
Dog policy, bylaw and regional park access rules 2025

Q2 Policy and bylaw matters

**(Q2G. Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog
access rules)**

Comments sorted by submitter's local board

Date published: Monday, 7 April 2025

Local Board	Page #
Albert-Eden	3
Aotea/Great Barrier	3
Devonport-Takapuna	3
Franklin	3
Henderson-Massey	4
Hibiscus and Bays	4
Howick	5
Kaipātiki	6
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	6
Manurewa	7
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	7
Ōrākei	8
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	11
Papakura	12
Puketāpapa	12
Rodney	14
Upper Harbour	15
Waiheke	15
Waitākere Ranges	15
Waitematā	16
Whau	16
Undeclared local board	17
Outside Auckland	NA
Regional organisation	NA

Sub #	Q2G Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2G Tell us why
ALBERT-EDEN LOCAL BOARD		
1622	Do not support	Can we change some of them as well?
2146	Support	Someone at the Council needs to be held accountable for the errors that exist.
2275	Support	I only support this if the errors are causing significant difficulties. I suspect they are probably not, and so would be another waste of money when no-one adheres to the access rules anyway.
2871	Do not support	Too restrictive
4141	I don't know	I want to leave it to properly qualified persons, who are the dog walkers.
4412	I don't know	As long as this isn't creating additional regulation, anything that provides clarity and more simplicity would be good.
4512	Support	Again, clarification, not limits please.
4520	Support	I don't agree with adding further limits to what is currently in by-law however I do agree with clarification.
AOTEA/GREAT BARRIER LOCAL BOARD		
6780	I don't know	What are the errors in Policy Schedule 2? I don't know and there for cannot make an informed decision.
DEVONPORT-TAKAPUNA LOCAL BOARD		
598	Support	As per previous comments
693	Support	I want to understand what is changing and how it will impact my dog
1758	Support	Handy to be clear on rules regarding dog access
2107	Do not support	Please explain which errors you're referring to?
3590	Support	of course if there are any errors in the policy they need to be rectified.
3762	I don't know	Do not understand this question. Not enough context
4260	Support	As above clarity is key. If there are mistakes they ought to be fixed
FRANKLIN LOCAL BOARD		
350	I don't know	This depends are you calling things an error just so you can change it? Or is it a minor error that actually doesn't make sense?
1045	I don't know	What will the changes be so I can decide if I support this matter.
1539	Support	I support change, there are laws preventing dogs from being off lead in parks but no one to make sure it happens. I had my dog put to sleep at age two due to being attacked by an off-lead dog in an on-lead park. no dog should be off lead unless in a closed space like a dog park fully fenced. rules need to be kept too, if its a lead park then that needs to be acted upon. I can report dogs loose to Auckland council but they say they don't have staff to deal with it
1922	Support	There was an off lead dog in the hunua ranges on my walk the other week, yes it was under control but I'm pretty sure it said on lead...do people will do what they want
2475	Support	Everyone should know and follow these guidelines.
2739	Do not support	What errors? This is too vague. You need to be saying exactly what you are clarifying or correcting, this whole page isn't specific enough.

