
Dog policy, bylaw and regional park access rules 2025

Q2 Policy and bylaw matters

**(Q2A. Restructure the policy to more clearly show its
goal, focus areas, council actions, and rules)**

Comments sorted by submitter's local board

Date published: Monday, 7 April 2025

Local Board	Page #
Albert-Eden	3
Aotea/Great Barrier	7
Devonport-Takapuna	7
Franklin	9
Henderson-Massey	12
Hibiscus and Bays	15
Howick	19
Kaipātiki	21
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	23
Manurewa	23
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	27
Ōrākei	29
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	39
Papakura	41
Puketāpapa	42
Rodney	44
Upper Harbour	47
Waiheke	48
Waitākere Ranges	49
Waitematā	50
Whau	52
Undeclared local board	53
Outside Auckland	55
Regional organisation	NA

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
ALBERT-EDEN LOCAL BOARD		
116	Support	The changes are meaningless without more enforcement. Animal Management needs to be more visible. Meola Reef has been feral for a good five years now, on-leash area rules are widely ignored, and there are still Karaka trees in the off-leash area, but labradors are meant to read the warning sign rather eat the berries and die. As for educating dog owners, they need to understand that dogs don't require an off leash run every time. At places like Meola Reef they should park 1km away, walk the dog on leash to the off-leash area, let them have ten minutes of off-leash time and then walk them back to the car. Also, people need to be educated around the fact that how they walk their dog impacts others walking their dogs. In many places outside Auckland, when someone with an off-leash dog approaches on-leash dogs, they will leash theirs up as they get within 100-200m, walk past the other dogs, and then let their dogs off-leash at a safe distance. It's quite clear that if someone is walking their dog on-leash it's for a reason, and they don't want their dog approaching other dogs on an unplanned basis. There are numerous reasons why approaching an on-leash dog is a bad idea. The dog may be young and not yet fully vaccinated, it may be a young intact male which is at risk from older intact alphas, it may be post-op, it may have an infectious disease, it may react badly to unfamiliar dogs. The person walking their dog on leash shouldn't have to explain this to every person they come across.
149	Support	A few dog owners are spoiling it (shitting) for all.
176	Support	Because the current situation is variable and unclear
375	Do not support	It's a poorly thought out change to the bylaw
383	Support	The current dog walking rules are so complex and confusing, and differ in each park that it is not surprising so many dog owners break the rules and feel entitled to do as they please.
721	Support	No dogs in parks . Where kids are. Differently no dogs in cafes. Shopping malls etc
982	Do not support	You are wasting our money!! You can put this money back to the front line people, e.g. lawn mowing crew to mow our parks more regularly, and reinstate the rubbish bins at parks. This means dog walks and families can enjoy the parks more often. No need to change anything.
1190	Support	So many dog users don't know what the rules are, with disastrous results. Dog owner and Council responsibilities need to be made very clear.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
1595	Support	Policy needs to be clear “In Control” does not mean on a leash, which, in my view, dogs should be outside designated areas. Current rules say “In control” and I think this is not enough. Both myself and my dog have been attacked by dogs off leash on Owairaka/ Mt Albert and along the Oakley Creek walkway through Mt Roskill and Mt Albert. “In Control” is too broad and a person may think they are in control when they are not, and this could result in harm to a person or other animal. The goal should be safety and consistency, and clear signage.
1622	I don't know	I would like to know what the goal is, and how it is being evenly applied to other animals that harm native wildlife for example - cats? or who excrement in public without cleaning it up - humans and cats (I know because those are the two poops my dog likes to eat!)
1939	Support	all rules should be clear so there is no argument
2146	I don't know	Without clear requirements on how the Council will manage the policy to ensure it is actually adhered to, redrafting an existing document is a pointless exercise. For example, how will Council staff be held accountable if/when people do not adhere to the policy? Will someone lose their job? Redrafting an existing document would take Chat GPT about 2 seconds. How long will it take someone at the Council and what is their hourly rate?
2275	I don't know	Restructuring existing policy is often not a useful use of time and money. This should go into enforcing existing policy instead
2325	Support	Dog access should be expanded to more public places with clearer rules and allowable seasons or times of day.
2476	Support	Even now as an Aucklanders of many years I still feel unsure of dog rules as they apply to me when going to specific places at specific times.
2524	Do not support	The by-laws are totally fine as is. They are easy to understand and there are far greater things to sort out in this city than the odd dog poop. Why not put the effort in to supporting stray management and bad owner management?
2990	Do not support	Only change is that it needs to be regulated
2992	Do not support	This just adds more cost to both myself funding yet another level of regulation within the council who already seem to have a major problem with delivering anything on time. It will increase the fees the dog walker charges- and people who are trying to make a living independantly like this group of people dont need it
3076	I don't know	I'm not against regulation—I support it! I believe in uplifting the industry through education to raise standards, licensing for accountability, and solutions that genuinely address the issues. Regulation by numbers alone won't solve the problem. Please work with real life dog walkers and trainers to come up with better solutions, rather than having a very small portion ruin it for a lot of people and dogs.
3342	Do not support	I support dogs being off-leash, with restrictions, (such as before 9am and after 5pm) in public spaces

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
4141	I don't know	I don't think Auckland Council should be making policy without the full involvement and detailed participation of representatives from the Dog Walkers' Association. These people have the day-to-day knowledge about what to do to ensure that both the dogs and the public have a great experience. They are the last people in this city who would want to be irresponsible and put their livelihood at risk. EMPHASISE - They KNOW what to do. That is because they do it every day, and bring the dogs home every day, without incident! I don't know who is making the rules up at The Council, but by their flavour, they sound like they are being determined by generalist bureaucrats with no actual insight into what would be best for us and for the dogs. THAT MUST NOT BE ALLOWED TO HAPPEN. Dogs have a society and a culture just like we do, and they must be given every opportunity to socialize and learn wise and good behaviour from each other. Compared to the "old dogs" we humans know nothing. Subjecting them to arbitrary rules without any foundation in who they are and how they think, is just going to make things worse. PLEASE DON'T ALLOW THAT TO HAPPEN! Dogs have been living with humans for many thousands of years and so the canine culture must have evolved an insightful and collaborative society. It couldn't possibly be due to human's - teaching them to sit, or fetch, or roll over... To think that, is blindness brought about by self-entitled arrogance. PLEASE DON'T GO DOWN THE ROAD OF BALKANISING THEM. They must be allowed to associate in freedom, so that they have the opportunity to learn how to be good dogs, which I'm sure they would all want to be, if relatively freed from the corrosive demands that humans place upon them. ABOVE ALL - LET THE DOG WALKERS MAKE THE RULES - THEY KNOW BEST!
4158	Do not support	In the recent years dogs have changed the lives of many. They are their family and in some cases their children. Dogs playing off leash also brings together diverse families and individuals that you typically wouldn't have gotten to know. They're the catalyst for community bonding. Dogs chasing balls together, tumbling, play fighting is what dogs need and can't do off leash. I would agree for harsher rules for people that don't care enough to run or walk their dogs - but you're punishing the wrong dog owners. We get out, we use the parks and bring communities together. The changes are very short sighted - no time thinking or understanding the positives of off leash mental and physical health benefits and subsequently taking pressure off the health system. Imagine an innovative design where more freedom was given and the naysayers told to perhaps get out of their four walls and enjoy the benefits of dogs and their owners enjoying each others company and fresh air
4368	I don't know	I think this consultation is not addressing more important issues relating to dogs in Auckland. Their over-breeding, for one - why is desexing not mandatory and facilitated? Another is the increasing practices of letting dogs roam, and of walking them off-leash - the fact that it is illegal to do these things seems to have been increasingly forgotten (generational knowledge loss?) and a major public re-education is called for.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
4512	Do not support	It feels that the policy is becoming anti-dog. A situation where a few 'bad-eggs' are ruining or for those who diligently follow rules.
4520	Do not support	My experience of being a dog owner is. Dog ownership has fostered a rich community of social networks that span age and stage of life. The current bylaws are clear and adequate. The proposed restrictions are perhaps punitive to a community that is semi complaint. The semi compliance that I have seen perhaps suggests that an increase in areas for dogs and owners to exercise is required. The positives I see that perhaps those that dont own dogs dont experience are not only the social aspects of interconnection but also the crime, harm reduction and regular consistent use of spaces that dog owners bring to environments. what I have experienced are the following: Dog owners are in parks and open spaces multiple times per day. In our local park I see multiple owners multiple times per day. We are aware of the park and what is happening in it. We are aware of the drug dealing and we create an obstacle for this increasing by our presence. We as a community are often the first to see and notify crimes, misdemeanors or property damage. We are present in parks, beaches and other green spaces in all weather conditions and seasons. I have experienced social good and action in the dog walking community. My general experience is dog owners care not only for their own dogs but those of others and also animals.
4674	Support	I think there should be a special exemption for supervised trained dogs to be off-leash in parks in a controlled work environment like the film industry.
4689	I don't know	What are the changes I'm commenting on??
4721	I don't know	I think council needs to take more responsibility for 'council action'
5431	Support	We are rate payers and everyone has a right to provide feedback if you're a dog owner or becoming one in the future.
5485	Do not support	Because it is your opinion that you are making improvements. From the dog owner perspective and animal warfare experts this is not the case
5629	Support	I am a 70 year old, active, long term resident of Pt Chevalier with a double hip replacement. For the last 4 years I have been unwilling to enter Meola Reef reserve on my daily walk as the whole of the reserve has been appropriated by dog owners who mostly run their dogs OFF LEASH in all areas rather than limiting off leash behaviour to the fenced dog off leash area. While walking on paths mainly in the Western Foreshore (and other areas) I have been rushed at, surrounded and circled by large dogs off leash. This is uncomfortable for me and a dog averse walking companion. When I have politely reminded dog owners of the off leash fenced area and the need to leash/control their dogs, I am ignored or incorrectly advised that the (Western foreshore area for example) is a "Dog Park" and as such the dogs are allowed free reign. I seek better signage/enforcement and compliance of dog owners for my safety and enjoyment of the Reef walks.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
5648	Support	The signs and notices about rules at parks and beaches need to be clearer. They are confusing. And then they need to be enforced. Certainly they are not currently enforced. I live right by one beach and the rules are constantly flouted by large numbers of people.
5804	Do not support	It is clear, this is a huge waste of tax payers money. Absolutely pointless.
6025	Do not support	Other than the obvious impacts on the health of dogs and their owners (!) these are big changes that do not meet the criteria of the Dog Policy 2019. Much of what has been suggested as 'findings' is merely a statement of what is happening already, and in many cases completely wrong interpretation of council own survey. Most of what has been cited and 'structural change' and 'significant risk' are in fact minor structural change, if any, or low-impact issues (by councils' own findings). The way the policy is meant to work is that the Council and Dog Management are supposed to manage the low-impact issues from irresponsible dog owners through better education and direct intervention, not massive changes to access. The policy is NOT designed to enable mass changes to dog access without significant reasons and due consideration to alternatives and/ or providing other places – neither of which are present in the proposal. In short, these are changes that could and should be managed with a few good signs and better management of irresponsible dog owners, not sweeping dog access changes for the vast majority of responsible dog owners! Keep the status quo. Leave it as it is.
6749	Support	As long as there is clearly a purpose that includes dogs and their wellbeing. Restricting and prohibiting is not the answer there needs to be a balance and animal rights as well as their needs should be met also
AOTEA/GREAT BARRIER LOCAL BOARD		
2952	Support	Most dog owners I encounter seem to think they are the ones that decide what the rules are for the control of their animals.
DEVONPORT-TAKAPUNA LOCAL BOARD		
181	Support	Believe more can be done to make clear the bylaws and rules. Signage has improved, but can be clearer. Enforcement could be more rigorous but realise resources are limited for this role.
598	Support	It is difficult at times to know whether the website is the place of correct information as not all dog-related signage correlates. Clarifying signage and aligning it with the website would very much assist dog-owners in understanding things like on-beach/off-beach rules; also by-laws about dogs in areas like Devonport village and surrounds
2107	I don't know	You haven't clearly stated what you want to change, so how can we give feedback? You haven't said what you want to write so how can we comment on it?
2322	Do not support	Don't waste money unnecessarily a clear sign is enough.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
2536	Support	Rules should be clear and big signage. Dogs should be on a lead on beaches — particularly dangerous when owners throw balls and large dogs charge off after it.
2845	Do not support	The proposed changes are very limited in scope. The balance remains focussed in favour of the dog owners lobby groups. Very unbalanced in both scope and depth. It will not address the majority of issues surrounding dog ownership.
2886	Do not support	Doesn't go far enough to protect nature.
3149	Support	Simplify signage, make it larger and enforce it.
3762	Support	Making things more easy to read and understand is always good
3919	Support	In Devonport the current laws are ignored by dog owners. It is time the rest of us were safe from all the free roaming dogs in the area.
4260	Support	Clarifying signage and information found on internet for all dog related things (especially beach on/off times) will be very helpful. Currently a shambles
4375	Support	Rules should be clear and common across Auckland, clear definition of areas and restrictions
4569	Do not support	This time I am submitting on your Dog Management Bylaw. I find the whole situation confusing, starting with putting Maori names first. Didn't the new Govt state you can't do this? I object to dogs in a vehicle being banned from public areas. Insane! *! I object to not being allowed to own more than 2 dogs. How many cats are people allowed to own?
5144	Support	Large and visible signage at all beaches, parks etc must be maintained and put in obvious places.
5215	Support	In North Head and Mount Victoria, as well as some of the fields, even though there are signs that leash is needed, no one seems to follow the rules. Explaining things clearly may help people to follow rules.
5346	Support	Dog laws need to be enforced. Presently Council does not enforce them at all. Dogs are constantly off leash where they shouldn't be and on beaches when they shouldn't be.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
6725	Support	In Anne St Devonport, with mainly narrow pavements for pedestrians many dog walkers fail to pick up their dog's faeces. One dog has been using my lawn as a toilet for months and I have been picking it up almost daily and taking it to the waterfront council bins. within the past 2 weeks I observed it happening and sprinted downstairs to catch the owner. The owner denied that it would be her dog but I was able to state that I had observed it happening and went to find a paper towel in my pocket to prove the freshness of the item. That was enough for the owner to accept that it was her dog but she appeared to be unwilling to pick it up until I insisted when she obliged. then she went away in her freedom camper for 2 - 3 days but before leaving let her dog poo on my lawn as usual. I left the faecal matter and wrote her a note as politely as possible, stating that I expected her to remove the faeces by 12 md tomorrow, and that her dog should not be on my lawn and enclosed a copy of the council's one page rules for dog owners, highlighting the item re cleaning up after your dog. The dog owner phoned to tell me that she thought that it was rude to send her a note(in a sealed envelope) and she came to my front door to see me. I apologised if the note upset her and we parted amicably. Glad I didn't enclose the dog faeces with the note. I am delighted that in the days since I have found no dog poo on my lawn!!! We are in a short street but when I walk to the supermarket I usually pick up 4 - 5 lots of dog poo on my side of the street. Have also had another episode with an offender leaving dog poo- I chased him and he said he just had to go home first but after 2 hours I had to pick it up myself.
FRANKLIN LOCAL BOARD		
350	Support	It really depends on how many things you are planning on slipping into it that owners aren't aware of fully. There needs to be full transparency
679	Support	The policy should be clear and enforcement should be strict. Pets should be registered. If unregistered/expired registration animals are found to be in possession of someone, the pets should be taken to the pound for a set period of time while the pet owner completes the formalities of registering/renewing registration. If they are unable to then they should not be entrusted with taking care of the pet animal
711	Support	There are some with very unclear signage. Also under control does not mean leash and vice versa
799	I don't know	I want the rules to change for dog licence prices. Why should I pay the same for a chihuahua as someone pays for a pit bull? It's ridiculous
958	Support	I believe every owner should obtain a pet license, or Dog owner license, like the responsible owner license. Where owners are tested to see how they would deal with animals, like cats and dogs In all scenarios. Education n animal welfare, should be compulsory. Limit to 3 Dogs per house at one time. Cats should be just as important as dogs.
1475	Support	People need signs, and need a sign to be a reason or an excuse. Signs are important for the public and they must be clear.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
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
1922	Do not support	Tbh change whatever policy ya want but if there's no one policing it out there it won't work...people don't care and will let there dogs off anywhere they want to
2242	Do not support	Yet more draconian measures against dog owners. We are high earners with no kids with a 7kg westipoo we pay a huge amount of taxes and use next to no services. You're punishing us yet again.
2532	Support	Clarity would be good. However, my biggest request is for more designated areas to take our dog off lead. Pukekohe needs a paddock / grassed area that is fenced into 2 or 3 areas so that small and large dogs can exercise separately. There are many of these areas throughout the rest of NZ but not in Pukekohe. Paerata has one designated area but there are always big dogs exercising in there. Plus it is quite a drive from Pukekohe.
2739	Do not support	This is too vague. Restructure in what way? I can't comment on whether or not I support this when I don't in what way it will be restructured. Would this restructure mean changing any of the rules etc.
3376	Support	Please be sure things are sign-posted AND enforced. In Beachlands/Maraetai rules are constantly and flagrantly ignored. From the dogs on the beaches all of the time, to the hundreds of piles of dog poo, to dogs off lead on Te Puru - it's actually stressful to go out with our dog on his lead or taking a walk with my kids and constantly saying "watch out for the poo!" Or "let's walk down here and give that dog some space". What is the point of rules when they aren't enforced? Also, there are almost no signs on Maraetai beach with the dog rules.
3553	Support	General comments & feedback from responsible owners can be useful to forming policy.
3923	Do not support	From what i have read it does not appear to be a simplification...rather the whole dog bylaws are becoming more complicated and definitely less dog friendly
3985	Support	Negative experienced I have witnessed, when I have question owners they claim not to be aware or understand the rules.
4342	Support	Update the structure is fine without changes to overall policy
4428	Do not support	Most responsible dog owners take the trouble to refer to Council policy and rules. It is the irresponsible dog owners that ignore them and cause problems for everyone. By restructuring the Policy it won't make any difference to those already not adhering to the rules.
4679	I don't know	Very difficult to provide feedback on an aspiration, the wording us purposfully saying nothing at all
4690	Support	Dog owners need to be required to pick up their dog poo.
4726	Do not support	Dog owners pay rates and dog registration there are many dog owners and we want to able to enjoy taking our dogs to parks and beaches we are voters!!

