hurt us with fees and now you want to do it more. Stop it. Dogs get lonely and need another dog for companionship and hurting and putting more fees causes further harm
2529	Support	If they hold multiple, they need to provide desex certificate to minimize risk of unwanted breeding.
2530	Support	ALL AREAS
2850	Support	All ares of Auckland should.
2974	Do not support	THE MOST DOGS THEY SHOOD BE ALLOW IS 3 ONE IN FRONT 1 AT THE BACK YARD AN A INSIDE DOGS ONLY IF THEY HAVE A BIG YARD ON THERE SECTION AN WELL LOOK AFTER

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
4740	Support	Proper farm areas so what but especially in high density and apartment areas absolutely needed
4757	Support	Should be all areas of Auckland
6691	Support	Current rule where a household (suburb) can have maximum of 2 dogs: a) should remain as is (see (b)) b) Consider type of breed, ie if lge/xlge dogs, only 2 be allowed per household (suburban) c) How is this applied with foster care?
PAPAKURA LOCAL BOARD		
1254	Do not support	I dont think it should matter where you live in Auckland, i think it should be more about the person keeping multiple dogs. There should be a lisencing programme for anybody before being able to own multiple dogs.
1282	Support	All areas of Auckland should have the same rules for keeping more than 3 dogs
1305	Support	I support this as with the rise of housing development in most areas of Auckland owning multiple dogs should be reconsidered and reviewed
1453	Do not support	ALL areas (possibly excluding rural working farm dogs?) where people keep multiple dogs on a property should by law hold a license. This is a big part of being a responsible dog owner. The license should be free (or minimal cast) to ensure there is no excuse.
2426	Support	how will you enforce this? so many dogs are not registered so how will you know? most dogs in this category are not sold legitimately at all, just passed around. Just look on the streets of Mangere
2533	Support	The limit should be increased as Working Dogs would generally be in numbers greater than three.
3072	Do not support	There should not be any discrepancy between areas as to a 'multiple dog license'. Simply make a rule for all areas; with an exception for working, dog rescue or training/service or registered dog breeders.
4455	Support	I think everyone should have to prove that they can and will look after a dog or dogs. Small spaces shouldn't be allowed to have dogs unless they can prove walking them and being good dog people
4619	Do not support	There is enough fees. Our dog lives on our rural property and never leaves yet we have to pay fees. For what???
4991	Support	There should be no more than one dog on any property.
5428	Do not support	This is a hard one, I want to say no and yes . As many people keep an unlawful amount of dogs that need up not having their needs met . There are also people such as myself who rescue dogs and pups plus have 2 dogs myself. It would make it a bit difficult for me to support the rescue dogs I take on
6461	Do not support	The Council should not be making a blanket decision based on area alone.
PUKETĀPAPA LOCAL BOARD		

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
32	Support	We have a neighbour that has three dogs and even though it says they need to obtain permission from all neighbours this did not happen. When I mentioned to council that they had three dogs they only got a fine from animal management and allowed to keep all three dogs. They have not been made to obtain neighbours permission nor does animal management take our concerns seriously on how annoying it is when all three dogs are barking particularly on the border fence to our property.
558	Do not support	As long as the property is well fenced and appropriate for the size of dogs the individual has, I don't see why it is the council or governments concern how many dogs they have on their property
687	Do not support	This is racism pure and simple. Stop it.
2460	Do not support	I do not support this change because it arbitrarily discriminates against owners of non-working dogs by imposing a blanket limit in urban areas. The proposal overlooks vital considerations such as fostering rescued dogs, larger families with multiple pets, and owners' mental wellbeing. Rather than addressing specific nuisances or documented issues, this rule penalises responsible multi-dog households, undermining beneficial activities like rescue fostering without providing evidence that such restrictions enhance public safety or community harmony.
2489	Do not support	I don't agree with this change because it randomly singles out owners of non-working dogs in urban areas. It doesn't consider people who temporarily take care of abandoned/rescued dogs, big families with multiple dogs, or anyone who relies on their dogs for mental wellbeing. It doesn't specifically address or propose solutions for the (presumably original) reasons for this restriction, like specific animal welfare conditions at the property. Instead of focusing on real problem cases, this rule punishes all households with several dogs without showing any real benefit to safety or harmony in the community.