Sub #	Q2G Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2G Tell us why
3473	Support	Dogs under control should not be alienated. You are targeting the low lying fruit the irresponsible owners and those t is not fair that the the responsible owners are punished!
3923	I don't know	I dont have any problems understanding the current dog rules
3985	Support	Currently far to much confusion or conflicting information available to dog owners and general public.
4428	Support	To "clarify" is good. To admit there are "errors" in the Policy Schedule 2 is
4450	Do not support	I should be able to continue to walk my dog in parks and sports fields. I pay registration fees and there are no dog parks in Pukekohe
5906	Do not support	The rules to prevent dogs from beaches, bush walks, reserves and gardens seek only to punish good dog owners. Owners of unregistered, unneutered, menacing dogs do not walk their dogs on or off leash at these places. They instead let their dogs roam the streets. STOP PUNISHING RESPONSIBLE DOG OWNERS. Down the road from me, in an unfenced property, two bully crosses have moved in. These dogs growl menacingly when people walk past - there is an entire road I can no longer walk down because of these two menacing dogs. Menacing dogs should NEVER be allowed on unfenced sections. I want to see the council be able to remove dogs, or force the owners to get an adequate fence (which will need to be extremely high for these power breeds). FOCUS ON THE TAN CROSSES THAT ARE CAUSING THE ISSUES - STOP PENALISING RESPONSIBLE DOG OWNERS
6746	I don't know	Clarify yes, but what 'errors' are being referred to.
HENDERSON-MASSEY LOCAL BOARD		
832	Support	Thus us not to be used as a back door excuse to reduce access!!! But plain, simple and consistent rules would be good.
940	Support	if there are errors they need to be fixed
998	Support	I support clarifying current access rules, but not imposing more rules
1751	Do not support	Don't limit the already restricted dog parks.. where do you want us to take them.. they need some freedom too
4924	Do not support	It is hard to ask for support or not for all. Generally, I do not want to remove dog access to beaches and parks. What I do want is more control.
6105	Support	The current system is confusing, and information is hard to find. This definitely needs streamlining to help dog owners find and understand this.
HIBISCUS AND BAYS LOCAL BOARD		
319	Support	Yes, please correct or clarify, some of the the rules don't make sense.
566	Support	Awareness of limited dog access to beaches during summer needs to be heightened among dog owners and their responsibilities clearly understood.
579	Support	Ensure there is no ambiguity
771	I don't know	Only after discussion with stakeholders and those experienced in the industry
776	Support	If it's unclear, clarify; if it's wrong, correct it!

Sub #	Q2G Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2G Tell us why
1324	Support	The list in the proposed schedule needs updating. There are areas listed that are no longer accessible or have names changed. Verify these places on google maps.
1385	I don't know	I want to know what the rules are that you want to clarify and the wording changes
1537	Support	So I understand what is happening
2171	Support	Schedule 2 Hibiscus Coast - no rules for the Green Road (Dairy Flat) Local park https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/about-auckland-council/how-auckland-council-works/local-boards/all-local-boards/rodney-local-board/Documents/green-road-park-masterplan-october-2020.pdf Why not - it's being opened up for public access, and there are livestock on the park. Already public users of the park can fly model aircraft and and participate horse riding
2268	Do not support	It's clear in black and white times at the beach, why, shouldn't people have the same rights to take their dogs to the park when they want. Same rights parents have for their dogs.
2290	Support	You're asking for support but not stating the changes proposed. Need to provide this information to clarify the changes
2801	Support	The rules need to be made crystal clear and be visible where necessary because many people either think the rules don't apply to them, or are unaware of the rules.
3332	I don't know	I do not know what policy schedule 2 is
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.
4354	Support	I was bitten by a medium size petagree, dog Las year off of lesh
6081	Support	Information should be sent to the relevant ratepayers and dog owners.
6396	I don't know	Not enough information supplied to decide if I support or disagree
HOWICK LOCAL BOARD		
407	Support	Ban pitbull type dogs
521	I don't know	Not enough details here. What would this look like?
541	Do not support	Rules should not be changed as a result of complaints against a few negligent dog owners spoiling it for the remainder of decent dog owners!! Instead, the Council should be targeting and educating the negligent and problematic dog owners!!
1669	Support	It's important for public to know what will be changed and allow consultation and feedback for changes before approval and publish