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
4847	Support	There needs to be a way of ensuring people follow the rules. I'm sick of seeing untrained, boisterous dogs off leash in, for example, Roseville Reserve, Pukekohe and around children's playgrounds. I like dogs, but I don't want them running up to me and/or jumping on me or any children I'm supervising at the playground.
5034	Support	Clear and concise rules that are easy to enforce when necessary. Clear signage of the rules in the area is most important.
5038	Support	You need officers in the ground reinforcing these policies and rules, giving out fines. Too many dog owners are doing what they please and there is no one enforcing these rules. When you ask them to abide by the rules they get aggressive.
5116	Support	I think it is important as Auckland is experiencing a real issue with the control of dogs
5161	Support	Last week I rescued a dog off a main road which was in danger of DEATH. Council contact had the address of owner but could not release to me because of PRIVACY policy. Their advice was to set it free and rely on dog control to pickup up. That dog would have been dead in 5 minutes. I, as a rate payer was VERY IRATE at this. I took it home, over 20kms away, took it to my vet, they micro chipped it and called the owner. Dog was picked up in 30 minutes. WHY AM I PAYING RATES FOR A COUNCIL SERVICE THAT DEFINATELY DOES NOT WORK?!!!
5574	Support	I'd like to see a licence regime with "teeth", and a maximum of 3 dog off leash.
5906	I don't know	This question is vague - are you referring to all the changes proposed? I agree to make the policy clearer, and I think rules around menacing dogs (keeping them contained, trained and neutered) need to ACTUALLY be reinforced. But I disagree to banning dogs from areas that responsible dog owners take their dogs. I want more control over menacing breeds, and banning of pit bulls and pit bull crosses (as even though pit bulls are a banned breed, this obviously is not reinforced as they are everywhere in South Auckland). I only see good dogs (good breeds too: corgis, golden retrievers, spaniels) at Botanic gardens or on bush walks. The menacing breeds that are causing issues are not the ones getting taken to these places; they are the ones with owners who let them wander the streets and kill neighbours cats as exercise. They are guard dogs; not pets. The rules to prevent dogs from beaches, bush walks, reserves and gardens seek only to punish good dog owners.
6073	Do not support	Clevedon Showgrounds - its off leash currently and has a great local community of dog lovers who utilise it
6096	Support	I think we should increase the penalty for unfollowing the rules people
6200	Support	There should be more clear reminders ta the dog walkers must clean up after their dogs. The format of the reminder should be prominent - do not make our public spaces dirty - for other people and other dogs.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
6434	Support	I have dog walkers walk past my house multiple times a day who are illegally walking their dog off leash on a public road and footpath. When I speak to them about breaching that law it's responded with either it's not illegal or I will do what I like. More signs and information need to be pushed in front of dog owners which also supports a lot of new immigrants to the community who may be not aware that people are breaking the law but this complacent behaviour is an issue and accident waiting to happen.
HENDERSON-MASSEY LOCAL BOARD		
239	Support	Can't search by area whether there are dog off leash parks nearby (e.g. where's a dog off leash area near Albany mall so husband can exercise dog while I shop in the mall).
565	Support	You need to make sure that these and all the rules are produced in more than just English. Manderin is also important.
832	Do not support	Dogs are an important part of the owners lives and the council should just leave dog access alone. There are already multiple places where dogs are not allowed or must be on a lead .
940	Do not support	Change for change sake . You will want to spend thousands upon thousands , to change a name , give it a heredity twist - not needed . If anything dog laws need to be looked at , as to the registration process that we pay for an no system is linked . Its not linked into lost dogs or the Vet system - if anything those are the changes that should be looked into
950	Do not support	You are just restricting access for dogs and minimising dogs walking and being able to be outside. This will only reinforce as behaviour from dogs by limiting necessary walking and leisure .
988	Do not support	There needs to be full education, going to the the general public does not seem right, talking to professionals, learning, understanding. Does change need to happen yes, but not without full consultation with the people doing the doing first. Licencing pack walkers, regular training to update licence. Enforcement of the licencing same as what Wellington has done. Personally both my dogs are pack walked by some of the best in the business, these are dogs I adopted from Council dog pound, both dogs had massive issues, I have spent hundreds on training, to find one of the best things for them both has been being with their pack out at the beach and forest running like they are breed to do. They are both amazing dogs now because I found their balance, peace and happiness, I would hate that to be taken away, and they are back to being frustrated Monday to Friday while I am trying to make a living and give them their best lives.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
1666	Do not support	Currently there are very few beaches or parks that allow dog access and if you are too stupid to adhere to the current times that dogs are allowed on parks and on beaches then you are just a muppet. Lets not legislate to the lowest current denominator. Different rules should apply to different areas, dependant on individual situations. A remote beach, with hardly any visitors should loosen the restrictions, if there is a nesting area, rather than closing it off, have leash restrictions rather than blocking the whole area off from any canine activity. Save Kakamatua as an off lead dog beach, I frequent there often and have yet to see any issues there at all. However, I get a bit irritated with people bringing small children to that beach without dogs, its really just a matter of time and then it will be ruined for everyone. Again, one size does fit all approach is archaic and will just encourage the irresponsible to defy the rules. Without any policing, the whole thing becomes pointless anyway. Work with your community ie: Dog owners, not some dog hating politician with an agenda. How about sending this survey to all registered dog owners? Rather than any old muppet with an opinion?
1708	Do not support	There are few places for dogs to be off leash as it is now
1751	Support	Please give us some space for our dogs to enjoy their time with neighbourhood dogs.. we don't have vehicles to take them to far away beaches and parks
2920	Support	I support the revamp of dog laws keeping in mind the lack of discipline the dog owners currently have I am opposed to owners taking their dogs off the leash in public open areas.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A 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
3777	Support	please do something for loose dogs, my neighbour keep the dog loose for poo by itself, and dog comes back after doing its job, if we complain council dont react swiftly and dog go back to its property
3786	Support	I often look at the council website looking for places i can take my dog and at what time of the year. Try it, it's impossible to find the information.
4381	Do not support	Clarity in policy is important. Similarly clarity for all members of the community is helpful. My response here does not suggest the details of the policy are things that I'm in agreement with.
4924	Do not support	The restructure continues to be too complex with a variety of rules around different parts of Auckland. The search engines for council are way worse than they used to be years ago for owners wanting to know the rules even if they wanted to follow them. For most people they give up as it is too difficult. Too many ignore the rules and there appears to be poor policing, poor reinforcement, and less gain for those that make the effort.
5401	Support	As long as the they talk with responsible dog owners and these decisions aren't made by appointed key board typers that haven't ever owned a dog..

