



**I give notice that  
an Ordinary Meeting of District Dog Control Committee will be held on:**

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Thursday, 30 April 2026</b>
<b>Time:</b>	<b>10.00am</b>
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Council Chamber Level 1, 67 Horomātangi Street Taupō</b>

# **AGENDA**

## **MEMBERSHIP**

**Chairperson** Cr Kevin Taylor

**Deputy Chairperson**

**Members** Cr Christine Rankin  
Mayor John Funnell  
Cr Hope Woodward

**Quorum** 3

**Julie Gardyne  
Chief Executive**

### **Auditory Announcement**

Please note that one of today's meeting participants has hearing loss. To support clear communication, please use the microphones, speak clearly, and keep your mouth visible to assist with lip-reading.

### **Reports Not Council Policy**

The reports included in this agenda are provided for consideration only and do not represent Council policy unless or until they are formally adopted. If you require further information about any report, please contact the Chief Executive, the Chairperson, or the Deputy Chairperson.

### **Public Forum**

Members of the public are welcome to address the Council or committee during the public forum at the start of the meeting. To participate, please complete the public forum request form available on Council's website by 4.00pm on the day prior to the meeting.

### **Livestreaming and Recording**

Meetings held in the Council Chamber are livestreamed on Council's YouTube channel, and recordings are uploaded shortly after the meeting.

**Karakia Timatanga** – opening prayer gifted by Iraia Bailey of Ngāti Tūwharetoa to Taupō District Council

Tuia ki te mauri o te whenua	Connect to the life essence of the land
Tuia ki te mana o te tangata	Connect and respect to all
Tuia ki te pono, te aroha	Be honest and compassionate
Kia piki, kia eke	(As we seek) to improve, to exceed
Ki te taumata	Expectations
Hui e, Tāiki e	To aim/reach for the summit
	(As we) come together

**Karakia Whakamutunga** – closing prayer gifted by Iraia Bailey of Ngāti Tūwharetoa to Taupō District Council

Unuhia te rito o tēnei hui	Remove any angst/stress that may have arisen during this gathering
Kia wātea i runga	To be free of anything that impacts your wellbeing
Kia wātea i raro	
Aro ki te tika	That we will act with integrity
Aro ki te pae	As we pursue our goals
Hui e, Tāiki e!	(As we) come together

## Order Of Business

- 1 Karakia
- 2 Whakapāha | Apologies
- 3 Ngā Whakapānga Tukituki | Conflicts of Interest
- 4 Whakamanatanga O Ngā Meneti | Confirmation of Minutes  
Nil
- 5 Ngā Kaupapa Here Me Ngā Whakataunga | Policy and Decision Making
  - 5.1 Objection to Menacing Classification- Jonah 256441 .....4
  - 5.2 Objection to Menacing Classification - Roxy 257286 .....9
- 6 Ngā Kōrero Tūmataiti | Confidential Business  
Nil

**5.1 OBJECTION TO MENACING CLASSIFICATION- JONAH 256441**

**Author:** Cameron Tait, Compliance and Regulatory Manager

**Authorised by:** Jessica Sparks, Environmental Services Manager

**TE PŪTAKE | PURPOSE**

This item is presented to the committee for consideration of whether to uphold or rescind the menacing dog classification issued for “Jonah,” following an objection lodged by the dog’s owner.

**WHAKARĀPOPOTOTANGA MATUA | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Officers are seeking the District Dog Control Committee’s decision on whether to uphold or rescind the menacing classification issued to “Jonah,” a male American Bulldog, following an objection from his owner under Section 33B of the Dog Control Act 1996.

The classification was issued on 21 July 2025 after an incident on 16 May 2025 in which a dog, tethered to its property was attacked by Jonah who was roaming at the time. As a result, the victim dog sustained a laceration and puncture wounds which required treatment from a veterinarian.

Under the Act, a menacing classification is applied where a dog’s behaviour poses a threat to people, animals, or wildlife. The classification imposes enforceable obligations on the owner, including muzzling the dog in public, keeping it under control at all times, and desexing it. Breaches may result in infringements, seizure, or prosecution.