Sub #	Q2G Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2G Tell us why
2333	Support	Have due consideration for dog only areas that do not endanger the general public. Limit off leash areas where the public and children gather.
4225	Do not support	What the heck is Policy Schedule 2? Sounds to me like Council is hiding something they don't want us to know. I have not viewed a Schedule 2. If it is so important, why have you not attached a link to it in the question? Wrong, wrong, wrong.
5235	I don't know	People provide companionship, emotional support and help foster social connections in the community: they are not secondary to animals- dogs in this case. People should be able to enjoy parks and public places without feeling uneasy about having to navigate dogs. Most owners say, 'Oh he's just being playful without considering emotionally supporting the person trying to overcome the concern of a supposedly friendly dog dashing at them. Educating owners to have their dogs sit or heel while a person is passing is only manners. I have been put off visiting Orakei Basin Walkway and Waiaatarua as owners let their dogs roam on long leashes or off leash and I felt very unsafe. People's concerns are secondary to dogs right it seems. This needs to be taken into consideration- Dog Training is essential
5832	I don't know	I don't even know what this means. I can't seem to find anywhere that actually states what the corrections will be. It just takes me to the 2019 policy
KAIPĀTIKI LOCAL BOARD		
254	Support	Would be a good thing to clarify dog access areas and times.
289	Do not support	There are too many off leash dog areas. I no longer go to any off leash dog beaches. I am fed up with entitled dog owners who say their dogs wont bite you , the dog poo not picked up, the dogs weeing all over the sand where children go to play. Takapuna beach used to be great now its just covered with dogs. My local beach Charcoal Bay has multiple dogs running around. Late last year one member of the public was badly bitten and had to go into the water to get the dog to let go. The owner of the dog gave a false name and phone number.
1199	Support	Depends on what is being corrected and whether it's in dogs favour.
1679	Do not support	who is determining what is unclear or an error - that sounds like fancy words for a rule change by stealth
5455	I don't know	What errors you have not notified by print
5849	I don't know	Would depend on the "errors". Simply proposing support for or against 'corrects' without stating what is going to be corrected is too vague and does not mean anything
6092	Support	Correcting errors is a positive step, but any corrections should be reviewed with community input to ensure they accurately reflect on-the-ground realities for dog owners.
MĀNGERE-ŌTĀHUHU LOCAL BOARD		
590	I don't know	I need to know what the "errors" are

Sub #	Q2G Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2G Tell us why
2150	Support	Same as above Its hard to know where and where dogs can/cannot access. So much conflicting information on the internet.
4302	I don't know	There is not enough information on Policy Schedule 2.
6024	Support	Correction only, not used as an opportunity to change covertly
MANUREWA LOCAL BOARD		
215	Support	Have wording in many language as possible, With simple picture/sign with it to help people understand better
3449	Support	Support the clarification, but where there are errors it should be clear and discussed before errors are fixed. Again the potential there for responsible owners to be penalised.
4166	Support	There shouldn't be errors in the policy in the first place. The amount of money spent by this council on trivial pursuits is astounding. If the council is making mistakes, the taxpayers shouldn't be the ones fronting the bill to fix them. Do better and ensure council members take responsibility.
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.
MAUNGAKIEKIE-TĀMAKI LOCAL BOARD		
639	Do not support	Remove rules

Sub #	Q2G Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2G Tell us why
909	Support	Dogs don't have enough access now. With more buildings going up the dog walks/beaches/parks are getting few and far between and for the amount of dog clubs around it's not fair.
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.
2202	Support	As above
3959	Do not support	Its a sneaky way of changing things without dog owners support
4470	Do not support	Why are there errors? Do we support errors? What is this question. Do not support.
ŌRĀKEI LOCAL BOARD		
519	Support	Correct your rules. It's high time they should be consequences for all this. Even schools and yirr council people when called to complain say - people know nothing will happen to them so they disobey. Putting signs and rules is NOT ENOUGH when no one will follow or obey
610	I don't know	Give me an example of an error.
643	Support	Again I don't even know what this means, so I would like to understand it better.
818	Do not support	Why in the world would you "clarify" an error. Just correct it...or if possible don't make the error in the first place.
952	Support	Want to have input into it rather than leave the council to make the decision.
1128	Support	Fix the errors. Not sure I would support more restrictions.
1421	Support	Same as earlier - Clarity and being error free is always good - that being said access rules should generally be permissive rather than restrictive. Generally all areas should allow dogs on lead, many areas should be allowed off lead on control and it should be the exception where this is restricted not a norm.

Sub #	Q2G Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2G Tell us why
1905	Do not support	clarifications need to increase off leash dog exercise areas. the proposed changes only decrease where they can exercise leading to more problems. the off leash dog exercise areas need to have more leniency for dog owners, more hours to exercise dogs when the areas are not in use, such as sports fields and beaches, when they are empty dogs should be able to exercise off leash on them. Increase the dog access areas in the local board areas, multiple local boards have no dog exercise areas - this needs to increase not decrease. make more areas where dogs can exercise off leash. clarifications should not lead to more restrictions. dogs need more room to exercise so they are not all boxed into two parks where they are allowed.
2906	I don't know	I am not familiar with this
3107	Do not support	The change is based on a redundant 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 mastif 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 times. Things to do: 1. Provide better support to responsible
3358	I don't know	You'll have to explain that to me, I don't understand the question.