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
5511	Do not support	Leave it as is it is logical and not over thought for people
5637	Do not support	Responsible owners who follow the rules and pay their annual council dog tags should not be penalised while the real issue, stray and neglected dogs—goes unaddressed.
5817	Support	It is good that people can understand the bylaws easily
6681	Support	If the proposed change and wording makes it clearer then I support that.
HIBISCUS AND BAYS LOCAL BOARD		
9	Do not support	No dogs should be allowed off leash in public areas due to the risks the animals have. Animal behaviour is completely unpredictable and the behaviour of an animal in all situations, no matter how well trained can be predicted or completely controlled.
319	Do not support	Typically clarification is code for making basic rules that apply everywhere, rather than applying specific rules for the location.
351	Do not support	You should be targeting people who do not abet the rules with fines And restrictions not those who are responsible dog owners. There is already limited areas to take dogs in Auckland this will make it even more limited. Plus the people who break the rules don't care about " rules " and will continue to disobey them even if they change . so you are just creating it harder for responsible dog owners .
566	Support	Some dog owners seem completely unaware of their obligations to ensure their behaviour and their dogs behaviour does not negatively impact others. There should be heightened awareness of their responsibilities and enforcement of the rules / a clear pathway for breeches to be reported.
579	Support	The more clear information available the better. It is in everybody's interests to know that they feel safe in their chosen environment based on the published rules.
584	Support	As with all bylaws, education and enforcement is key. Enforcement is difficult so increased signage at all public places where dog access is allowed or not can assist public to point out to offenders what is expected. Particularly parks and beaches where dog owners seem oblivious to any restrictions.
601	Do not support	People don't follow the rules, we need enforcement not more rules

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
607	Support	I would like to see it made clear that dog owners are rate payers too, and owning a dog is a valid and common recreational activity. 1). I would like MORE areas to be dog accessible.(not restricting dogs from so many areas). 2). I would like more areas added by making them ON-LEASH areas, so that owners with dogs can better coexist with and share areas with people and wildlife, rather than restrict dogs entirely, and therefore have more equal access to recreational areas including regional parks, which they currently don't have. 3). I would like more fenced off-leash recreational areas for dogs that are split into designated areas according to size e.g., have a small dog separate fenced area from a medium and large dog exercise area. Plimmerton reserve in Wellington is a good example of this. 4). Let dog owners use Auckland regional park areas with dogs on leash by enforcing hefty fines of \$400 if someone exercises their dog in those areas off-leash. At the moment dog-ownership is discriminated against as a legitimate recreational activity because ratepayers aren't getting facilities and adequate or equal access to recreational space that are meant to be for all New Zealanders. Many recreational spaces, including most of the regional parks, are denied access to dog owners even if their pet is on leash. It is unfair use of ratepayers' money to not recognise and support this activity as a recreational activity to be encouraged like any other healthy and physical exercise/hobby.
623	Support	Each person can only bring two dogs, and they must be on a leash at all times. Clearly defined areas with signage
706	Support	It should be more stressed that people rather than dogs will take priority.
771	Support	Only after discussion with stakeholders and those experienced in the industry
776	Support	Public need to understand the risks of multi-dog handling and, where appropriate, have opportunity to receive the skills needed to handle 'small packs' effectively. Without this, more and more 'dog-walking' services will arise - often by school-age young adults looking for additional income. Such services should be licenced and insured.
857	I don't know	How would it be restructured
1150	Support	It is all good and well to clarify rules but there is little to no enforcement of these rules by the council. An example is at Orewa beach where the dogs must be off the beach by 10am -5pm. This is 100% not adhered to by many owners and when you ring the council they ask you to get the dog registration number and tell them. However, in today's society when I have tried I have been verbally assaulted and physically threatened for doing this. Enforcement is key to adherence.
1153	Do not support	The council doesn't even enforce the rules already.
1308	Support	dog rules are often confusing so clarifying points would be helpful, as well as council goals as currently it seems like council just wants to diminish spaces for dogs

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
1378	Do not support	I believe dog should be permitted on footpaths provided they are under control - not necessarily on leash. How else can you teach them to stay off the road if they somehow escape or get lost... The council takes no responsibility for verges and berms so how can you ban animals from them...
1537	Support	So I can understand what I think I understand, is what I understand about the policies
1676	Support	I am concerned at the growing number of Dogs off lead.
2084	Do not support	Because the rule change will generally be in the human's favour - not the dog's favour! The places where the dogs can go is getting smaller and smaller. More and more houses are going in and there are fewer places to walk the dogs and now you are potentially tightening the rules further. Beaches and parks are for humans and dogs alike!
2290	I don't know	It depends on the changes made
2521	Support	It will be better and appreciated if the policy can include a map showing the areas with different restrictions.
2798	Support	Support better signage and making the rules more clear, publicized. Would be great to get a copy of the rules / link to rules each year when renewing dog registration.
2820	Support	The wording appears confusing at the best of times.
2857	Support	If the rules are working for everybody why change. If it aint broke, dont fix it.!!
3235	Support	I think there should be restriction on where dogs can be exercised
3337	Do not support	I support laws against dangerous or menacing dogs. I do not support any change to access to beaches regarding endangered birds nesting. We have 2-4 dotterils on beaches near us and the people who take care of them are bullying and intimidating people who pay to live in the area and enjoy walking the beaches with their dogs. All are under control off leash and this is monitored by other dog walkers and people who walk the beach for leisure. To have access restricted in any way for 2 birds who mother poorly (their chicks don't survive due to their poor skills).is an affront to every other rate paying person. We are a country of dog lovers and those who don't love dogs are in the minority and should not dictate the rules overall to others.
3439	Do not support	The proposed changes, whilst a step in the right direction, need more focus on the impact of dogs on the natural environment, not just on the general public. The public were/ still are banned from areas affected by kauri die back, surely dogs should be banned from all kauri forests. The Proposal identifies specific areas for dog control...This should be extended to have dogs on a lead and under control in all natural forest, riparian, and estuarine areas. Breaches of dog walking rules need to enforcing by instant fines, with increased monitoring and extension of those with authority to issue instant fines.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
3446	Support	The Public need to be well informed & heed the rules that all dogs in all public areas must be leashed at all times & Council needs to have signs & issue infringement notices. Designated fenced Dog Parks need to be advertised & promoted for those wanting their dogs off leashes so they're not a public nuisance
3824	Support	Currently it can be very unclear as to dog access rules especially if you are in an area you are not familiar with.
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. Since the information is not clearly presented, I am against it.
3988	Support	I walk my 3 on leash at Hobsonville Point/ Catalina Bay early morning 6 days a week. They're easy boys. I don't like encountering off lead dogs whose owners think they don't choose to walk their dog/dogs on lead. We have to wait for them to grab their dog/dogs & pull them to the side. Or stop & wait to see if their dog actually has an owner as dog appears around a corner by itself, or is it a wandering dog stopped, staring at us. There are signs stating all dogs must be on lead. There is an off leash area & another being erected. I usually point this out to errant owners. Some choose to ignore me others argue 'their dogs are well behaved' or 'friendly' or just don't want to'.
3991	Support	FINES should be shown on notices and REINFORCED.
4082	Support	As a current regional Park, and beach user and dog owner. I think there should be a blanket rule. No dogs in regional parks. Main public beaches Dog on leash at all times. There are too many irresponsible dog owners, now days. Regularly see dogs rushing kids, elderly, older dogs, toileting on public seats places children play and sit. Faeces not picked up. Need more dog off lead areas.
4354	Support	I was bitten by a medium size petagree, dog Las year off of leash
4435	Support	Clear communication is obviously needed. particularly on how to report rule breakers and what the penalties are for rule breaking. In several languages.
4621	Support	Compliance is MUCH MORE likely to occur if the policy changes and new rules are stated explicitly, clearly & concisely.
5015	Support	Dog owners on the whole are law-abiding, but they must be given good clear data and information that is not contradictory
5221	Support	I support focussed goals with consequences but these policies need to be enforced. Dogs off leash but not under control is a regular occurrence on beaches. Safety of others is compromised.
5675	I don't know	Because decisions need to be clear and fair.
6081	Support	The policy should not necessarily be a deficit policy whereby all dog owners are penalised by a few who do not pick up after their dogs or do not control their dogs.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
6396	Support	By all means remove duplications and make it clearer to read. Don't put limitations on dogs walking the beach unless you're putting limitations on how many small children use the beach as they can be very disruptive and dangerous to birds
6494	Do not support	Council should always be transparent yet it continues to be anything but. The question itself is ambivalent. Why do you not already clearly show your goals. Why is it always so difficult to get an answer from Council. This submission process itself, why is the information on the proposed changes so difficult to find. So to your above question: Restructure the policy to more clearly show its goal, focus areas, council actions, and rules, this entire process from the outset is anything but clear. YOU make it so difficult as a way to deter people from putting through an application. In short, you should already be making policy clearer and therefore able to communicate your goals more efficiently. Dog owners are passionate people and like last time when the council tried to cut our dog allocation times, they were met with much pushback from us dog lovers.
HOWICK LOCAL BOARD		
407	Support	Ban pitbull type dogs
521	I don't know	This statement is very general and there is too much room for surreptitious changing of regulations within it.
541	Do not support	I only partly support this. Sounds like a large portion could be a waste of rate-payers money. Keep it simple!
1593	Support	It is a great idea to clarify expectations around rules and bylaws but I would like to see more enforcement of these rules. In a neighbouring bush walk near my home, almost every second dog that I come across is off lead and there is signage at both ends of the walk, clearly stating dogs must be on-lead. This not only causes my dog to get stressed by being approached by dogs unexpectedly, but also other walkers who are not comfortable around dogs. My previous dog was bitten by another dog on this bush walk, and the owner was not held accountable at all. I have never seen a dog ranger on this walk in the 15 years that I have been using it.
2216	I don't know	Rules do need to be more clear and better signposted for dog and non dog owners to be aware
2218	Support	Clarity is always good for everyone. It's not the clarity that most people have a problem with it's what is being clarified and what rules are changing. This part speaks mostly to the enjoyment of all people and points at enjoyment of people and dogs but doesn't actually serve the people with dogs it seems the people with dogs are the ones who are least observed. But in terms of clarifying, yes be clear about the policies.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
2347	Support	Council needs a clear policy to enforce the bye laws they set. My, park has bye laws of no dogs on marked sports fields and only on leash on other areas. I have made representations that these bye laws are consistently broken on a daily basis. A group meets daily on workday evenings and run their dogs off leash on th3 marked sports fields. Individuals do the same at other times of the day most often before and after work. However nothing is effectively done to enforce these bye laws. No point in having rules if you don't enforce them.
2692	Do not support	The focus areas are completely misguided and penalises responsible dog owners, rather than focussing on the issue of irresponsible dog owners. No issues with the proposal to provide more clarity- just with content.
3113	Do not support	I do not support the policy changes on dogs needing to be on leash at all times, and minimising the amount of areas they can be off leash. There are already so few places we can enjoy taking dogs outdoors with us in Auckland, especially areas they can be off leash. It is extremely unfair to those who have very well behaved and disciplined dogs to be stripped of these of these options. With Auckland already becoming more congested and houses having smaller and smaller backyards, we need space where our dogs are allowed to be able to properly stretch their legs and enjoy some freedom and happiness being outdoors. It is for our dogs' health and wellbeing that they can have room to run and have dog meets at the park and play. Please reconsider the rules for dogs being off leash. Again, there are already so few dog friendly places in Auckland. I understand we have precious wildlife to protect, but with better signage, education and employing staff to attend to the parks and monitor dog walkers would be of better use. Everyday, I wish I could take my dog everywhere with me, but Auckland is so limited and strict already on the dog rules, I can't. In Europe, dogs are allowed to go everywhere with their owners - they're allowed to be inside restaurants, cafes, shops and be off leash in so many areas outdoors as well. We need to advance towards that instead of caging our dogs in and not allowing them to have some freedom. Please work on educating dog owners instead - use social media to make educational videos, YouTube, TV ads etc. and perhaps to have park staff, and better signage. There will be a lot of unhappy dog owners if these new policy rules were enforced.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
3987	Support	For the love of god, make people have a permit or licence to own dogs. I have 2 dogs, and I'm all in favour of stricter rules of dog ownership. The amount of free roaming pits we see in this city is insane. And it's always the same type of characters who own these dogs. The ones who need a "scarier" dog for them to compensate for their own insecurities. And every dog should be chipped by law and attached to that said license or permit
4225	Support	I always support easily read Policies so they can be well understood by all, where there is no cause for misinterpretation. No jargon just plain clearly understood rules/policy.
5235	I don't know	The proposed changes are well and good, however dog owners and dog walkers are currently a law unto themselves. For example, today while walking a man had the leash attached around his waist and his two big golden retrievers were on a long leash taking up the whole of the footpath, another man had his large Alsatian off leash and only as I showed visible disapproval did he attach the dog's collar and guide it, a 3rd man allowed his Alsatian to continue past me off leash. All were unconcerned about sharing the footpath or even considering me a walker. I provide companionship, emotional support and help foster social connections in the community and my needs were the least considered or respected. The proposed changes look good and provide some comfort to me as I read them but how will changes be administered and enforced? As a human being I feel like I am in the minority.
6328	Support	Clarification is essential and will be welcomed by responsible dog owners. We want to retain the few areas that are available to walk and exercise our dogs. Particularly in the hot summer months.
6555	Support	While the current 'policy language' is lacking in explanation, too vague, old fashion, confusing and/or assertive - the proposals also need edits. There appears to have too much filler and 'friendliness' where policy needs to be simplified, modern, direct language is required, Edits, consistency
KAIPĀTIKI LOCAL BOARD		
31	Support	Solid rules and fines for not picking up after your dog should exist. The problem is getting much worse and it reflects poorly on dog owners...however most dog owners do the right thing
186	Support	Strongly disagree that ownership of a dog deemed dangerous is allowed at all.
238	Support	Only to say that clarity is always good. Rules should be expressed in simple language, short sentences etc. Illustrations often help.
289	Support	I strongly believe that there should be dog exercise areas set aside or specific beaches that are dog walking and exercise beaches. All other beaches should be dog free. This way compliance is far easier to manage. I lived in Perth for many years and this was how it was managed there. Having different times etc for dog access and on lead/off lead and in control are just an expensive compliance cost for council