The owner has objected to the classification and no further incidents have been reported since.

Two options are available:

1. **Rescind** – removes the restrictions but may expose the public to future risk and criticism of Council’s preventative measures.
2. **Uphold** – reinforces Council’s commitment to public safety and responsible dog ownership but places ongoing restrictions on the owner.

Given the circumstances, the Compliance team recommends upholding the classification. This aligns with the Dog Control Act 1996 and the Taupō District Council Dog Control Policy objectives to minimise danger, distress, and nuisance caused by dogs, and to protect public safety.

**NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That the District Dog Control Committee upholds the menacing dog classification for Jonah

**TE WHAKAMAHUKI | BACKGROUND**

The proposal has not been presented previously.

The matter arises from a report received by the Council Compliance team regarding an incident in which a dog was attacked by another dog while being tethered on its property in Te Takinga St, Tūrangi at approximately 12.00pm on Friday, 16 May 2025. According to the vet report provided, the victim dog sustained a ten-centimetre laceration on his left-hand side lip, two teeth punctures holes in his left-hand side gum, and a puncture wound above his right eye.

This incident is a result of “Jonah” and two other dogs pushing through the front gate of their property and roaming. All three dogs are owned by the objector.

After the investigation was completed by the Compliance Officer it was then reviewed by the Senior Compliance Officer. After this review, a recommendation was made to the Compliance and Regulatory Manager that Jonah be classified as menacing under s33A(1)(b)(i) of the Dog Control Act 1996 and that the dog owner receive an infringement for each dog under s52A of the Dog Control Act 1996. The recommendation was adopted by the Compliance and Regulatory Manager and Jonah was classified Menacing on the 21<sup>st</sup> of July 2025.

The dog owner has formally objected to the proposed classification of Jonah as a menacing dog under the Dog Control Act 1996.

## **NGĀ KÖRERORERO | DISCUSSION**

### **Statutory Framework – Section 33A and 33B of the Dog Control Act 1996**

The proposal has been evaluated with regards to a range of legislation. The key legislation applicable to the proposal is the Dog Control Act 1996, in particular section 33B – Objection to classification of dog under section 33A:

- (1) If a dog is classified under section 33A as a menacing dog the owner –
  - (a) May, within 14 days of receiving notice of the classification, object in writing to the territorial authority in regard to the classification; and
  - (b) Has the right to be heard in support of the objection.
- (2) The territorial authority considering an objection under subsection (1) may uphold or rescind the classification, and in making its determination must have regard to –
  - (a) The evidence which formed the basis for the classification; and
  - (b) Any steps taken by the owner to prevent any threat to the safety of persons or animals; and
  - (c) The matter relied on in support of the objection; and
  - (d) Any other relevant matters.
- (3) The territorial authority must, as soon as practicable, give written notice to the owner of –
  - (a) Its determination of the objection; and
  - (b) Reasons for its determination.

The objectives of the Act are to make better provisions for the care and control of dogs. The Act also imposes obligations on dog owners designed to ensure that dogs do not cause a nuisance to any person and do not injure, endanger, or cause distress to any person.

Should a dog, by action or observed behaviour, be considered to pose a threat, then section 33A of the Act allows the territorial authority to classify a dog as menacing, and section 33B allows the owner to object to the classification and to be heard in support of the objection.

### **Evidence which formed the basis for the Classification – Section 33B(2)(a)**

1. On the 16/05/2025, Council received a complaint that a dog attacked another dog.
2. From statements collected from witnesses and the dog owner, the offending dog has been identified as Jonah.
3. Jonah was not under proper control at the time of the attack.

During the investigation, a classification matrix was completed. This is based on the information gained from witness interviews, previous history, and evidence found during the investigation. The matrix forms part of the decision to classify a dog as menacing. In this case the classification matrix from the investigating officer did reflect a dangerous classification for the dog. However, the requirements to classify Jonah as dangerous could not be met as the witness to the attack did not provide a sworn statement attesting to the aggressive behaviour of the dog.