Sub #	Q2G Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2G Tell us why
3753	Do not support	I do not know what errors need to be corrected in the policy or what clarifications need to be made. If there are obvious errors without a change to rules and policy, then it is common sense to make the corrections and notify the public. I support restricting dog & human access to sensitive wildlife/nesting areas/forest rehabilitation. I do not support changing the policy to further limit community dog access to public green spaces, including sports fields when not in use. Dogs and their owners should always have access to public sports fields when not in use and it is safe to do so. These grounds are often open fields that offer multiple uses for its residents' use, including exercise with your dog, and dog training exercises. All residents need to take full responsibility for their time in the parks and public spaces, including proper disposal of cups and drink bottles (often discarded and left on the playing fields), food and containers, and cleaning up after dogs. Recycling containers should be placed in every park, with incentives, and information to encourage people to dispose of trash correctly. Bins overflow with recyclables after sporting events, food is strewn about, and rats are evident. Further, discarding bones of any type should be outlawed. This is a serious issue in Mission Bay/Kohi/St. Heliers beaches and Madills Farm. In addition to being a public health issue, many dogs get sick, injured, or die from eating bones discarded by humans. Instead of dividing the community and pitting dog owners against non-dog owners, Council should re-direct their funds and resources to bring communities together
4117	Do not support	Not sure what the Council is saying here.
4419	I don't know	For example Fenton Cirecus in Orakei has a large grass area where dog owners meet and balls are thrown, many residents love this area but there are outdated dog on lead signs, how on earth would a round grass area be used if a dog has to be on a lead to chase a ball. Things like this should be fixed. Desley is a local, chat to her she can see some common sense
4570	Do not support	I do nto agree with applying a blanket ban on digs on sports fields as the drastic impact on Madills Farm has a significant impact on the usage of our Reserve.
5520	Do not support	Well, what's the error? Will it benefit the dog? Need more info here.
6185	Do not support	Dog access is so bery limited already. Don't change anything just manage those who break the rules by fining them.
6217	Do not support	as per previous comment what you use the word "clarify" while you actually mean change, that is not a fair process. I want the park off leash access to continue as it is.

Sub #	Q2G Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2G Tell us why
6456	Do not support	There is no actual evidence in the bylaw consultation document that dog walking off or on leash has any impact on sports grounds or the health and safety of its users. Or put another way ...The bylaw significantly reduces access for dog owners and there's no evidence that a dog restriction will create any benefit to the sports grounds or its users.
6566	Support	Apart from understandable restrictions to access on sports fields and surrounding playgrounds, it seems a shame that the few owners who do not pick up droppings from their dogs are disenfranchising the considerate others. For the sake of their mental and physical health, dogs need to be socialised and exercised, ie they need to run. Happiness for a dog is a good run with or without doggie companions, and then the bliss of relaxing with their family.
6596	Do not support	As noted above the policy appears a god fit and could in fact be relaxed
6787	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' are merely statements of what is happening already, and in many cases completely wrong interpretation of council own survey - eg coucil findings interpreted survey results on the 'right to access' question as being LOW "agreement was low for the statements dog owners have the right to use public places" there was extremely HIGH majority support for dog access with 81% agreed 'places for dog should be easy to acces and enjoyable' and 68% believe "dog owners have the right to use public places" despite only 42% of respondants being dog owners! Only 12% actually disagreed with that statement 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 works 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!
ŌTARA-PAPATOETOE LOCAL BOARD		
2530	Support	ALL DOGS TO BE ON LEASH
6389	Support	There needs to be more access to parks and areas for walking dog both on leash and off leash.
6691	Support	a) if it benefits responsive dog owner and dog(s)