2499	Do not support	Responsible dog owners should be able to have a number of dogs no matter where they live. It would also limit who can be fosterers for organisations like Spca and Chained Dog
2689	Support	I think these areas especially when it is inner city but also rural areas need checking as well.
3653	Support	Aligned with the overall strategies regarding housing plans - density housing areas etc
4436	Support	Surely all areas should be covered. Multiple dog ownership even in a farming or rural setting should be policed. Also if you have rules, make sure they are strictly applied.
4896	Support	The number of uncontrolled dog's roaming is increased
5494	Do not support	Why should some areas. Be treated differently to others? How's that fair on keeping things for the people? Not to mention, two dogs are sometimes better than one etc.
5714	I don't know	this should be in relation to the general public and not licenced pack walkers or registered kennels. Pack walkers can use places like the dog squad in addition to other areas to run multiple dogs.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
6500	Do not support	Any dog owner, whom has the relevant backyard area size (and it has been assessed and deemed appropriate by an appropriate officer/SPCA representative) should be able to have any amount of dogs as long as they are well looked after, registered, vaccinated etc.
RODNEY LOCAL BOARD		
68	Support	Should be prohibited any where in Auckland . Multiple dogs should not be allowed in any area unless rural and the animals are working dogs Or the property is a registered business with the necessary facilities that can handle the demands of multiple animals.
972	Support	There are plenty of areas in Auckland where properties are large enough and separated enough to allow families to have more dogs, but in more population dense areas, the number should be limited due to noise, aggression, roaming, etc
1252	Support	It depends on the rating the properties are under. Also owner need to make sure their properties are fenced.
1283	I don't know	It would depend on what the licence involved. It seems like a good idea - but would need to be structural and allow people a chance to put things in place to meet the requirements of a licence if they already have multiple animals
1300	Support	Important for those multiple dog owners who may be considering moving properties to have a clear idea of the rules as pertaining to their dogs in potential new location.
1318	Support	All areas in Auckland should have limits on dog numbers unless they are a dog facility such as a groomers, daycare, kennels, vet, breeder registered.
1320	Support	This should be monitored also
1646	Do not support	Why on earth should multiple dogs not be allowed. Why are dogs the only ones to be restricted here? This is a real imposition on liberties.
1936	Support	In my community no one wants to live next to a property that has multiple dogs (more than 3) unless it is rural. Obviously farm dogs or hunting dogs are different - but in urban environments there is no reason to keep multiple dogs on a small property.
1955	Support	it is obvious that some areas people live in tend to house a group of people who do not follow the rules nor have respect for others.
1995	Do not support	I can't really see how a specific area can be used to control dog numbers. Or how that is in any way fair and transparent. There are likely areas that have more issues with stray unregistered dogs than others. Things I do agree with are the amount of dogs you can own for the square meterage of your property. Possibly proximity of Neighbours etc.
2073	Do not support	I think the number of dogs that can be kept on a property should be up to the individual - so long as the other requirements are adhered to e.g., not cause a nuisance, not a danger to others, are safe/well cared for etc.
2129	Support	Definitely for safety and noise nuisance reasons

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
2244	Do not support	The licenses should be equal throughout the region and more emphasis given to enforcement of existing license breaches.
2537	Do not support	This is unjustified and an overstepping of auckland council. We will register all dogs on a property but you don't have the right to limit it. How does a farm differentiate from a residence? We will semi rural and it won't make sense.
2682	Support	I know that the owner of Fetch uses his Grey Lynn property as an overnight kennel, sometimes for over 20+ dogs. Is this legal?
2716	Do not support	Rather than asking to licence people for having a number of dogs by area ,the time and money should be spent on identifying and restricting irresponsible dog owners across the Auckland area.
2828	Support	Presumably this rule will only apply to residential suburbs, not rural properties.
3252	Support	Rural zones change frequently with the increase of housing developments. This should be updated regularly and where changes are made fair notice given.
3343	Support	Requiring a license for multiple dogs should only be required in extreme circumstances.
3642	I don't know	If someone has multiple dogs on their property the dogs tend to call out in chorus which affects a peaceful neighborhood and also from my experience the dogs are not always taken out for exercise as perhaps taking out 3-4 dogs requires more energy and planning. Also is anyone needs to go on the property the dogs form a pack.
3933	Support	Understand that there needs to be limits in an urban area. There should be greater limits for non working dogs in the rural enviroments
4084	Do not support	Unless the dogs are menacing or creating unrest by barking or roaming, I do not think it is Council business about how many dogs a person may have on their property
4123	Do not support	If dogs are on private property, this isnt council business.
4128	Do not support	Unfair to categorize all owners just by where they live, and as per the last question, you will simply increase the number of unregistered dogs.