### **Steps taken by the Owner to prevent any threat to the safety of persons or animals – Section 33B(2)(b)**

Since the reported incident, there have been no further reports to Council in relation to Jonah. During the investigation the dog owner was served a direction to improve the front gate so that the dogs would not be able to push through. This was completed by the dog owner.

### **Matters relied upon in support of the objection – Section 33B(2)(c)**

The dog owner has objected to the menacing classification but has not made any comment to Council in support of her objection.

**Other relevant matters – Section 33B(2)(d)**

Given the subjective nature of dog attacks and the process of classifying a dog, each incident although seemingly similar will vary as will the enforcement action/options. The outcome is based on evidence that has been presented, the likelihood of reoccurrence, history of the dog, negligence on the part of the person in control of the dog at the time and ensuring the safety of our community from further harm.

Following a review of the file and in accordance with section 33A of the Dog Control Act 1996, a territorial authority may classify a dog as menacing if it considers the dog may pose a threat to any person, stock, poultry, domestic animal, or protected wildlife due to observed or reported behaviour. It is determined that a menacing classification was both warranted and appropriate in this case.

Based on this information it is considered that there are two options:

1. Rescind the menacing classification; or
2. Uphold the menacing classification

**NGĀ KŌWHIRINGA | OPTIONS**

Analysis of Options

Option 1. Rescind the menacing classification

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council is seen to have a fair and robust process when considering an objection.</li> <li>• The dog owner will not have to abide by the effects of the classification, including not having to muzzle her dog in public.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for another incident with the dog unmuzzled in public.</li> <li>• Should there be another incident, Council may be criticised for not taking all actions available to prevent harm by upholding the menacing classification to ensure the dog is not a threat to the public and other animals.</li> </ul>

Option 2. Uphold the menacing classification

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council is seen to take any incident seriously when it comes to uncontrolled dogs or owners not abiding by their obligations under the Act.</li> <li>• Council is empowered by the Act to take stronger enforcement action for any potential issues in the future of non-compliance by the owner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dog owner will be required to abide by the effects of the classification and muzzle her dog in public.</li> </ul>

Analysis Conclusion:

The preferred option is option 2, that the menacing classification is upheld by the committee.

## NGĀ HĪRAUNGA | CONSIDERATIONS

### Ngā Aronga Pūtea | Financial Considerations

There are no financial considerations.

### Ngā Aronga Ture | Legal Considerations

#### Local Government Act 2002

The matter comes within scope of the Council's lawful powers, including satisfying the purpose statement of [Section 10](#) of the Local Government Act 2002. That section of the Act states that the purpose of local government is (a) to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities; and (b) to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities in the present and for the future. It is considered that social well-being is of relevance to this particular matter.

### Ngā Hīraunga Kaupapa Here | Policy Implications

#### Taupō District Council Dog Control Policy 2021

This policy outlines the legal, financial, and practical consequences a dog owner may face when their dog is involved in an attack on a person, in breach of the policy and the Dog Control Act 1996. These implications apply to all dog owners within the Taupō District.

The policy sets out the following relevant objectives:

**Objective 2** – To minimise the fear of dogs attacking or intimidating people;

**Objective 4** – To minimise danger, distress and nuisance caused by dogs.

Dog owners are expected to take all reasonable steps to prevent harm to others under the policy and the Act.

### Te Kōrero tahi ki te Māori | Māori Engagement

Taupō District Council is committed to meeting its statutory obligations including in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi/Treaty of Waitangi principles, consideration of Māori interests and meaningful engagement with Māori. In meeting its statutory obligations, Council is committed to acting reasonably and in good faith and consistently with a partnership-based approach. Te Tiriti/Treaty principles include but are not limited to active protection of Māori interests, informed decision-making and enabling effective Māori participation in Council processes. This has been taken into account and assessed that matters of importance to Māori are not relevant in this decision.