Sub #	Q2G Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2G Tell us why
PAPAKURA LOCAL BOARD		
1305	Support	Dog access rules is important for me as a dog owner, ensuring dogs have places for them to exercise off leash and socialize
2109	Support	Access should be given to ALL areas but control requirements should be made clear and enforced.
4455	Support	Policy should allow good dog people to take dogs out in the community. If they aren't good people they shouldn't be allowed to keep dogs and this should be enforced. Council and spca are not good at looking after dogs or enforcement of rules for bad people with dogs
4619	Do not support	Find other ways to generate revenue
6461	Support	Clarification is essential. People may not understand that there are errors in the policy document, and it is hard to follow a policy correctly when there are errors in it.
PUKETĀPAPA LOCAL BOARD		
2460	Do not support	I do not support this proposal to clarify or correct errors in Schedule 2 because it is predicated on the same flawed premises underlying the other proposed changes regarding dog access rules. Rather than merely adjusting or clarifying details, the Council should address the fundamental issues with the existing and proposed restrictions, which lack robust evidence and fail to balance the needs of responsible dog owners.
2489	Do not support	I don't agree with discussing details like this when the main issues with dog access rules haven't been solved. Tinkering with details doesn't address the lack of solid proof for these restrictions, nor does it respect owners who handle their dogs responsibly.
4076	Do not support	I believe there is nothing wrong with the rules as they are
4391	I don't know	You are removing off leash dog areas in central Auckland specifically Monte Cecilia Park and Onehunga Bay Dog Park. We exercise on sports fields because 1. they are flat, there are no holes and our dogs are not going to be injured. 2. They are flat and you can throw the ball for the dog to fetch and get exercise with. 3. They are flat and are easy to access for those of us with mobility issues. There are days when I cannot walk well and need to park close to an exercise area. Why are dog owners treated like second class citizens? Why are you penalizing us and our dogs. They deserve decent land to run on and we deserve easy access and good paths that are not gravel. Onehunga Bay Park is the best for me because it is paved and I will not trip on the pathway. There is flat ground for the dogs to chase each other or play ball. I don't want dog areas that are on sides of mountains, that are rocky, or have holes in the ground or are difficult in general to get at.

Sub #	Q2G Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2G Tell us why
4436	Support	There certainly needs to be clarity as to where you can or can't take your dog. It should be easier to access information and there should be more effort given to ensuring all dog owners are aware of local access rules. Perhaps more education/information provided via dog registration or at points of dog adoption like pounds. Some sort of dog owners guide could be produced, outlining rules and giving links as to where to find more information.
6201	Do not support	It is abhorrent that a 'bylaw' delegates everything to a 'policy which can be changed without consultation. In reality, the proposed bylaw often is "the policy on dogs is the bylaw". Also, it is not clearer. "The owner of any dog (including ..) may take that dog under control off a leash in a ..." packs *far* too many rules and conditions into a single sentence. Using the phrase "provided that dog is kept under control" (older text) stresses that kept under control is more important. Also, combining into a single sentence makes it difficult to reference in a court of law - which is important. It is also very silly to write "dangerous dog" in lower case, as "Dangerous Dog" is a legal term in the context of legislation. It is important that attention is drawn to terms that have specific interpretations, and using Title Case helps reinforce that.. I would suggest rewriting in the style of true legislation, such as: Owners of dogs may take that dog off leash, provided: (1) The dog is under control, and (2) The dog is in an area designated as a dog exercise area by the Policy on Dogs 20xx, and (3) The dog is either (a) not a Dangerous Dog or (b) is muzzled. Likewise, using "policy on dogs" instead of Policy on Dogs underplays how important that document is. Removing the year likewise suggests it can be changed on a whim.