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
359	Do not support	I have read and re-read the proposed changes in our area (Kaipatiki) and they are still a bit vague. More to the point, focusing on changing the rules alone will make no difference to the substantial issues - dangerous and/or roaming dogs. inconsiderate owners, insufficient council staff to deal with dog-related complaints. Also, people who dislike or are afraid of dogs often don't know how to interact safely with dogs e.g. waving arms/yelling and some public education is needed rather than just removing dogs from public places.
395	Support	I think that the current dog spaces that are off leash areas 24/7 in and around the area of the northshore should be made for only dog owners and there dogs. Family's should be restricted from bringing small children or staying for recreational purposes in these areas.
572	I don't know	How can I comment not knowing what it is you are actually proposing? Current rules are not necessarily unclear
		Additional clarity is always welcome, as long as it is not disproportionately high in effort for the benefits.
1199	Support	Because I want to have an opportunity to give feedback as I think again bad dog owners make it difficult for good dog owners and it's the bad dog owners that need to be targeted.
1449	I don't know	The number of dogs being walked and the clarification of menacing dogs seem to be explained well. However, the information you provide on local board dog-walking rules does not show previous rules compared to the changes you have made. Hence, it is difficult to determine what has changed.
1523	I don't know	If walkers are trained and qualified why can't they get on with their careers. Perhaps they could sign write their cars and wear a badge or tshirt to show they have qualifications to handle larger dog packs. I do not think the limited experience and responsibility of some should affect the wider industry.
1602	Support	there are more dogs as well as more people in Auckland now, so I guess some changes are due to accommodate this.
1654	Do not support	We are already restricted to any decent beaches where we can take dogs and children at the same time. We should be looking at Europe to USA States to see how there dog laws work.
1679	Do not support	this doesnt allow for locals to enjoy their dogs in local parks vs major recreation areas- blanket rules never work
2779	Support	Clarity should be part of the council communication to the people they serve.
4430	I don't know	There are FAR too many different rules - requiring people to check before they head out with their dogs to an area they dont usually frequent !! No wonder there's confusion and non compliance !!
4523	Support	When simplifying, do not change the rules but make them easy and clear to understand. Auckland is not a one rule fits all,, this will just lead to the rules being changes yet again
5276	Support	The council should be concentrating on funding animal management and changing the laws to make it easier to uplift neglected or roaming dogs and to prosecute irresponsible dog owners. This would go a long way towards improving the current issues around dogs in Auckland and NZ

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
5338	Support	The council in general does not focus enough on the needs it readers when publishing things so this is welcome but long over due and there's a huge way to go.
5363	Support	Dogs are out of control especially menacing dogs attacking children and adults... menacing breeds should be banned... furthermore, the majority of dog owners appear to be irresponsible insofar as picking up dog ***** is concerned
5455	Do not support	It is not broke you do not need to fix anything
5607	Do not support	There is no compelling evidence that this is necessary.
6092	Do not support	While clarity is important, restructuring should not result in oversimplification or removal of details that impact responsible dog ownership. It's essential that the new structure remains comprehensive and accessible for all dog owners to understand their responsibilities.
6290	Support	Yes! I've tried to look up regulations before to ensure I knew where & when I could legally walk my friend's dog, & the rules were very confusing because they were not easy to find or understand.
6316	Do not support	Making more specific rules makes it much harder to follow
MĀNGERE-ŌTĀHUHU LOCAL BOARD		
590	I don't know	I've got no idea what this means. For genuine consultation you need to clarify what you are talking about.
766	Support	I feel that having a policy and by law that is easily understood means us as the community have clear indicators of what's allowed, and what's not.
4270	Support	sorry like all policy it is not easy to find where it impacts on me the community person, dog owner and local place based being. Yes it is a great idea to clarify, simplify etc but most people dont have time to find the small print and cross relate with unitary plan or whatever. So it will get ignored until someones 'caught' Also it does no address core issues around public safety and animal wellbeing ... I assume the real purpose of so many words and rules.
5680	Support	Needs to be more clearer. Access points/carpark should have obvious signage and rules. This needs to be shown on websites/online too as usually this is where we go to find dog friendly walks/areas.
6024	Do not support	Better advertising of the rules is required. Not a change.
6127	Do not support	We are responsible dog owners whose doge need daily exercise, without leads or banning from public parks. I urge the Council to come down hard and ban all large aggressive dogs who are from irresponsible owners who are not community focused.
6685	Do not support	The policy that you need to be making is to make a law for people adopting dogs/owning dogs are responsible and if not, they could be fined and locked up. This is also suitable for people who abused dogs.
MANUREWA LOCAL BOARD		

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
215	Support	make rules & wording more clearer, in many language as possible with simple picture/sign included so that people can understand. I recomend add penalty fine below it too so people can be more considered while occupying public space with their dogs
1223	Support	What changes will be made and how can Aucklanders see them?
1342	Do not support	It does not make sense to ask Joe public to comment on limiting the amount of dogs in PACK WALKS for the dogs and their PROFESSIONAL dog walkers. We know that he is being cared for and controlled in his pack, which can sometimes be up to 14 dogs. Joe public has no clue how beneficial this service is to all the whānau and their dogs that use it.
1788	Do not support	This policy limits dog owners from enjoying public spaces unfairly. A responsible dog owner would know to keep their dog contained and safe around others. Changing the rules means people have to adjust the routines already established in those listed areas. Expecting a dog owner to responsibly exercise their dog, but taking away access to this is counterintuitive.
2011	Support	~~Simplifying and clarifying the policy will make it more accessible and easier for~~ dog owners, the public, and enforcement officers to understand and follow. However, the effectiveness of this restructuring depends on ensuring that the revised policy addresses critical issues like owner accountability, enforcement, and public education. Key Benefits of Restructuring Improved Accessibility: Clearer organization will help dog owners understand their responsibilities, reducing instances of unintentional non-compliance. Simplified language and layout can encourage more community engagement with the policy. Enhanced Focus on Key Issues: A restructured policy can better highlight priority areas like roaming dogs, responsible ownership, and containment. Transparency in Council Actions: Outlining council responsibilities and enforcement mechanisms will provide the public with confidence in the policy's implementation. Suggestions for Restructuring To maximize the effectiveness of this change, the following elements should be emphasized: Goals and Objectives: Clearly articulate the primary goal of dog management, such as reducing roaming

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
2295	Support	You guys cannot even enforce the rules you have at present. I'm so confused how nz is the only country where officers cannot arrest owners for bad behaviour and sieze dogs on the first instance. Roaming dogs especially in south Auckland is absolutely disgraceful. It's beyond third world.
2981	Support	Please include maps when explaining what areas are of-leash/on-leash/no dogs allowed. Current descriptions using words are impossible to understand.
3449	Support	A restructure for sure but it needs to reflect the needs of responsible dog owners who utilise the facalities and not the individuals who have decided they do not want dogs in the area after years of dogs being allowed to.
4063	Support	More education is needed to promote cultural shift so that owners actually control dogs in public areas including beaches. I hate seeing dogs chase birds resting by the Shoreline. I don't like seeing dogs running up to strangers on the beach. I would prefer all dogs be on a leash, even a long one on the beach.
4166	Do not support	Stop wasting taxpayers money on such trivial matters
4792	Support	I noticed in your subscribed email from my Auckland, and also this review that you do not mention guide dogs, and where & when they are allowed to go. I am sick of telling AT Metro bus drivers that guide dogs DO NOT NEED TO WEAR MUZZLES. Can you please ensure that all Auckland bus drivers are made aware of this. My friend gets upset that I always get frustrated & having to hold up other passengers so my friend & I can use your public transport.
4843	Support	Council should give more emphasis to safety and conduct more random checks to proactively identify wondering dogs and restrain/destroy them. Another area that council must improve is by applying higher fines to dog owners who are in breach of dog owner rules/regulations. E.g. changing the rules for people who want to have a dangerous/menacing dog. Such people must prove first that they can handle dogs like this (e.g. complete a special practical training course) before they are allowed to become an owner of a dangerous dog.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
5620	Support	The Beautification Trust fully supports the proposal to restructure the Dog Management Policy to more clearly outline its goals, focus areas, council actions, and rules. A well-structured and easily understood policy is essential for ensuring compliance, supporting enforcement efforts, and protecting both people and the environment. Currently, vague or unclear rules have contributed to widespread non-compliance, as seen in the 826 bylaw breaches, 12,737 complaints of roaming dogs, and 200 reports of dogs in regional parks. Without clear structure and enforcement mechanisms, these issues will continue to negatively impact public safety, shared spaces, and sensitive ecosystems. By improving the policy's structure, Auckland Council will provide much-needed clarity for dog owners, enforcement officers, and the wider community. A stronger policy will also help ensure effective protection of areas like the Puhinui Stream, where ongoing dog activity has caused erosion and ecosystem damage despite existing rules prohibiting access. We encourage Auckland Council to prioritise plain language, clear signage, and strong enforcement mechanisms as part of this restructuring, ensuring that all Aucklanders understand their responsibilities and the consequences of non-compliance.
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.
6319	Support	There needs to be far stricter rules on dog management

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
MAUNGAKIEKIE-TĀMAKI LOCAL BOARD		
639	Do not support	More rubbish rules that won't change any of the actual problems.
840	Support	many people are still confused, or acting confused when it comes to dogs on leash laws and bylaws. I see dogs off leash on roads with or without owners everywhere in Auckland, and they are breaking the law like that every day. many don't know it is illegal, and many don't care because the law is not enforced. People from certain ethnicities, some migrants and many from Housing NZ won't desex their pets, dogs or cats. Either for personal false beliefs, cultural differences or financial reasons. Even when rescues and the SPCA offer them FREE desexing, they still breed their dogs and cats. These actions have resulted in an explosion of unwanted, abused and dumped cats and dogs in such areas where these people cluster. In many of such areas it has well gotten out of hand. Dog breeds such as staffordshire and pitbull mixes are breeding and roaming freely in such areas, and cause a lot of grief for others. The owners and backyard breeders are often bullying and intimidating the others in the neighbourhood. Housing NZ tenants of this nature hide the dogs and cats from the managers, and many managers don't care either. Housing NZ is ignoring the calls for better management of these tenants.
909	Do not support	Don't change the by laws at places where it's already established. The botanical gardens have it noted that off leash is down the back and on lead front top of walk down. Your ruining it for the ones who obey the rules.
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.
993	Support	Our friend had her dog mauled then euthanised late last year and while I support any change the council offers doubt the council will follow through even with changes.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
2047	Support	We always check the dog rules on the website before we go to a beach etc, but they can be difficult to interpret. I may well have missed a basic "this is what it means" section but the "water area" always worries me - does that mean below the high tide mark? If so, please say that! Also a map would be SO helpful - in a lot of areas there's multiple areas ie on-leash during XYZ and off-leash from the south end after the reserve etc etc etc.... a map with corresponding areas shaded in or outlined would be amazing and much easier for dog walkers and non-doggie people to interpret. Everyone would know which areas dogs were okay vs where to avoid them etc. Please!
2545	Do not support	There are many many other problems in Auckland City and dogs do not feature as a priority.
2599	Support	I am not sure if this is the right place but unless by laws are enforced they are a waste of time dog owners ignore them I hear it is a funding and resource issue (staff vehicles etc) I feel if you fined people more often then that would give you more revenue and you would need more funding from council
3760	Support	My comments around the policy. Must be very clear in it's intent and simple to understand. The rules must be simple. Multi language chinese , etc so everyone gets it. 1) I personally would like to see more dog control people driving around in south auckland mangere and airport area. Lots if loose dogs. 2) instant fines for not picking up poop! 3) instant fines for not paying registration and failing to microchip dogs. 4) offleash area controls random in high volume dog parks - as a dog walker I am constantly amazed that my dog is the only one on leash in areas not designated as offleash areas.
3959	Do not support	Changing this makes way fir amendments to be passed without proper consultation
4470	I don't know	This is not a proposal to change. This is hypothetical. I do not see a need to change.
4876	Support	The restructuring needs to be in clear language. It is very difficult to find out what the council actually means by this. Even on the information sheet it only says the policy is to amend local dog access to a large number of parks. There needs to be a much better explanation available for people to comment on. The actual proposed updates document has a bit more information but nothing seems to be focussed on improving the policy for dogs. It is very much about reducing exercise options.
5522	I don't know	I think that dog walkers and owners need places they can walk off leash all day, all year round including beaches and parks.
6031	Support	Clear rules leave no room for misinterpretation by dog owners and the public alike.
6107	Support	It is very frustrating that it is often unclear what is allowed where and at what time for dog owners. I often see dog owners breaching the rules but they seem to think it is ok what they are doing and will sight an out of date sign or ancient rules. The more simple and clear the less opportunity for bending and breaking the rules.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
6444	Support	I want proper policing and effective management of problem dogs. October 10 2024, my dog was attacked at an off leash dog park. Animal Control were notified and the attacking dog seized a week later. This dog had other verified complaints of aggression. On the 20 February 2025 I found out the dog was released back to the owner. This should NOT happen.
ŌRĀKEI LOCAL BOARD		
183	Do not support	Changes to dog rules are a knee jerk reaction to bad dog owners.
322	Support	There is a lot of misinformation circulating in out of date signage, historical information vs council website and how it can be interpreted.
363	Do not support	It is completely unnecessary.
417	Support	The current Auckland Council website is very confusing to navigate and decipher when trying to figure out if a public space is dog friendly, on leash or off leash. It needs redesigning to make communicating the rules more clear, thereby ensuring more people understand them so they can abide by them
444	Support	The policy is currently open to interpretation and confusing for dog owners
468	Support	More signage at parks needed. People assume all parks are off leash and too many attacks happening
519	Support	Have consequences if dog owners don't follow the rules. Now they don't follow as they know nothing will happen.
600	Support	Clearer regulations are important. However it is not clear in the feedback exactly what the rules are
610	I don't know	This statement is really vague - please clarify specifically what changes will be made.
643	Support	Because I own a dog. I also work for a qualified dog trainer and packwalker. My life has always involved dogs, as does the life of my friends. I want clarity and understanding so that dog owners can enjoy their pets within the neighbourhoods that they live in.
691	Support	Dog laws in NZ are too restrictive. Dogs and pets are an integral part of family and life and we dog lovers should be able to take our dogs many more places.
818	Do not support	This is make-work. There is no imperative to tamper with generally well understood and successful existing policy.
880	Support	Great to be clear and easy to understand- there's a lot of dog owners who will still ignore anyway and not enough officers to do anything about it
902	Support	want to know whats included.
953	Do not support	The current system works very well at Madills Farm and Glover Park
962	Support	More clarity of dogs being registered and owners being accountable for dogs being reported to dog control.
1128	I don't know	More clarity is always good. But there is no details on the actual changes.
1135	Support	As a dog owner myself it can be really difficult to understand rules. Efforts need to be in place to make it really simple and clear, but there must also be enforcement as that doesn't happen now