### Ngā Tūraru | Risks

If the classification is rescinded, there is a risk to Council if Jonah was to be involved in another incident of similar nature. This risk is a reputational one i.e that Council did not use all of its tools to prevent future harm as well as the potential risk to the public.

## TE HIRANGA O TE WHAKATAU, TE TONO RĀNEI | SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL

Council's Significance and Engagement Policy identifies matters to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions.

Officers have undertaken an assessment of the matters in the [Significance and Engagement Policy \(2022\)](#), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of a low degree of significance.

**TE KŌRERO TAHI | ENGAGEMENT**

Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of a low degree of significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

**TE WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO PĀPAHO | COMMUNICATION/MEDIA**

Direct communication has been/will be carried out with affected parties/key stakeholders but no wider communication is considered necessary.

**WHAKAKAPINGA | CONCLUSION**

It is the responsibility of every dog owner to ensure their dog is always properly controlled and in accordance with the Dog Control Act 1996. Owners must understand and meet their obligations—particularly their obligation to prevent their dog from causing harm or nuisance to others through aggressive or uncontrolled behaviour.

This incident occurred as a direct result of Jonah not being under effective control, which allowed the behaviour that led to the complaint.

Based on the available evidence, the Council's Compliance team considers that the classification of Jonah as a menacing dog is justified under the Act. The Act provides that a territorial authority may classify a dog as menacing if the dog's behaviour has been observed or reported as posing a threat to any person, animal, or protected wildlife.

If the dog owner complies with the requirements of the classification and her obligations as a dog owner, the risk of future incidents will be significantly reduced, and the intent of the legislation will be met. However, failure to comply may result in further enforcement action, including financial penalties and additional classifications, as permitted under the Act.

**NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS**

1. 2025-06-10 - Complainants statement REDACTED
2. 2025-06-10- Witness 1 statement - REDACTED
3. 2025-06-10 - Witness 2 Statement - REDACTED
4. 2025-05-16 - Offending dog owner statement - REDACTED
5. Photo's of the victim dog's injuries
6. 2025 05 16- Photo of Jonah (1)
7. 2025 05 16- Photo of Jonah (2)
8. 2025 05 16- Photo of Jonah (3)
9. 2025 05 16- Photo of Jonah (4)
10. 2025 05 16- Photo of Jonah, Zena, and Karma
11. 2025 05 16- Photo of the front gate (1)
12. 2025 05 16- Photo of the front gate (2)
13. 2025 05 16- Photo of the front gate (3)
14. Scene Diagram SR2508830
15. 2025 05 16- Vet bill REDACTED
16. 2025 05 16- Vet Notes REDACTED
17. Dog Owner History- REDACTED
18. SR2508830 REDACTED
19. TDC Dog Classification Evaluation Matrix- SR 2508830- CO 67 REDACTED
20. TDC Dog Classification Evaluation Matrix SR2508830 CO82 REDACTED
21. Summary of facts SR2508830 REDACTED
22. Animal Enforcement - Menacing by Action - Notice of Classification (Sec 33A)
23. Animal Enforcement - Warning Notice - Following Incident (Sec 57 and 57A)
24. Signed delivery of menacing classification

**5.2 OBJECTION TO MENACING CLASSIFICATION - ROXY 257286**

**Author:** Cameron Tait, Compliance and Regulatory Manager

**Authorised by:** Jessica Sparks, Environmental Services Manager

**TE PŪTAKE | PURPOSE**

This item is presented to the District Dog Control Committee for consideration to uphold or rescind the menacing classification issued for the dog "Roxy", following an objection lodged by the dog's owner under section 33B of the Dog Control Act 1996.

**WHAKARĀPOPOTOTANGA MATUA | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Officers seek the committee's decision on whether to uphold or rescind the menacing classification issued to "Roxy", a female Rottweiler owned by Tracy Livingstone.

The classification was issued on 03 March 2026 following an incident that occurred on 17 February 2026 at approximately 1:58 p.m. outside PAK'nSAVE, Taupō, where a member of staff was bitten by "Roxy". The victim sustained a gash to the lower right arm and wrist pain, requiring medical treatment.