4175	Do not support	The rules are already in place they just need to be properly enforced, new rules will not stop owners or people who don't respect the current regulations.
4311	Support	My mother lives in mangere bridge and roaming menacing dogs are a huge problem there .. more penalties for useless dog owners please
4314	Do not support	Pragmatism is necessary for any changes to be effective. It is unlikely that the change in the rules will deliver the outcomes sought but may create unintended consequences and additional cost for rule abiding dog owners. The rules are aimed at those already likely to be non-compliant in terms of registering all dogs at the premises which provides an avenue for enforcement. Over regulation in all areas is likely to create more not less non-compliance.
4408	Do not support	Why should you need a licence to own a dog? That's extremely restrictive. A better idea would be to enforce property checks and potentially along the same lines as a home loan with financial checks to make sure the individual can support the animal they have chosen. And to let professionals guide individuals as to what breed would suit them best instead of having a border collie in an apartment complex

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
4631	Support	A limit of 2, especially with large dogs, should be implemented. My observations are that most dogs are left alone with a tendency to bark and annoy neighbours.
4640	Do not support	Dog behaviour is not affected by land designations. AAll areas should be treated the same.
4747	I don't know	The last time I checked, multiple dog licenses were firstly based on property size and I think this has merit and should be a first step rather than geographical location.
4796	Do not support	It should be all areas, not certain areas. As an owner with a Responsible dog owner licence, the intent should the same for all dog owners, if the dogs they have are not registered or microchipped then that is an issue. By stating a particular region you are effectively discriminating.
4899	Support	This sort of makes sense but more rural towns like wellsford and the Hana should be sweet for dogs we have a big dog park and quieter area
5013	I don't know	I agree that to meny dogs are not a good thing especially if those dogs are untrained or people are untrained in how to handle them more advocate and campaigning for animal traning would help all of these issues and more traing is important
5275	Support	Aligned with this needs to be some thinking about dog breeders - particularly those who run puppy mills and pump out pups with no regard to animal welfare.
5429	Support	South Auckland!!!! So many Bully breeds left to roam the streets and generally being uncared for These dogs need loving and secure homes and not just being kept as a status symbol then forgotten about . These irresponsible owners are what give these Bully breeds a bad name!!
6102	Support	Absolutely support this but again reiterate that enforce is the key here and needs to better than it is currently
6470	Support	It is important to note that someone with three Shitzus is going to be less of a problem in their environment, than someone with three XL bully breeds. Again I think breed specific training and licensing requirements will solve this more effectively.
UPPER HARBOUR LOCAL BOARD		
65	Support	This is currently quite unclear. I think rural properties above a certain acreage should be exempt from a limit.
83	Do not support	The area where you live should not be taken into account. The same rule should apply no matter where you live. It is extremely unfair to expect people to have to rehome their dog because they are moving to an area that requires them to do so. There should be the same rule for cats: some house have too many cats and they also endanger wildlife and no one does anything about it!
129	Support	Should be licensed to own any dog, auckland is in a homeless dog crisis.
179	Support	Make it clear that roaming dogs still count. Ie, you Jane 7 dogs and they roam thus they are technically not on your property. This is a loophole.
754	Support	This must be rigorously enforced to avoid the situation of irresponsible owners allowing unplanned breeding of their dogs.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
1141	Support	All people with more than 3 dogs should have a very good reason to have them. Eg farmer, foster, volunteer org, or dog trainer. Nz kennel club registered breeder. Anyone else should not be allowed any more dogs.
1165	Do not support	It should be auckland wide not specific areas
1166	Do not support	Again with the limiting of people's choices. You should be able to do what you want on your own property as long as you aren't harming or damaging other people's property.
1218	I don't know	Bring the cats regulations!!! The cats must be registered, chipped, not allowed to wonder around without owners. Example: a cat came to our property, attacked 2 our dogs. One dog almost died, we paid over \$2000 of excess insurance costs for surgery and hospitalisation. No way to even find whose the cat was, why it was in our enclosed backyard.
1363	Do not support	This is already clear and has been for years. Please don't overdo it and try and fix things which are not broken
1394	Do not support	I see this as another way council is obtaining further funding.
1637	Support	Multiple dog owners must have outside grass areas for their dogs to be active in. Apartments and other close living places must have a total, for the numbers of dogs overall, with only one dog per household (none if the total of dogs allowed is already there)
2701	Support	people should only be allowed 2 dogs unless they are operating kennells.
6634	Do not support	You should be able to own and register as many dogs as you like as long as they are cared for and have the appropriate space
WAIHEKE LOCAL BOARD		
861	Support	A license to keep multiple dogs should be required everywhere.
2771	Do not support	All areas should have to meet the same requirement. You should have a license to keep multiple dogs anywhere in Auckland.