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
1264	Do not support	The council barely enforces the current dog laws, why are you now turning on registered dog owners and limiting our dog socialisation opportunities. Focus on resourcing dog control and prosecuting poor dog owners, not further penalising those of us who are good, law abiding dog owners. You are villifying dog owners in Auckland even further.
1421	Support	I think this questions is a bit pointless - of course we want a clear set of rules and focus etc. That being said I believe that the dog rules should generally default to having almost all areas allowing dogs ON LEAD and only specific areas requiring protecting being an exception to this. Similarly it should be clear where dogs are allowed off lead and there should be a preference to allowing this than not unless there is a really clear reason why not.
1905	Do not support	I think that dogs can be classified as menacing too easily, such as a dog defending itself especially if it is large can be interpreted as aggression when it is just barking to defend itself if it is being mistreated or bullied by another dog, and displaying normal behavior.
2052	Support	There needs to be actionable policy. The off limits beaches along the eastern bays have off lead dogs in every day I am there literally. I may only be there for an hour or so a few times each week and have never seen either Kohi or St Heliers beaches free of off lead dogs. Without enforcement, these policies are meaningless.
2627	Do not support	I am walking my dogs in a number of parks and beaches. I have not seen many/if any problems around the existing dog rules. Times for dogs on beaches and off leash seem to be adhered to. Parks can be a bit loose with dogs off keas but nearly all owners control their dogs. This is case of fixing what doesn't need to be fixed. Also in a cost crisis adding more rules and more staff to police them is inappropriate and unnecessary. Leave the rules alone they are working well.
2752	Do not support	In proposing Madills farm which is a council thus Auckland residents owned land. To be an off leash dog field not just a majority sports dictated area. The community this nurtures is one I have never experienced before in my Auckland where I am born and raised. The trust and education I garnish from talking to people has been invaluable. Helping the dogs also to learn social rules and safe practices, is immensely important. Separating the dogs adds to their all ready fears (owners who are fearful transfer these emotions onto the dog) by pharmones,body language,tone. Etc

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
3107	Do not support	The change is based on a redundant and old fashioned view of dogs (big & dangerous) & owners. While there are irresponsible dog owners in the minority - the majority of dogs & their owners are well trained, socially adjusted, contained, clean, small in size & socially important for the health & wellbeing of Aucklanders, A blunt instrument is being proposed that will punish dogs & owner's freedoms and our access to common spaces that are for all to enjoy. You're not fixing anything; you're neglecting to face the problem head on. The issue that should be addressed is responsible dog ownership. In Switzerland you must first demonstrate ability to become a good dog owner before you're allowed to bring a new pup home - they complete a course & take a practical & written exam. Responsible dog ownership (also in France & the UK) includes dogs allowed on buses, in restaurants/cafes, shops, museums, local parks, hotels - culturally the nation has moved on from dogs as hunters, fighters, working on farms to kind gentle creatures that are an extension of whanua. We don't go anywhere without our pup - to that end it's our freedom you're curbing, not just that of the dog. I would visit a lot more places & be more active/participatory if Akld was canine-friendly (instead of Uber Eats I'd spend my money at Akld businesses who are currently struggling). In Germany laws discourage pet owners from leaving their dogs at home for too long, In Hungary microchipping is mandatory, a program to make neutering affordable, rules to ensure every dog gets the minimum required exercise every day. In France messy footpaths were solved by adding more poop/doggy bag stations (again dog owners can subsidise the cost). Have you considered delineating dog rules based on the type of breed & size of dog? Owners paying more to register a dog in order to recoup council costs of legislating the rules seems fairer. On our affluent street we have a very large mastiff owned by a family for security - he has no space to run & isn't walked, so he howls all the time. Where is the genuine Akld Council focus on the welfare of animals? I'm disappointed you're not taking the opportunity to modernise & pay attention to what's happening in your communities - the proposal is not relevant in these
3358	Do not support	Simplifying the policy - if you mean so dog owners can easily read what they can and cannot do then yes, I do support that. However, the changes you want to make regarding Madills Farm and Glover Park are what I do not support.
3430	Do not support	The dog rules at the moment are fine- not adhered to by a small minority - and not enforced. There are stray roaming dogs in Manukau and Glen Innes with no ability to catch or remove such dogs. A few dog owners don't pick up poop and abuse those who point it out to them. This is where effort should be concentrated- enforceable laws, enforced and sizeable fines/ confiscation of dog
3508	Do not support	I think the rules as they stand work well. I no longer have a dog as living in retired and a senior citizen. I love dogs and especially seeing them playing at parks and beaches. Please do not change rules to ban dogs from parks and beaches when it gives pleasure to so many people.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
3520	Support	My concern is the danger dogs pose to young children. As adults we owe it to the children of our community to ensure we take all practical steps to keep them safe. Currently the rules are not followed. Dogs are running around not on a lead in breach of council rules. Needs to be harsher penalties and some enforcement. 3 weeks ago i was out with friends when their 4 year old girl was bitten by a dog. The dog was not on a lead. This is simply not acceptable. This young girl should have been safe. Dogs should always be on a lead. No exceptions.
3548	Support	Please make rules and spaces more obvious. I have tried to create an app for dog users based off council rules and it was very difficult and frustrating to find out what area was dog friendly and what was not. Especially when travelling to different places you aren't familiar with. Also please look a similar model as Christchurch where you have dog friendly fenced parks for big dogs and small dogs
3745	Do not support	Madills farm is a recreational park intended for all in the neighbouring community including dogs. The area is not solely a sports field, and as the football club do not own this land, and this land is for all, it should therefore be a shared space. Why are they the priority and dictating the rules? Most millennial families, including my own, are not having children and our dogs are our children, they require the same rights to a space to exercise. As housing in this area does not allow much land, there is little opportunity for them to exercise to this scale in the home or garden. While on the map the proposed new off-leash area looks large, this space is in fact a slopped bank with trees allowing very little space for dogs to exercise. It is not an appropriate piece of land where I, the dog owner, can run and exercise with my dog due to the uneven level.
3749	Support	I support the intent of simplification, but am concerned what is proposed has not gone far enough. We need one set of easily understood rules for every location in Auckland and it needs to be easy to communicate and implement. I favour a simple traffic light system (Red - prohibited, Orange - on lead only and Green - off lead) with these same rules applied year round regardless of time of day or season. Dogs don't differentiate, why should we? And we need clear and frequent signage so people know what is expected. Current signage is inconsistent and sparse.
3753	I don't know	Support clarification but need to understand the current issues and the proposed changes.
3769	Do not support	Dogs need to have off lead areas - the local have never really been an issue in st heliers glendowie and I use the parks for all reasons

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
3796	Do not support	There have been no incidents reported where dog walking with packs has caused any trouble. The only trouble has been with unsupervised dogs and irresponsible owners along with dogs who have not been properly socialised.
3963	Do not support	Police the lawbreakers not all. It is too easy and lazy to hit normal owners
3992	Support	Generally the rules are currently minimal but extreme change will have a major flow on effect on many businesses and households.
4117	Do not support	The existing structure is satisfactory. The focus should be on education socialising the wider community to the benefits of dog ownership and making the wider community more accessible and dog friendly. For example, in the Newmarket retail precinct there is a shop dog that a number of neighbouring retailers/office workers take for walk to the supermarket/Domain, come and pat/give treats. This dog is acknowledged as a therapy dog for them and customers. The problem relates not to regulation but improving community understanding of the multiple roles dogs have within the community.
4122	Support	Specifically signage for park rules relating to dogs and beach signage relating to dogs (Kohimarama) need to be increased and more visible. (I know dog owners should know the rules but dogs are frequently walked on or off leash at all times during the restricted hours.
4135	Support	If there are any unclear sections they should be updated
4147	Do not support	The changes proposal do not value the community at large, these parks are for all users, 2 sub 4 legged ,
4419	I don't know	It seems like council wants to take away any areas that dogs can freely walk and run without understanding the needs from dog owners. It would be good to have more off leash parks, Waiaatarua for example is an area where it works perfectly and there should be more designated parks like this, not reducing park numbers.
4519	Support	Please ensure that signage at beaches is clear. The sign at Kohi beach has been defaced and gives no information to the many many dog owners who use the beach
4643	Support	It is frequent for dogs off leash on shared paths/cycleways to obstruct cyclists and or bark, chase or snap at cyclists. Owners should have it made clear that they need to control their dogs in the presence of other people, either by keeping them on leash or by obedience training.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
4691	Do not support	Subject: Submission regarding Proposed Dog Access Bylaw Changes for Madills Farm Recreation Reserve To the Ōrākei Local Board, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed changes to the dog access bylaws for Madills Farm Recreation Reserve, specifically the restriction of off-leash access on sports fields. I am a ratepayer in St Heliers and a regular user of Madills Farm with my four-year-old Maltese, Esha. I believe the proposed changes are unnecessary, infringe on the rights of responsible dog owners, and negatively impact the well-being of our canine companions. The Board's stated reasons for these changes, namely the protection of sports fields from damage, are not sufficient justification for such a sweeping restriction. While I understand the need to maintain the fields, the claim that dogs cause significant damage is overstated and lacks specific evidence. Digging can be addressed through responsible dog ownership and the provision of designated digging areas. Furthermore, the impact of dogs on field surfaces, especially when dry, is minimal compared to the wear and tear caused by organized sports. The financial burden of repairs, as cited by the Board, should be balanced against the benefits that off-leash exercise provides to dogs and their owners. It seems disproportionate to punish all dog owners for the potential actions of a few. The current policy, which allows off-leash access in designated areas, strikes a reasonable balance between the needs of sports players and dog owners. Restricting dogs to on-leash access near the sidelines during sports activities is a sensible compromise. However, a complete ban from the sports fields, even when not in use for organized sport, severely limits the space available for dogs to exercise and socialize. Madills Farm is a vital community asset, and its use should