At the time of the incident the dog had been tied up unattended outside the supermarket while the owner was shopping inside, leaving the dog without direct supervision in a public area.

Under the Act, a menacing classification is applied where a dog's behaviour poses a threat to people, animals, or wildlife. The classification imposes enforceable obligations on the owner, including muzzling the dog in public, keeping it under control at all times, and desexing it. Breaches may result in infringements, seizure or prosecution. The behaviour demonstrated by "Roxy" satisfies the threshold for classification under section 33A(1)(b)(i) of the Dog Control Act 1996.

The owner has objected to the classification but has not provided supporting reasons or evidence of steps taken to mitigate future risk.

Two options are available:

1. **Rescind** – removes the restrictions but may expose the public to future risk and criticism of Council's preventative measures.
2. **Uphold** – reinforces Council's commitment to public safety and responsible dog ownership and places ongoing restrictions on the owner.

Given the circumstances of the incident and the potential risk to the public, officers recommend that the menacing classification be upheld. This aligns with the Dog Control Act 1996 and the Taupō District Council Dog Control Policy objectives to minimise danger, distress, and nuisance caused by dogs, and to protect public safety.

**NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA | RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That the District Dog Control Committee upholds the menacing classification for Roxy

**TE WHAKAMAHIKI | BACKGROUND**

The proposal has not been presented previously.

The matter arises from a report received by the Council's Compliance Team regarding an incident in which a person was bitten by a dog tethered outside PAK'nSAVE Taupō at approximately 1:58 p.m. on 17 February 2026.

The complainant stated she was returning to work after her break when she encountered a dog tied up outside the supermarket entrance. When she extended her hand towards the dog, it bit her on the lower arm. The injury required treatment at Taupō Medical Centre where the wound was cleaned and a tetanus injection administered.

A witness to the incident confirmed that the dog was tied up outside the store and appeared calm prior to the attack but stood up and bit the victim when she reached down to pat it.

The owner of the dog confirmed that the dog was tied up outside the store on a leash and they entered the supermarket to shop. After the incident the dog then untied the dog and walked to her vehicle with her unleashed dog.

Following investigation and review of the evidence, the enforcement action that was to be carried out included:

- A warning dog incident letter.
- An infringement under section 53 of the Dog Control Act 1996, Failure to keep dog under control
- An infringement under section 20(5) of the Dog Control Act 1996, clause 7 of the Taupō District Council Control of Dogs Bylaw 2021, Offence of failing to leash a dog in public.
- The revocation of the Responsible Dog owner permit if the owner previously held one.
- The classification of dog “Roxy” as a Menacing dog under section 33A(1)(b)(i) of the Dog Control Act 1996.
- Verification that the dog has been neutered by a veterinarian IAW the Menacing classification.

## **NGĀ KŌRERORERO | DISCUSSION**

### **Statutory Framework – Section 33A and 33B of the Dog Control Act 1996**

The key legislation applicable to the proposal is the Dog Control Act 1996, in particular section 33B – Objection to classification of dog under section 33A:

- (1) If a dog is classified under section 33A as a menacing dog the owner –
  - (a) May, within 14 days of receiving notice of the classification, object in writing to the territorial authority in regard to the classification; and
  - (b) Has the right to be heard in support of the objection.
- (2) The territorial authority considering an objection under subsection (1) may uphold or rescind the classification, and in making its determination must have regard to –
  - (a) The evidence which formed the basis for the classification; and
  - (b) Any steps taken by the owner to prevent any threat to the safety of persons or animals; and
  - (c) The matter relied on in support of the objection; and
  - (d) Any other relevant matters.
- (3) The territorial authority must, as soon as practicable, give written notice to the owner of –
  - (a) Its determination of the objection; and
  - (b) Reasons for its determination.

The objectives of the Act are to make better provisions for the care and control of dogs. The Act also imposes obligations on dog owners designed to ensure that dogs do not cause a nuisance to any person and do not injure, endanger, or cause distress to any person.