2933	Support	All dogs and owners should be registered. Max number of dogs Auckland wide should be 2. All kept in fully fenced sections.
4893	Support	Need to know more about this. How many dogs etc etc
WAITĀKERE RANGES LOCAL BOARD		
433	I don't know	If multiple dogs means more than 2 then I support. But if 2 dogs are classed as multiple then I don't support.
506	Support	Too many terrible dog owners.
523	Do not support	Rules around this need to be loosened
634	Support	The current cap on 2 dogs is ridiculously low, and the ability to gain the license is more dependant on neighbors liking or not liking dogs in the first place & general relationship with the neighbors.
1519	Support	Akl CBD must have only 1 small dog
1600	Support	it will be helpful to have a restriction on the number of un-neutered dogs on a property compared to neutered dogs. Consideration also to be given based on size of dogs and owner's level of investment to provide regular exercise and socialisation to their dogs.
1665	Support	This could help limit puppy mills as well as limit people in urban areas having too many dogs on one site.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
1930	Do not support	Why are you not allowed to keep multiple dogs? If the dogs are well cared for and do not cause any issues why does the council get to make that decision? You can keep multiple cats, who do cause a nuisance, without any restriction. Dog owners being targeted once again.
2167	Support	Be good to have a understanding of which areas can have more than one dog on a property
3802	Do not support	We have to ask neighbour's to sign to agree, this is unfair if the neighbour's are not friendly, are not dog people. We are fully fenced and registered, there should be no need to get a license if we wished to have say 3 dogs. However in situations where more than say 3 dogs are wanted, unless a rural area then I would agree with this proposal.
4067	Support	It's the owners who don't register their dogs at all that mainly cause issues. The cost is prohibitive and also having to give personal information is probably something they prefer not to do. This is where the the animal management team should be concentrating their efforts.
4571	Support	I live in Glen Eden and have a neighbour who seems to breed dogs on his site. His dogs do nothing but bark every night from darkness any slight movement and they bark and always barking in the middle of the night and council don't want to know about it!! my other neighbour has at least 5 small dogs often left at home for long periods of time and also often barking for hours on end!! these owners both don't seem to know that they need a licence for multiple dogs on site.
4898	Support	This law needs looking at generally. With the explosion in population in Auckland in recent years and the result being an explosion in the number of dogs, a law having only 1 dog per property seems a logical conclusion. Then a much stricter bylaw introduced for the whole of Auckland for licensing of multiple dogs on a property.
5480	Do not support	It should not matter where you live. There should be one ruling across the country for dog management and ownership.
5896	Do not support	If t
6447	Do not support	Private property rights should not be eroded Beef up legal consequences for welfare transgressions instead
6765	Do not support	Licenses for multiple dogs should only be required in the case of owners who have repeatedly contravened other dog regulations (animal welfare, noise, 'menacing' etc). The onus should be on the council to show that it is inappropriate for an owner to have multiple dogs at an address.
WAITEMATĀ LOCAL BOARD		
118	Do not support	I have always been a very responsible dog owner. I have two large dogs and I live in the Auckland CBD. My dogs are well trained and everyone in the building comments on their good behaviours. In the same building there are people who own one small dog and they have absolutely no control over their dogs. Often off leash with no recall, barking the whole day. This change to the policy will not change anything for the public. I am happy to provide more feedback in person or over the phone

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
206	Do not support	I think all owners with multiple dogs should have a license regardless of their location
560	Support	You have not said here the regions
1404	Support	It is critical there is monitoring of this given many of the currently offending properties don't even register their dogs
1544	Do not support	????? seriously, you might as well pose that every person who has more than 2 babies should have a license to have their kid in their house. what a stupid idea
2184	Do not support	How about the amount of abandoned cats that's what should be managed instead of punishing dog owners
2232	Support	Anyone that has more than two should have a license on the property.
2611	Support	The cost of registering a dog is prohibitive so registering multiple dogs (if you are an owner, not a day care, groomer or stay) is not likely and will only be identified after it is reported.
3851	I don't know	I do not understand this proposed change based on the document I've read.
4582	Do not support	I dont want more than the 2 dogs i have, but again i feel like its the type of dog / owners that are the issue. 1 uncontrolled large dog, is worse for a neighbourhood than 6 wellbehaved one in a house.