Sub #	Q2G Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2G Tell us why
6267	Do not support	We are passionate about our communities, our parks, other dog owners and non dog owners alike. We are concerned about what is happening at Monte Cecilia Park – and that is important. My biggest concern is the proposed change to the overall objective of the policy, from being very supportive of dogs as a part of our society, to being viewed as more of a 'nuisance'. If these changes go through, I see this as the thin end of a wedge that will drive a continuous degradation of how dogs are perceived in the eyes of Policymakers in New Zealand. The current (2019) Policy and by-law state one of the key objectives of the policy to “maintain opportunities for owners to take their dogs to public places”. The proposal is to change this wording to very negative words about dogs that assumes they are a ‘danger and distress, a nuisance, cause damage’ and that there is an expected or “inherent conflict between dog owners” and the rest of society! This is not the case - especially not in Monte Cecilia Park. Overall, the proposals are to bring in new significant restrictions to dog access rules at 64 parks across Auckland. Council is proposing to introduce these changes as what they refer to as merely ‘updating and clarifying’ some rules, but what it is actually proposing is a major restructure/redirection of the Policy, introducing restrictions and reductions on dog walking and in particular off-leash exercise areas.
RODNEY LOCAL BOARD		
1869	Support	Better signage
2828	Support	Ensure that all users of council facilities are aware of the rules concerning dog walking but again ensure that a "one size fits all" approach is not used for dog walking. Ensure that each area is looked at individually
3343	Support	Errors must be corrected and correct changes put in place in the best interest of dogs and owners.
3526	Do not support	Already quite limited beach hours for dogs.
4084	I don't know	Statement unclear. I don't understand what this is asking.
4311	I don't know	Vague again .. what rules ?? Transparency plse
4821	I don't know	
		What does Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules mean?
5260	Do not support	Refer above, people dont read this stuff...money wasting exercise.

Sub #	Q2G Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2G Tell us why
5275	Support	Obviously wildlife must be protected. Bigger signs and more policing so the morons who wreck things for everyone are kept under control.
5437	Do not support	Forestry beach has had dog access rules and slowly Auckland Council has been removing access to other beaches. Reducing access results in concentration of dogs which creates far wider problems.
5440	Do not support	Also does not say what I am or am not supporting
6470	Support	Provided the solution is sensible and effective and not just simple.
6578	Do not support	Rules are being set by unfriendly dog people a small minority is the problem and your rules effect everyone
UPPER HARBOUR LOCAL BOARD		
846	Support	I support correcting these. But why do you think you need to ask such a silly question?
1218	I don't know	Bring the cats regulations!!! The cats must be registered, chipped, not allowed to wonder around without owners. Example: a cat came to our property, attacked 2 our dogs. One dog almost died, we paid over \$2000 of excess insurance costs for surgery and hospitalisation. No way to even find whose the cat was, why it was in our enclosed backyard.
1363	Do not support	I have a feeling, or an educated assumption, that this will allow council to correct mistakes by creating further rules and restrictions for dog access....we are already limited on where we can take them, please don't make it harder
1637	Support	I'd like to ensure that the rules are workable, for the dogs, their owners and the other people impacted
WAIHEKE LOCAL BOARD		
4734	Support	Dogs should be allowed at certain beaches all year round
4893	Support	THE RULE ABOUT DOGS THAT ARE IN SEASON CANNOT ENTER A PUBLIC PLACE SHOULD BE REMOVED. TOO FAR REACHING
WAITĀKERE RANGES LOCAL BOARD		
506	Support	THAT
523	Do not support	Removal of unwanted abd un needed restrictions will take care of this.
1930	Support	There shouldn't be errors in the policy if you want people to know where they can and can't take their dogs. As dog owners we can be fined if we are in the wrong place and yet your policy is not accurate.
3639	Support	To have the opportunity to challenge rules that I don't agree with.
4732	Support	Have prepared a paper which will be sent by email