Should a dog, by action or observed behaviour, be considered to pose a threat, then section 33A of the Act allows the territorial authority to classify a dog as menacing, and section 33B allows the owner to object to the classification and to be heard in support of the objection.

### **Evidence which formed the basis for the Classification – Section 33B(2)(a)**

1. On the 17/02/2026, Council received a complaint that a dog had bitten a staff member at PAKn'SAVE Taupō.
2. The registered dog owner confirmed she tied “Roxy” outside the supermarket while she entered the store to shop. Leaving a dog unattended in a busy public area creates a foreseeable risk of interaction with members of the public.
3. The dog involved in the incident was identified as “Roxy”, a female Rottweiler owned by the objector.

4. The victim was bitten by “Roxy” sustaining wounds to her lower right arm and required medical treatment.
5. In statements provided to Council, a witness confirms that the dog stood up and bit the victim when she reached down to pat the dog.

After completing the investigation, a classification matrix was completed. This is based on the information gained from witness interviews, previous history, and evidence found during the investigation. The matrix forms part of the decision to classify a dog as menacing. In this case the classification matrix from the investigating officer did reflect a menacing classification.

**Steps taken by the Owner to prevent any threat to the safety of persons or animals – Section 33B(2)(b)**

The dog owner stated she would prevent a similar incident occurring again by not stopping at PAKn’SAVE while walking the dog.

While this demonstrates some acknowledgement of the circumstances that led to the incident, the behaviour already demonstrated by the dog indicates that it poses a potential threat if placed in similar circumstances again.

**Matters relied upon in support of the objection – Section 33B(2)(c)**

The dog owner has objected to the menacing classification but has not made any comment to Council in support of her objection.

In correspondence with Council, the dog owner refers to the incident as just a ‘nip’. This characterisation appears to minimise the seriousness of the attack and does not accurately reflect the available evidence.

**Other relevant matters – Section 33B(2)(d)**

Given the subjective nature of dog attacks and the process of classifying a dog, each incident although seemingly similar will vary as will the enforcement action/options. The outcome is based on evidence that has been presented, the likelihood of reoccurrence, history of the dog, negligence on the part of the person in control of the dog at the time and, ensuring the safety of our community from further harm.

Following a review of the file and in accordance with section 33A of the Dog Control Act 1996, a territorial authority may classify a dog as menacing if it considers the dog may pose a threat to any person, stock, poultry, domestic animal, or protected wildlife due to observed or reported behaviour. Because of this it was determined that a menacing classification was both warranted and appropriate in this case.

Based on this information it is considered that there are two options:

1. Rescind the menacing classification; or
2. Uphold the menacing classification

**NGĀ KŌWHIRINGA | OPTIONS**

Analysis of Options

Option 1. Rescind the menacing classification

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council is seen to have a fair and robust process when considering an objection.</li> <li>• The dog owner will not have to abide by the effects of the classification, including not having to muzzle her dog in public.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for another incident with the dog unmuzzled in public.</li> <li>• Should there be another incident, Council may be criticised for not taking all actions available to prevent harm by upholding the menacing classification to ensure the dog is not a threat to the public or other animals.</li> </ul>

Option 2. Uphold the menacing classification

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council is seen to take any incident seriously</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dog owner will be required to abide by the</li> </ul>

<p>when it comes to uncontrolled dogs or owners not abiding by their obligations under the Act.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council can impose stronger enforcement action should further incidents occur</li> </ul>	<p>effects of the classification and muzzle her dog in public.</p>
---	--

Analysis Conclusion:

The preferred option is option 2, that the menacing classification is upheld by the Committee.

**NGĀ HĪRAUNGA | CONSIDERATIONS**

**Ngā Aronga Pūtea | Financial Considerations**

There are no financial considerations.