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
4702	Do not support	Subject: Submission regarding Proposed Dog Access Bylaw Changes for Madills Farm Recreation Reserve To the Ōrākei Local Board, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed changes to the dog access bylaws for Madills Farm Recreation Reserve, specifically the restriction of off-leash access on sports fields. I am a ratepayer in St Heliers and a regular user of Madills Farm with my four-year-old Maltese, Esha. I believe the proposed changes are unnecessary, infringe on the rights of responsible dog owners, and negatively impact the well-being of our canine companions. The Board's stated reasons for these changes, namely the protection of sports fields from damage, are not sufficient justification for such a sweeping restriction. While I understand the need to maintain the fields, the claim that dogs cause significant damage is overstated and lacks specific evidence. Digging can be addressed through responsible dog ownership and the provision of designated digging areas. Furthermore, the impact of dogs on field surfaces, especially when dry, is minimal compared to the wear and tear caused by organized sports. The financial burden of repairs, as cited by the Board, should be balanced against the benefits that off-leash exercise provides to dogs and their owners. It seems disproportionate to punish all dog owners for the potential actions of a few. The current policy, which allows off-leash access in designated areas, strikes a reasonable balance between the needs of sports players and dog owners. Restricting dogs to on-leash access near the sidelines during sports activities is a sensible compromise. However, a complete ban from the sports fields, even when not in use for organized sport, severely limits the space available for dogs to exercise and socialize. Madills Farm is a vital community asset, and its use should
4799	Do not support	No where near hard enough on troublesome dogs and dog ownership - have a much bigger list of dangerous breeds that are or should be banned - prosecute for people owning dangerous dogs, inadequate fencing etc. All dogs to be registered and chipped - fines destruction of dogs if not done.
4831	Support	Reorganise but only to achieve clarity and simplicity.
4894	Do not support	Based on the maps of the proposed changes across the Auckland Region, it is clearly the intent of the Auckland Council to shrink the areas avail for dog walkers and especially for 'off leash' dog walking. This is unacceptable and in particular the areas of Madill's Farm and Glover Park MUST remain as a free off-leash dog walking and recreation areas.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
4903	Do not support	A local resident of 70+ years mother of 3 boys and 3 grandchildren all living in the eastern suburbs area. I wish to maintain the status quo. We all have the opportunity to use these grounds and having seen the existing and proposed rules it's looks to me that dog people are being eliminated. In both cases of Madills and Glover the off lead area is pushed to the surrounding roads and in Glovers case the cliff also. These are not appropriate spaces for off lead as for the other space offered at Glover you'd have to be a mountain goat. I am not a dog owner but still believe everyone has the right to enjoy these spaces and learn to compromise with the other activities that take place here. If the parks are going to be dominated by Eastern Suburbs football club then where does this end, is this the thin end of the wedge. And who will be eliminated next. Round the Bays, Movies in the Park, Opera in the Park, all these things I would have thought has more impact on the ground surface. Thank you for the opportunity to have my say Susan Bain
5155	Support	Current rules are poorly enforced and many dog owners claim ignorance, despite these rules being clearly sign-posted and easily searchable / accessible on the Council's website.
5183	Do not support	Dogs are an extension of family. Recreational sports people leave more rubbish and abuse these parks than dogs could ever do. We dog walkers / owners know because WE pick it up.. just as we do our own rubbish. Not on at all!!!!
5204	Support	Most people with dogs are considerate, pick up after their dog and stick to the rules.If any new policy is made, it would be nice to think that the law would be weighted more heavily on those that don't abide, instead of the majority that do.
5214	Do not support	I object to the overall effect of the rules however if games are being played in parks dogs should be on a leash.
5279	Support	Dogs are becoming a real barrier to people rights to safely walk in their neighbourhoods. We need stronger enforcement and more controls. Need to bring in more rules to control dangerous dogs like, All dogs must be neutered, unless e exemption licence to allow breeding.
5520	I don't know	Not enough information to support this statement. What's the restructure going to be?
5725	Do not support	I am a responsible dog owner. I walk my dog through parks such as madills, crossfield with the occasional off lead time. As most dog owners are responsible to ensure we pick up if necessary(unfortunately some don't but be realistic this applies to everything in life). Dogs and parks are a special part of families and children's outdoor activities. Be tragic if this is no longer available. We are trying to encourage health and outdoor activities but this just kills it. Think again council not a wise move

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
5751	Do not support	Some of the proposed changes to the areas have been 'gifted' to the community - not just for sports - but all to use. BUT I do agree that it is the responsibility of the person with the dog to have control - and to clean up after - at least be aware what the dog is doing. If they can't then on lead.
6067	Do not support	I don't think change is needed as locals go to madills to enjoy quality time with family and dogs
6122	Do not support	I don't see the proposed changes as positive. Our rights are being taken away. You start with saying that dogs provide companionship and socialisation yet you are making it harder to own dogs, punishing us that are responsible dog owners who pay their registrations and use these parks and beaches.
6185	Do not support	It seems to be currently working the way it is. Where there are issues focus on that like, roaming dangerous dog. Dogs get lost too, not always roaming
6217	Do not support	ok to clarify goal and focus areas and actions but I dont think applying a "one size fits all" set of rules is relevant in the context.
6229	Do not support	Just back off trying to control people's lives to the nth degree. 99.9% of the dog owners are responsible and not the problem. Why don't you focus your efforts on the very small minority of people and places that are not responsible
6309	Do not support	Waste of taxpayer money. Existing signs are sufficient.
6379	Do not support	Each time there is a restructure more areas are restricted for dog walking. Dogs need exercise and responsible owners exercise their dogs. Restricting more and more areas makes it difficult to freely exercise a dog causing other problems such as barking and antisocial behaviours.
6566	Support	All dog owners need to be aware of regulations and restrictions, once any policy changes are implemented they should be communicated directly as an adjunct to the annual licence tag. Too many people are not aware of access times to public beaches even though information is available on the side of rubbish bins.
6645	Support	Clarity is good for all, but rewriting of the rules should not be mistaken for a licence to change the rules carte blanche.
6687	Support	Clarification of goal, focus areas, council actions, and rules is welcome. However, I do not believe this should be mistaken as license to change any of these rules without the ability of council ratepayers to have their say.
6700	Do not support	Madills farm park was donated to the community for our collective enjoyment. The current arrangement works well, I do not see a compelling case to restrict access. Both parties respecting each other. We live on the boarder of Madills and I would suggest that the number of people using the park for recreation with dogs at least matches the number of individuals playing sport.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
6771	Do not support	The proposed changes apply to areas where I walk my dog regularly and I request for no changes to the off leash areas in dog parks in Auckland. I have a friendly well trained but very energetic dog that needs to run and run best off leash. It is important that a big city like Auckland has plenty of safe off-leash spaces for dogs and owners to exercise and socialise. A growing population needs a match in growing infrastructure i.e. more off-leash dog parks. I do not recommend to narrow our choices for off-leash walking!. The changes you wish to see for dogs on Madills Farm Park in Kohimarama, Glover Park in Gelendowie and Big Manly Beach and Tindalls Beach in Whangaparaoa would effect us negatively because we regularly go there so my dog can run!
6772	Support	Clear and general public's friendly policies are a given. This proposal has no logic. It is something that has to be done by default. Taxes payers should be able to have easier access to policies that are easier to follow and understand.
6785	I don't know	It depends on how you wish to reorganise, simplify and clarify the policy and bylaw content. I haven't been able to find any document on it, nor have you provided links or explanations here. If the simplification means more restrictions for dogs just to have one policy region-wide, then I do not support it. For example, people in an inner-city apartment can't have many dogs; but it would be stupid to apply the same rules to dog owners with a full size section and a park close-by.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
6787	Do not support	The prpoposed changes are absolutely not a simple restructue and clarification or information. The wording chages are infact wholesale chages to the objectives and therefore intention of the Policy. I am outraged by the extent to which council is presenting these changes as minor 'updates and clarifications' when they are infact major changes that not only go directly against the current objectives of the Dog Policy 2019, but also stand to have a significant negative impact on the welfare of dogs and their owners. specifically "To keep dogs as a positive part of the life of Aucklanders by: -maintaining opportunities for owners to take their dogs into public places -ensuring their welfare. The proposed changes are also directly contradictory to the core principle of the policy to “Recognise dog owners as legitimate users of public places and that dog access is essential for dog welfare” S1(a) A requirement to consider all “practicable alternatives” AND that ‘displaced dog owners and their dogs have access to other places as part of the same decision’ S6" The policy also requires there to be a ‘structural change’ or a ‘significant risk’ before any change should be considered and the evidence that has been provided is low impact and tenuous at best. The findings of the reports have been written in a way that seems to favour a predetermined outcome to significantly reduce dog access in public places.
ŌTARA-PAPATOETOE LOCAL BOARD		
153	Support	clarity is good
465	Support	Current structure and information available is out dated and does not benefit the animals, owners or the community.
2245	Do not support	You have already restricted huge changes over the years making huge restrictions on us dog owners. Stop doing this

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
2530	Support	This change won't change the fact that dangerous dogs are still roaming around the suburban neighbourhoods harming people and other animals. There needs to be a change on how people are able to acquire dogs and a monitoring of people who breed dogs. I live in South Auckland and the amount of dogs that roam around freely is shocking. It's unsafe to walk around as these dogs don't get caught straight away and when they do there's nothing done about them. If the council know the owners have had a history of not taking care of their dogs then they need to be fined and completely banned from ever owning a dog as a lot of these dogs are not trained either. Even they say that the dogs on the property so the council can't do anything but literally I've seen dogs jump over their fence to attack people. While I was walking my dog recently a unleashed pitbull was with a group of young children aging around the youngest being about 6 or 7 to the others that were around 8-9 years old. That pit bull straight away saw my dog which was harnessed and on a leash, and tried to attack my dog who's quite small and is Maltese x Shih Tzu. I protected my dog as much as I could as she was crying from trying to be attacked and I had to shield her between a fence and my legs as the other dog was trying to get to my dog. I then had to grab the pitbull and throw it away onto the road and yell at him, then he ran off back to the children that it was walking with. This is the one of many cases around the country, especially in South Auckland where backyard breed pitbull/Staffy terriers are being left to roam around by themselves or roam around with people that don't seem to worry about their dogs' behaviour the fact that it needs to be on a leash. I mean look at this example. No dog should be ever left with children that young and if it has to be then the dog needs to be on a leash. It's a joke honestly the council needs to enforce better laws around roaming dogs in suburban areas before even thinking about putting rules in parks. Nowadays I see people that do walk their dogs in my area, carry something of a pole or stick with them just in case if they or their dog gets attacked by another roaming dog or a dog that's able to jump the fence and onto the pathway and attack. DO SOMETHING ABOUT THE ROAMING DOGS THAT ARE ATTACKING OTHER DOGS
2974	Do not support	Dogs are family members so why should a dog have to pay for registration when they are like our kids we love our animal as much as we love our kids so I reckon you should stop people paying for registration people are struggling to pay already for their shots their food their chipping them parvo shot if your dogs get sick see as for people like me I really love my dogs and there really actually like us as people which we already got to pay for all these things for them already so PLEASE! STOP REGISTRATION AMEN
3899	Do not support	I don't own a dog, however I feel there are not enough areas for dog owners to be able to walk their animals off leash. The current rules are sufficient and should remain the same.
4740	Support	More changes are needed at the roaming dog in public and changes to impound payment fees are causing huge numbers of dogs being killed because of payment at the pound inability
4757	Support	Penalise people who do not clean up dogs ***** and heavy fines.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
6691	Support	South Auckland: Botanic Gardens; fencing area to allow for dogs be unleashed to get a good run; should consider fencing off in order to minimise risk to people who walk into dog unleash area. a) dogs in unleashed areas, fenced off if possible, should be considered for dogs who are large to x-large. This allows for these types of dogs to really exercise their lge muscles and run; these include border collies, german shepherds, mixed large/xlge breeds etc. b) There are so many areas available to the general public and children, but not for responsible dog owners. Also, there are certain groups of people who dont like dogs and that's ok. With children, there are a lot of children who provoke dogs with their high pitch screaming and running towards and away from dogs. It is provoking. So by decreasing off leash area for dogs, how does this impact on attempting to be responsive and caring of dogs, and their health/wellbeing? .
6826	Support	I would like these bylaws to include the first legislations in each section which support our rights [as stipulated in every first legislation], as opposed to dictatorship with policies that abuse us. An example: Animal Control Officers (AMO) need to have objective evidence prior detaining dogs as stipulated in the Local Government Act and using Police as the means to gain entry unlawfully (without an order/warrant) is also against the law. Another example: What is the purpose for registering an animal? Auckland Council claim it is for administration fees. This is already paid for by the Ministries of Primary Industries. You were granted just shy of 9 million dollars (according to MPI's annual report) as the cover of all expenses/expenditures. When I called the AMO office, they had no excuse except understanding what a Registration was. In the Crimes Act; this policy is classed as pecuniary rights, as it serves "no benefit" to pet owners. It does the exact same job as a microchip - and a microchip does more for you than having people subscribe THEIR property to pay you money and receive nothing except blackmail pursuits by your officers.
PAPAKURA LOCAL BOARD		
1067	Support	No Matter what changes are done people will not follow the rules only 30% might
1305	Support	Yes. I would want this to change. Make everything clearer especially the fines for dog owners! Council should consider number of offences before fine is sent (especially minor ones e.g, dog approaching other dogs which is pretty normal but other dog owners will complained about)
1406	I don't know	This is not clear on what the proposed changes are and how they will affect dog ownership
1466	Support	As a dog owner I see no adverse effects for me & a general standardizing of rules across Auckland as a positive for all owners who take notice of the regulations.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
1648	Do not support	None of these rules are addressing the real issues of our streets not being a safe place to walk our dogs on. In Papakura the streets are crawling in loose un neutered and unsplayed dogs that are dangerous. We have to take our dog out of area to a park to walk it safely. These rules are just making it harder for good dog owners to exercise their dogs. We need rules to make all pit bulls have to be neutered and spayed and any dog found roaming to have to be spayed. Only registered breeders should be aloud unsplayed un neutered dogs. We need more areas to exercise our dogs, not less. I am not safe on our streets in Papakura and alot of the dogs climb out of their properties because they are not being walked. There are no consequences and the same dogs are out week after week.
2109	Support	Keeping a policy up to date is always a good idea to add clarity but a restructure must NOT inhibit or bias any one particular party without specific consultation.
2231	Support	What are these proposed changes, exactly? Need more details from this. It's a very ambiguous statement.
4455	Support	We need change to the Animal Welfare Act and enforcement
4991	Support	Make sure enforcement gets prioritised. Signs saying keep your dog off sports fields are ignored.
6461	Do not support	Responsible dog owners are already aware of the rules and Council policy. It is irresponsible dog owners who cause most of the problems. Restructuring the policy is not going to change this.
PUKETĀPAPA LOCAL BOARD		
262	Support	The existing docs are confusing. If each park could have a map on your website then it will be much more clear.
558	Do not support	The policy is fine as it is, there is no need to change something that was fine in the first place
798	Support	If the policy is changed then communication would be appreciated
1057	Support	Happy rules are simplified but don't want registration fee increasing
1161	Support	Dogs should have more parks and water parks off leash
2460	Do not support	I do not support the restructured policy. It claims to provide clearer objectives, focus areas, actions, and rules, but in practice, it does the opposite. The revisions introduce unnecessary complexity and impose unsubstantiated restrictions, overshadowing the stated goal of keeping dogs as a positive part of Auckland life. Instead of offering clarity and balanced protections, these changes penalise responsible owners without addressing demonstrable problems.
2489	Do not support	I don't agree with the restructure. It claims to make things clearer but actually adds confusion and extra rules without real proof. This goes against the claimed goal of making dogs a positive part of Auckland life and ends up punishing responsible owners instead of addressing real problems.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
2810	Support	Anything that clarifies requirements, and the consequences for not following them, is very welcome. There are still some confusing areas, for example, around where off-leash areas start and finish, and some where naming is unclear. The ability to bring up a map, particularly one showing nearest main roads for reference, would be very useful.
3653	Support	Although diligent persons may seek out this information - it could be considered that it is not easy to find and understand Once that has been done it would be good if not critical to look at having the information more broadly published and advertised
4391	I don't know	Sounds like a lot of dog haters out there.
4433	Support	Clarification of rules and simplifying them is important so everyone is clear on individual responsibility
4436	Support	Yes clarify the rules and focus, but more needs to be done to enforce those rules. Our biggest problem is the number of unregistered, not microchipped, unneutered, poorly trained and uncontrolled dogs roaming free.
5724	Do not support	This is our only local dog park we can walk our dogs off leash. If it's on leash we're better off walking on the road, where the dog can't run around or play.
6267	Do not support	The structure and wording of the proposed policy amendment uses language that appears to reduce the support and promotion of dog walking as part of the enjoyment of living in Auckland. Across Auckland and in our area around Monte Cecilia Homestead/Park the interaction between residents with and without dogs has not and does not introduce any observable or measurable concern. The changes proposed appear to be reducing the costs and effort needing to be spent by Council in enforcement of the current policy. There is no need to change the policy/