Sub #	Q2G Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2G Tell us why
4827	Do not support	All you are doing is removing more and more opportunities for dogs to exercise freely and off-leash; restricting the significant enjoyment people get from walking with their dogs in parks and on beaches. This planet is meant for more than just people. People litter; people fights; people pollute - people cause more injuries; leave more "*****" around than dogs and behave worse than dogs. We don't restrict there use of parks and beaches. Who are you to restrict me to "pocket handkerchief" size areas to enjoy and exercise dogs. All you are going to do is cause more problems by condensing people and animals into smaller and smaller areas. Please - just stop.
6447	Do not support	This is a tactic to erode dig owning rights
WAITEMATĀ LOCAL BOARD		
366	I don't know	I'm sorry, but I did not see the different policies clearly. I did miss some of the available information. I will make another submission if the info is available.
560	Support	I support error correction
1474	Support	access rules are fine to have but don't take away on-leash access to areas - remove the use of long-leads must be standard length leads and problems is solved. owner responsibility
2184	Do not support	Clarify should already be in this feedback not assuming we already know what you want to clarify. Why don't you already have it in writing so we can make feedback but you are giving vague questions are misleading
2625	Support	Auckland council website is somewhat confusing as to dig access rules for specific parks and beaches
3851	Do not support	This question is too limited to provide comprehensive feedback - as there are so many parks and public spaces outlined in this section!! I would like to see better rules in Auckland Domain - as there are now HUNDREDS of dogs running around the park off lease throughout the day and night, including the sportsgrounds. There is ZERO enforcement in this park and things have got totally out of control. It's not unusual to see dogs fighting each other or becoming aggressive due to the high numbers of people there now walking/running dogs across the fields and all around the visitor attractions in the park.
5964	Do not support	DOGS NEED SPACE TO RUN, TO INTERACT WITH OTHER DOGS IN AN OPEN SPACE WHERE THEY CAN RUN! You can't cut that access from dogs most dogs are more aggressive on leash too! Give dogs space to enrich there minds, smell things and be free the issue isn't the dog parks it's the ROAMING DANGEROUS DOGS
6182	Do not support	Clarifying sounds like 'change' Any change should be made clear and be put to consultation
WHAU LOCAL BOARD		
2455	Support	I want to understand whats being altered

Sub #	Q2G Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2G Tell us why
3394	Do not support	Dear Auckland Council, I am writing to formally express my strong disagreement with the recent decision to reduce off-leash dog areas, including the changes affecting Monte Cecilia Park. While I understand the need for balanced public spaces, I believe this decision unfairly restricts responsible dog owners and creates unintended negative consequences for both people and animals. Auckland already has a limited number of spaces where dogs can run freely, while there are abundant areas where people can enjoy outdoor activities without dogs. With the increasing number of dog owners in the city, reducing off-leash areas will lead to overcrowding in the remaining parks, increasing the likelihood of conflicts between dogs and people. A higher concentration of dogs in fewer locations can contribute to more incidents, despite the best efforts of responsible owners. Additionally, many people may simply choose to ignore these new restrictions, allowing their dogs off-leash in prohibited areas. This is not due to a lack of care, but rather practicality—many owners rely on these spaces for their dogs' physical and mental well-being. A sudden reduction in off-leash areas will likely lead to more rule-breaking rather than increased safety, creating more issues for enforcement. Furthermore, I am frustrated by the council's focus on minor issues, such as updating guidance on picking up dog feces, while ignoring the root cause of the problem. The removal of rubbish bins from parks has directly led to an increase in waste left behind. Instead of implementing more controls on dog owners, I urge the council to reinstate rubbish bins, making it easier for people to properly dispose of waste.
4025	Do not support	First Clarity - then later change
4727	Support	I support the intention but would like to see some locations favour dogs and dog owners. It is important for local borads to provide a large open, green space for everyone to socialize, play and run off leash freely. This creates a harmonious balance between all dogs and owners. If the only place to walk your dog between 10 - 5pm is on ashphalt - that is terrible for your poor dogs paws during summer!
5023	Do not support	It's clear enough as it is and this gives the Council the chance to change existig access for dogs, either on-leash or off. The whole debate about this dog business came about because of roaming dogs and dog walkers. Let's keep the focus on that.
UNDECLARED LOCAL BOARD		

Sub #	Q2G Clarify or correct errors in Policy Schedule 2: Dog access rules	Q2G Tell us why
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.
2584	Do not support	You are not clarifying rules. You are restricting more access and causing more confusion. Redraft the changes.
4150	I don't know	Make things simple and lawful. Don't make up rules that further restrict good dog owners from being able to exercise their dogs.
5514	I don't know	First identify what are the errors rather than pointing out making the corrections already. Don't be sneaky.
5738	Support	It would be good to clarify the rules, but I don't believe they need to be more restrictive.
5884	Support	Less noise and mistakes make it easier to follow along with rules.