4584	Do not support	there is already rules in place that conrols the amount of dogs you have, isnt this enough
5125	Do not support	All areas need to hold a licence for multiple dog ownership(apart from farms).Special oversight and and strict laws for any dog breeding establishment
5310	Support	Anyone with a genuine reason for wanting multiple dogs, should be willing to meet certain requirements. If not, they are probably not the right people to own multiple dogs.
5618	Support	Four dogs or more should require special exemption in residential areas.
5638	Support	I am not aware of this rule.
6182	Support	Clarify but not change without further consulatation
6445	Support	Apart from the urban and rural distinction, I m not sure the rules should differ depending on suburb
WHAU LOCAL BOARD		
328	Support	All areas of Auckland should require permits to keep multiple dogs.
522	Support	2 Dogs with out a license should be enough. Anymore, and they should have a license
2455	Do not support	i have dogs
2544	Support	This should only affect residential areas. If you live rurally or have working dogs this shouldn't affect you as a dog owner.
2819	Support	More clarity.
3381	Do not support	This is an elitist approach. Rules should apply to all or none of Auckland
3549	Support	No more than 2 dogs should be allowed on any property
4025	Support	All Dogs should be License & have some mandatory training for both dog & Owners
4879	Support	Multiple dogs on a property should be banned in Auckland. Start enforcing the rules, not just making them.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
4923	Do not support	Again, this change was supposedly made in the previous review. It makes me very suspicious that it is being 'clarified' again.
5023	Support	I'm assuming that all of Auckland needs to apply for a license (for more than 2 dogs) at the moment if it's not a working dog. So from that perspective, I say for some neighbourhoods, it should probably even be for a license for more than 1 dog. The amount of roaming dogs in South Auckland far outweighs the rest of the city and so I don't think everyone should be punished for the few that can't look after a dog.
6077	Support	That should be a blanket roll and not pick out certain areas of Auckland as that is not equality
UNDECLARED LOCAL BOARD		
474	I don't know	How many is multiple? People should be able to own at least 3 dogs without restriction provided they are a responsible dog owner.
903	I don't know	How many is multiple. 2 dogs should be allowed.
1243	I don't know	I think breeders should require a license, but others should be able to have multiple dogs or more as long as they are neutered and well looked after. Don't make it harder for rescues.
1816	Support	A several people without financial means have dogs that are not neutered and start to breed with other dogs and in the end they all grow up and are left loose on the streets.
2102	I don't know	Once again certain people won't comply, regardless of the rules.
2584	Do not support	Stop trying to control everything. Provide the required support for owners instead! If dogs misbehave or are treated badly it's your responsibility to act as required. You cannot make every single owner pay the mistakes of your poor administration!
2652	I don't know	Current rules requiring over 2 dogs to need a license seem reasonable (absent working dogs). Consider adding owning 2+ cats - as they damage wildlife (quietly) at a very high rate - it's just not as obvious as with a dog.
3675	Do not support	These restrictions are against providing residents the flexibility to keep dogs.
4468	Do not support	You shouldn't be penalised for where you can afford to live
5466	Do not support	People who breed dogs should have a limit as they are part of this problem but people who are fostering or looking after dogs, there should no limit. They should make the question clearer
5514	Do not support	Leave this part alone. Why does everyone have to bother what one does inside
5884	Support	This is tricky. Legitimate businesses should be able to have a license that allows them to have more dogs on their property. Any properties that have excessive dogs and that cannot provide a license for such, should be heavily fined and have procedures in place to get them to provide better living situations for the dogs.
6408	Support	As Auckland gets denser this is an absolute requirement. Most dog owners will be mindful of their neighbours and their rights to peaceful and quiet enjoyment of their property; however, there are others who blatantly disregard their responsibilities as a pet owner.

Sub #	Q2D Multiple dogs on a property	Q2D Tell us why
7261	I don't know	NOS OF DOGS KEPT AT A PROPERTY: This question is not a good one. It depends entirely on the size of the property. There is no one size/rule that fits all. Suitably qualified people should inspect the property and make a decision.
OUTSIDE AUCKLAND		
710	Do not support	Don't let dog ownership influence house prices and buyer appeal.
932	Do not support	A bit discriminatory. Just because you live in a certain area this shouldn't limit the number of dogs you can keep. Might not be ideal circumstances. But it's would discriminate against low income families.
4517	Do not support	Incredibly unnecessary