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
6425	Support	Given below is my submission regarding the proposed changes to the dog access rules applicable to Auckland's Regional Parks and Reserves. We (my wife and me – in our 60s) reside at 2 Haughey Ave, Three Kings, Auckland. The Monte Cecilia Park / Reserve is near our residence and alas, the council only consulted the dog owners and proposed an uncontrolled dog access area in the Natural Bowl section of Monte Cecilia Park about a decade back. It may be noted that no initial feedback was sought from the non-Dog owners regarding the proposal. The lack of inviting feedback from non-dog owners became obvious during the meeting to endorse the proposal chaired by Mr. Michael Wood, who was an elected representative at the Auckland Council. The proposal was rammed through at the meeting. This was done without putting in place some basic safeguards like fencing and demarking clearly the off-leash areas to ensure the dogs and their owners remain within those confines and do not take over the park / reserve. Also, there was no system of monitoring after the proposal was implemented to check whether post implementation the area continues to be safe for the elderly and children. We used to go to the park for our daily walk, to get some fresh air & exercise. But soon after the proposal was implemented using a flawed process that pandered to a selection of the population, we soon started encountering unrestrained dogs and their aggressive owners who showed no civic sense whatsoever. The Dog Owners actively encouraged their dogs to move all over the park, including the walking path unrestrained and doing their job all over, with the dog owners not bothering to pick up the dog poo. What used to be a peaceful walk soon turned into a nightmare. Even a polite reminder to the dog owner that the dogs can be off leash only within the confines of the designated area of the park were met with a snub at the best, and aggressive and threatening behavior at the worst. Feeling unsafe, we stopped
6500	I don't know	The update of the rules should make it up to date with current language which may have changed over 6 years since the last one. The policy appears very one sided in that it is concentrating on bad dog owners when the majority of dog owners are well educated dog owners who abide by all regulations and query if this is becoming more of a nanny state regulation document that limits responsible dog owners and not the small number of irresponsible dog owners
6618	Do not support	We love the monte cecilia dog park. The dogs. The people. They are responsible respective and caring. It is a safe place to allow our dogs off leash to let of some steam. It would be extremely sad if this was to change.
RODNEY LOCAL BOARD		
68	Support	The number of pets in our community is becoming a problem, their owners are unaware of their obligations to the pets and the community they are living in.
199	Support	Some current signage can be hard to interpret where the off lead/dogs can go areas actually are.
1146	Support	Signage at rautawhiri park Helensville is non existent and council rules are mostly ignored by dog owners there

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
1252	I don't know	If you push through with all these changes, you need to make sure you have enough staff for all areas. With dog attacks on increase and nothing to monitor the beaches and parks it makes the Bylaw inadequate.
1550	Support	It should be easier to find dog-friendly places in your area. Rather than needing to search for specific places you should be able to type in an area then have only dog-friendly parks beaches walks etc come up.
1589	Support	There are many places in Auckland where dogs are rightly not allowed, for example, Muriwai close to the gannets/top car park. However, it is not well monitored. There should be better signage stating what will happen if dogs are there, why not a fine? There does not seem to be a consequence to non compliance
1627	Support	I am a dog owner but feel rules around where dogs can be taken and when they must be on leash etc needs to be made more clear. Every time my young child and I walk dog on leash on beach, off leash dogs come bounding up, scaring my child. We have the right to peaceful enjoyment of these areas.
1646	Do not support	There is no rhyme or reason to change what is currently working well. The policies continue to be so anti dog all the time that eventually there will be no space to walk them
1921	I don't know	You have not provided enough information for me to make an informed decision
2244	Support	I sometimes think you produce so many different rules that members of the public get very confused!!
2537	Do not support	I feel that simplifying will result in reduced access as a result to quote simplify and make signs logical. They already make sense, common sense. This is a waste of Auckland council and tax payers money. Rather focus on education of the existing signs.
2638	Support	The current signage is confusing, too small and a joke and it seems most dog owners ignore it. The signage needs to be much clearer and reasons explained. Also allowing dogs on beach before 10 am in summer is too late and needs to be pulled back to 8 am to 8 pm
2668	I don't know	Simplifying is helpful and makes it clearer to understand as well as helps ensure there is no confusion about it but changing it is not as the current laws work well and nothing needs adjustment
2716	I don't know	Well I think clarity is a good thing I find some of the council speak regarding making it easier for dogs and dog owners is then contradicted by Prohibiting dogs from not only many council owned places but also all other public spaces not under control of council, unless there is signage dogs welcome. There are a few cafes in our area that are happy to have dogs with their owners at their outside tables, I have checked before taking my dog, but they do not display a sign and that is their business.
2828	Support	To fully inform all users of council areas about the rules concerning dog walking
3227	Support	No dogs should be on Muriwai Beach. There's too much wild life. Every year I see dogs attacking birds, seals, and the occasional turtles. Although there was no changes to the rules on walking dogs on Muriwai Beach, This should be re-visited.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
3343	Support	Policies regarding dogs need to be transparent and clear as many provide a crucial relationship with owners - taking away the freedoms of them will negatively impact both dogs and owners.
3572	Do not support	Dogs are apart of our families and are important parts of our lives. We need places to exercise them in enriching environments. Removing the ability for us to take our pups out with us will stop our family enjoying the great outdoors.
3642	Support	Signage must be all along the walkways at Snells Beach and a more obvious presence of rangers as at the moment it is rare to see them here more than once a month for a brief time. So people ignore rules.
4084	Do not support	I do not believe changes to the existing by-laws are necessary or needed. The Council needs to focus on menacing and roaming dogs and unregistered dogs, not make life more difficult for responsible dog owners who also are rare payers and pay dog registration
4123	I don't know	It is unclear what is being proposed
4311	I don't know	This is unclear please clarify to make a better informed decision . Depends entirely on what you want to simplify which you haven't stated
4380	Support	Education of dog owners is important to help compliance.
4408	I don't know	Talking with the industry experts that do this day to day, they should be influencing policy, not just locals. Let those that understand have a say, not just anyone that's around
4631	Support	Important that rules are implemented and overseen. This does not happen at present. Most dog rules re timing on beach are totally ignored.
4640	Support	I Would like to see professional dog walkers licensed.
4821	I don't know	What does Restructure the policy to more clearly show its goal, focus areas, council actions, and rules mean>
4899	Do not support	Why are you changing forestry beach ,banning dogs but allowing Tara iti development
4950	Do not support	This will just be another waste of time and money and will only help you justify an increase to taxes on owning a dog.
5013	Do not support	There is no need to restrict access from dogs at these beaches There's already plenty of beaches a person could go to that are dog free and not many dog friendly places to take dogs to removing access will make people more likely to ignore the law instead to upholding it . Make changes like having dogs on lead at more beaches mandatory having no go zones for dogs to protect wildlife would be much better and affective then just banning dogs. More advocate and campaigning for animal training would help all of these issues and more
5260	Do not support	No one reads it outside council. Stop wasting our money
5275	Support	The policy must be informed by research rather than hearsay. How many of the officials have spent time with professional dog walkers who run a very good pack with great control? I want to see policy that puts some focus on the home dog walker, the owner with the out-of-control dog that zooms around a carpark. I want to see change that focusses on people being made to be responsible and of course for licensing of pack dog walkers.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
5524	Do not support	Overall, council seems to be proposing sweeping changes that go directly against the Policy on Dogs 2019, notably: - The objectives of the current dog policy to “keep dogs as a positive part of the life of Aucklanders by: maintaining opportunities for owners to take their dogs into public places” - A core principal of the policy to “Recognise dog owners as legitimate users of public places and that dog access is essential for dog welfare” S1(a) - A requirement to consider all “practicable alternatives” AND that ‘displaced dog owners, and their dogs have access to other places as part of the same decision’ S6
5830	Support	The Trust supports the overarching objectives of the proposed amendments, particularly those aimed at maintaining opportunities for dog owners while addressing environmental and safety concerns. Specifically, we endorse provisions to: 1. Clarify and update dog access rules for regional parks, including Te Ārai. 2. Limit the number of dogs a person may walk at one time. 3. Reorganise and simplify policy content for clarity and enforceability.
5952	Support	Council actions must be clear on the signage, e.g. fines, and include council phone number where complaints can be made
6102	Do not support	Any restructure policy needs to be properly enforced- the current dog rules are continually ignored by individuals who will continue to ignore any new policy or rules therefore the focus should be on enforcement and not a blanket approach that will impact the many professional and responsible dog walkers
6387	Support	see below
6470	I don't know	Simplifying a complex matter to legislate it, is not a good solution. Complex problems require complex solutions applied by experts. No matter how appealing simple may be.
UPPER HARBOUR LOCAL BOARD		
311	I don't know	That proposal is utterly vague. It makes no concrete suggestion so I could be supporting something I disagree with.
846	Support	I support the proposal to restructure the policy to more clearly outline its goal, focus areas, council actions, and rules. However, I strongly urge the Council to ensure that any changes result in a policy that is simple, concise, and easy for the public to understand and follow. Many people will not have the time or inclination to wade through overly bureaucratic or technical language. Policies should be accessible to everyone, regardless of their familiarity with council processes. I'd suggest that the Council develop a user-friendly digital tool, such as a mobile app or interactive website, so that people can easily check the rules applicable to their local area.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
925	Support	Too many owners take the dog to the park or allow them to defecate off their property. I witnessed many not picking up after their dogs.
1046	I don't know	I do believe that there should be rules but I think the council should talk to dog walkers and pack walkers to see how they can implement these rules that won't affect them and their business. I do believe there should be rules but not the one that is trying to be proposed
1140	I don't know	Having clear rules is always good, but hard to say if it will be really better if there is no context or example of these changes
1166	I don't know	What does that even mean? Very vague wording for something you mean to clarify...
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	Support	The rules still confuse people and it causes problems. Please simplify for those who don't understand
1394	Support	The restructuring of the policy is aimed at reducing where dogs can go whereas it does not address the underlying issues of stray dogs and dogs that have been left to roam by there owners.
1637	Support	I'm a dog owner who uses parks
1924	Support	Fully support. The changes and structured layout make reading and referencing the policy easy and quite fast.
5685	Support	As dog owners the rules concern us and we would have a say in our areas, cars have no laws - just saying.
5880	I don't know	This question does not say what may change... so am unsure what i would be supporting
6386	Do not support	I think as a responsible dog owner we should have some say and be able to enjoy taking our dogs with us as they are part of the family and as long as we control our dogs on lead in public places and clean up after our animals that we should be allowed to have them with us in public
6662	Do not support	The rules and restrictions are too strict and not supporting of dog owners
WAIHEKE LOCAL BOARD		
420	Support	Very experienced dog owner who has gotten sick of people not even carrying a leash for their dog.
2771	Do not support	Dog access to public beaches and regional parks/reserve areas should be removed completely. Dogs should only be allowed in enclosed areas. This is to protect wildlife, children, the elderly.
2933	Support	There needs to be a greater penalty for not having dogs on leash in public area and on the streets within Auckland. Also, all dogs must be kept in fenced garden, or on rope. Those that don't abide get 3 warning before dogs taken to pound and owner not allowed dogs for X number of years.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
4484	Support	Want more restrictions for dogs to be on leash on beaches. Off leash dogs are a menace to others and leave feaces behind, many owners fail to pick up or control their dogs on beaches.
4893	Support	Because as a dog owner, there are too many specific rules on walking your dog from your house to the beach and on the beach.
WAITĀKERE RANGES LOCAL BOARD		
433	I don't know	You are not being clear about what the changes are so it's hard to comment
506	Support	Too many terrible dog owners in this city. Roaming pitbulls all over Auckland. I'm hoping I can make comments on this and changes will be made.
523	Do not support	The rules need to be loosened not clarified
969	Support	In general it would be unwise to relax any existing dog regulations or bylaws. With the advent of dense housing ownership of small dogs will increase with the carry on effect that public spaces will be increasingly utilised to exercise animals
1291	Support	I think the exclusion of dogs is too broad so I hope areas and walks can be wider and more inclusive of dogs. Also monitoring of dogs in areas should increase. I regularly see dogs, often off leash, in parks and tracks where they are not meant to be. There needs to be serious fines and confiscation of dogs that are acting viciously and the owners have no control and the dogs are off leash.
1296	Support	While the proposed change is good in theory, it will have no practical effect (like 99% of council bylaws). The fact is that there is no enforcement of these bylaws, and they are ignored. Take a walk up Mount Hobson any day of the week, and you will see unleashed dogs.
1325	Support	Hopefully improving the clarity will improve the ability to enforce the existing rules. Dogs not under appropriate control must be taken from public places.
3639	Support	Having clearly defined goals, focus areas, council actions and rules will clarify best working practice.
3879	Support	I have never felt it is easy to find the information on where places are off leash
4001	Do not support	Council has entirely the wrong approach. You keep reducing places we can walk our dogs both on and off leash. This forces more dogs into fewer areas which is always going to add to pressure and socialisation. If you opened more tracks I could walk my dog with nobody around and work with her as I have always done. Of course I know some people's behaviour is appalling and I have challenged many with behaviour around wildlife etc. However, the way to improve behaviour is to fine people whose dogs are blatantly appallingly behaved but encourage and provide huge spaces for those of us trying to exercise a dog responsibly. Council has a reputation of hating people and their dogs and your policy of not providing enough space is responsible. We are ratepayers also.
4571	Support	So many dog owners don't follow the rules or maybe they don't know them. They should have to pass a test to own a dog in my view as I come from a farm and can not believe how city dwellers manage their dogs in my suburb of West Auckland.
4827	Do not support	Please spend our rate payer money on more important things.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
4898	Support	Simple and concise is best. People are already anti at being told what to do. Comprehension and understanding go out the window when lots of words are involved.
4934	Support	Clarity on rules would be good so that people can understand what is expected and not say oh but my dog is different.
5480	I don't know	I'm all for making it simpler. Why you restrict Auckland dog owners to 2 dogs without a specific licence is beyond me other than money revenue gathering. I'm a responsible dog owner Never lost a dog Always registered Well trained animals I adopted unwanted animals to reduce the dogs in the pound Your strict regulations do not support the values and the responsibility I take seriously as an owner of animals Your current rules suck resulting in the volume of dogs you see for adoption. You need to regulate the breeding of animals. Focus on puppy farms
5896	Do not support	I am sure the registration fees and taxes could be better used elsewhere than on re-structuring. Most people walk 2-3 dogs MAX. and pack walks would be the dog walkers which is not as concerning as the rescue/adoption system!
5909	Do not support	I think the rules we have now should be left as is, dogs deserve to be out in the public especially in parks just as much as humans do
6447	Do not support	This is just more erosion of dog and dog owner basic rights to exist peacefully
6610	Do not support	There's nothing wrong with the clarity of the current policy.
6724	Do not support	Do not support the proposed limit of 6 dogs per person with only 3 off leash allowed at a time. Do not support the amount of restrictions proposed to be put on dog friendly parks, which are already so limited in Auckland.
WAITEMATĀ LOCAL BOARD		
118	Support	Please consult professional dog trainers on this matter. For any other policies, the council would consult an expert before making any changes. Please respect professional dog trainers and behaviourist. They can really help make it safer for everyone.
162	Support	As a frequent walker I frequently meet people who are not following the dog rules. When I point them out I usually either get a "I didn't know" or rudeness. It seems very useful to clarify these rules.
366	I don't know	It is unclear what changes are being made, so it is challenging to comment. Which parks are being changed, and what are the changes being considered, please
370	I don't know	This does not detail the changes