**Ngā Aronga Ture | Legal Considerations**

Local Government Act 2002

The matter comes within scope of the Council’s lawful powers, including satisfying the purpose statement of [Section 10](#) of the Local Government Act 2002. That section of the Act states that the purpose of local government is (a) to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities; and (b) to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities in the present and for the future. It is considered that social wellbeing is of relevance to this particular matter.

**Ngā Hiraunga Kaupapa Here | Policy Implications**

Taupō District Council Dog Control Policy 2021

This policy outlines the legal, financial, and practical consequences a dog owner may face when their dog is involved in an attack on a person, in breach of the policy and the Dog Control Act 1996. These implications apply to all dog owners within the Taupō District.

The policy sets out the following relevant objectives:

**Objective 2** – To minimise the fear of dogs attacking or intimidating people;

**Objective 4** – To minimise danger, distress and nuisance caused by dogs.

Dog owners are expected to take all reasonable steps to prevent harm to others under the policy and the Act.

**Te Kōrero tahi ki te Māori | Māori Engagement**

Taupō District Council is committed to meeting its statutory obligations including in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi/Treaty of Waitangi principles, consideration of Māori interests and meaningful engagement with Māori. In meeting its statutory obligations, Council is committed to acting reasonably and in good faith and consistently with a partnership-based approach. Te Tiriti/Treaty principles include but are not limited to active protection of Māori interests, informed decision-making and enabling effective Māori participation in Council processes. This has been taken into account and assessed that matters of importance to Māori are not relevant in this decision.

**Ngā Tūraru | Risks**

If the classification is rescinded, there is a risk to Council if Roxy was to be involved in another incident of similar nature. This risk is a reputational one i.e that Council did not use all of its tools to prevent future harm as well as the potential risk to the public.

**TE HIRANGA O TE WHAKATAU, TE TONO RĀNEI | SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL**

Council's Significance and Engagement Policy identifies matters to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions.

Officers have undertaken an assessment of the matters in the [Significance and Engagement Policy \(2022\)](#), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of a low degree of significance.

### **TE KŌRERO TAHI | ENGAGEMENT**

Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of a low degree of significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

### **TE WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO PĀPAHO | COMMUNICATION/MEDIA**

Direct communication has been/will be carried out with affected parties/key stakeholders but no wider communication is considered necessary.

### **WHAKAKAPINGA | CONCLUSION**

It is the responsibility of every dog owner to ensure their dog is always properly controlled and in accordance with the Dog Control Act 1996. Owners must understand and meet their obligations—particularly their obligation to prevent their dog from causing harm or nuisance to others through aggressive or uncontrolled behaviour.

This incident occurred as a direct result of Roxy not being under effective control, which allowed the behaviour that led to the complaint.

Based on the available evidence, the Council's Compliance team considers that the classification of Roxy as a menacing dog is justified under the Act. The Act provides that a territorial authority may classify a dog as menacing if the dog's behaviour has been observed or reported as posing a threat to any person, animal, or protected wildlife.

If the dog owner complies with the requirements of the classification and her obligations as a dog owner, the risk of future incidents will be significantly reduced, and the intent of the legislation will be met. However, failure to comply may result in further enforcement action, including financial penalties and additional classifications, as permitted under the Act.

### **NGĀ TĀPIRIHANGA | ATTACHMENTS**

1. Victim's statement- Redacted
2. Dog Owner Statement- Redacted
3. Witness statement - Redacted
4. Request for service REQ2026-002714
5. Scene diagram REQ2026-002714
6. Photo of Offending dog
7. Photo 1 of 2 Injury
8. Photo 2 of 2 Injury
9. TDC Dog Classification Evaluation Matrix - Investigating Officer
10. TDC Dog Classification Evaluation Matrix - Senior Compliance Officer
11. Dog Attack Investigation review checklist
12. Summary of facts REQ2026-002714
13. Notice of Menacing Classification - Roxy
14. Warning Notice - Following Incident (Sec 57 and 57A)
15. Objection acknowledgement
16. Dog Control Act 1996 s33A
17. Dog Attack Terms of Reference REQ2026-002714
18. TDC Dog Classification decision guide