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
454	Support	Support, but I think we need to go further and have video adverts about consideration around young kids and not taking offense if a person asks them to stick to the rules. We have a Major cultural problem. I've politely asked many dog owners that have dogs-free in leash areas such as near playgrounds to put leashes on as my autistic daughter has huge meltdowns. 90% of the owners respond and say the dog is friendly, I respond and say Mila is scared, then they ignore me. For two years I've avoided taking her to gladstone playground because there are always dogs there and I'm sick of the drama. Council doesn't reply to my email of complaints.
803	Support	Everything in one place and easily read would be helpful.
1048	Support	Leash laws need to be clearer. Many folks are allowing uncontrolled dogs off lead. Many issues ensue
1404	Support	Where are the goals and focus areas for unregistered dogs, roaming packs and owners that don't care for their dogs?
1510	Support	My dog is registered - hence I got this email asking me to give feedback. My neighbour across the road has a fighting dog breed and so does her boyfriend. Neither of these dogs are registered - both of them roam free in the neighbourhood as the property which is a state house is unfenced. The dogs can be threatening to humans and other dogs. When I have phoned council in the past to complain about these dogs being allowed to roam and being unregistered the person I've spoken to has insisted that I give my name and address when reporting the dogs. I mean, seriously, are you trying to make me go to war with my neighbour? If they knew it was me reporting their dog I'd get a brick through my window. I did find one person at council who noted that the dogs were loose and unregistered and I assumed they would address the problem. They haven't. Loose dogs roaming the streets are the biggest growing problem in NZ when it comes to domestic animal safety and yet this hasn't been addressed at all in your bylaw and instead you are focused on large walking packs when in my experience a large pack is usually being walked by an experienced dog handler and is not a risk.
1544	Do not support	Don't even bother, rather than focusing on these bylaws, why dont you focus on other areas that actually needs attention.
2184	Do not support	The animals owner should have a voice and say in this matter
2625	Support	I am a dog owner and I find some aspects of Council policy confusing
4064	Support	I believe that many changes should be made towards the improvements of dog parks in Auckland. Fully fenced in go areas at all parks should be number one priority, just that action by itself would prevent so many complaints from all parts. And keeping dogs excited on a lead can be as hard as having multiple dogs running looses, as some individual often tend to grow their anxieties when they get at the park.
4584	Do not support	The dog laws are find, their only a few dog owners that can't manage their dogs and need more control or training over them.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
5004	Support	The concerns raised, such as owners not picking up after their dogs or letting them off-leash in restricted areas, stem from a lack of education and enforcement rather than a need for more restrictions. Public awareness campaigns, clearer signage, and better monitoring would be more effective solutions than outright bans.
5125	Support	New structure/laws etc are only as good as the oversight and follow up and enforcing them.
5310	Support	I think this is a reaction to growing numbers of professional dog walkers rather than a genuine concern. we use a dog walking service and they are all properly trained, use GoPros, and fully supported and coached - our dog is always relaxed and well behaved with them. I would much rather see policy developed around professional dog-walking to ensure proper training and controls (certification maybe), than to impose a blanket set of rules that will stop professional dog-walking. It is simple and obvious that trying to control a mix of dogs on and off leash, is far more difficult than working with a group of dogs on leash - and we know from research that dogs on leashes tend to be more reactive.
5638	Support	More clarity helps people understand and obey rules better.
5812	Support	While I support the effort to simplify and clarify dog access rules, it is crucial that changes do not result in further confusion or unnecessary restrictions. The new rules must be clearly communicated through signage, council materials, and public outreach efforts. Future changes should be subject to ongoing consultation with dog owners and stakeholders to ensure fairness and effectiveness. Requested Amendment: Establish a regular review process to assess the impact of dog access restrictions and adjust them based on community feedback. Ensure all updated maps and rule changes are easily accessible and clearly signposted in public spaces.
6182	Do not support	Too many things are being lumped together in this single consultation making it difficult for affected individuals and groups to have their say.
WHAU LOCAL BOARD		
80	Do not support	We don't need more and more rules.
1411	Do not support	I disagree with the proposal of some parks being on leash at all times
2455	Support	I have dogs
2819	Support	There needs to be clear consistency information that is easily accessed and understood rather than current all over the place unclear information.
4025	Do not support	Clarify current rules before - Restructure / Changes that should have a consultation

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
4157	Support	To ensure that off leash dog areas will still be available for the majority responsible dog owners. And as a fair and realist dog owner myself.
4727	Support	Auckland provides very few locations where dogs are allowed off leash at all times. This makes it very difficult for dog owners to exercise their dogs freely, socialize them properly which ultimately helps with training and safety around humans and other dogs. Although I agree with clearly identifying the rules and editing some to suit the needs of the community, however, I would appreciate the inclusion of areas with trees or water that accommodate dogs to freely play at any time of the day.
4879	Support	Make pedestrian and public safety and rights paramount please! No dogs off a leash period!
4923	Do not support	My concern is that this process is being used to make changes which allegedly were aligned in the last review. For a council that is supposedly focused on reducing costs and unnecessary bureaucracy, there is a lot of unnecessary bureaucracy in this review.
5023	Do not support	Rephrasing and restructuring is not going to change people not following the rules. The rules are clear enough.
6020	Support	Clarity of Policy and Bylaw Making the policy and bylaw clearer and easier to read is a commendable goal. To enhance understanding and accessibility, we recommend the inclusion of QR codes on signage within parks, linking to the dog policy in multiple languages. This would ensure that all members of our diverse community can access and understand the regulations
6077	Support	Redesign and update the information on where dogs can and can't be walked on leash or off leash at all parks. The current maps and information available on the councils website is difficult to navigate and confusing to understand it needs to be far more simple and clearly defined they shouldn't be fudged lines of off leash on leash based on landmarks or streets etc they should just be a sign at that point stating this is on leash this is off leash north of this point or south of this point or sign
UNDECLARED LOCAL BOARD		
349	Support	ALL policies should be clear
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.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
2102	Support	Council information is very difficult to follow. I'd like to know when cat owners will be held accountable and see nothing on the website or hear about any changes regarding cat owners, despite having our say? When will our wildlife be protected from cats prowling and when will cat owners be held accountable for their cats peeing on outdoor furniture and pooing on our sections. Many times I have had to take injured birds to bird rescue or dispose of dead birds on my property. We have many Tui, doves, thrush, blackbirds etc and too many cats in the neighbourhood killing them all. Cat owners need to be more responsible and should also have to register them, just as dog owners do!
2183	Do not support	Simplify and clarify is subjective. This must be done without changing policy through rewording. It needs to be extremely clear and filtered through multiple focus groups consisting largely of dog owners or animal support workers to give a fair review.
2235	Support	The policy should be clear about how it defines off leash dog and what it means by under control.
2584	Do not support	I pay an exorbitant amount of money to have a dog in this Auckland when compared to other parts of the world and you use this money to continue to stop access to dogs! STOP! Use this money to improve life of families with dogs. I and educate owners that you believe cause issues. Have a ranger inspect these parks instead of putting so much unnecessary stress to families with dogs. This is discrimination! Find a better way and stop wasting tax money for all this nonsense to simply make your administration easier! It's disgraceful!
2652	Support	It should show why you are making a change. Focus should balance the possible impact by dogs with owners. Some of the reasons given appear to ignore the fact that people even without dogs create a disturbance for wildlife (I've witnessed young children chasing wildlife, people playing football/volleyball, or engaging in other noisy activities) - whilst a dog on leash with a complying owner is likely to pass through an area more quietly than people who may be more static in an impacted area. So goals are good but might open up the question why allow people in those areas at all - or are dogs just an easy target? Overall: This Ask was not very well presented. Seems a lot of the information is scattered across multiple documents making this much harder to assess for the public.
3675	Do not support	Support the clarification but very important to know the proposal for change with substantive reasoning.
4150	Support	Confusing as a dog owner to know when I can walk my dog. There is way too many restrictions on where you can walk dogs as it is
5540	Support	I support the plan to make the rules clearer, though my primary concern is the lack of management/enforcement, and this is where improvement is needed.
5561	Do not support	There is no reason to restructure policy, dogs need places to exercise not be restricted
5884	Support	Clarity is always a good thing. If rules and regulations are clear, there should be less room for error.

Sub #	Q2A Restructure the policy	Q2A Tell us why
6408	Support	The focus should be on the rights of children and other vulnerable users of these facilities first. As Auckland's living conditions are becoming more closer to their neighbours the council should also put more resourcing into animals that continually bark and completely destroy the peace and tranquility of their neighbours and neighborhood.
OUTSIDE AUCKLAND		
2114	Do not support	Just making it harder for responsible dog owners.
4517	Do not support	This should be something that is looked at by a dog behavior professional and talked about with the industry as a whole who have knowledge and understanding and take immense caution of the council and the public. It is unfair to put ridiculous and unnecessary rules on small businesses who are making a positive change in the community