

**TAUPŌ DISTRICT COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY DISTRICT DOG CONTROL COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, LEVEL 1, 67 HOROMĀTANGI STREET, TAUPŌ
ON THURSDAY, 28 MAY 2026 AT 11.45AM**

PRESENT: Cr Kevin Taylor (in the Chair), Cr Christine Rankin, Cr Hope Woodward
IN ATTENDANCE: Environmental Services Manager, Compliance and Regulatory Manager, Senior Compliance Officer, Compliance Officer, Team Leader Communication, Committee Advisor

MEDIA AND PUBLIC: 1 member of the public

1 KARAKIA

2 WHAKAPĀHA | APOLOGIES

DDC202605/01 RESOLUTION

Moved: Cr Kevin Taylor
Seconded: Cr Hope Woodward

That apologies from Mayor John Funnell be received and accepted.

CARRIED

Note: All members present at the District Dog Control Committee meeting voted in favour of resolution DDC202605/01 above.

3 NGĀ WHAKAPĀNGA TUKITUKI | CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil

4 WHAKAMANATANGA O NGĀ MENETI | CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 ORDINARY DISTRICT DOG CONTROL COMMITTEE MEETING - 30 APRIL 2026

The minutes were amended in the following manner:

Cr Woodward had raised concerns of incorrect or misleading risk factors ticked regarding the classification for Roxy. She also disagreed that Roxy had started the attack.

DDC202605/02 RESOLUTION

Moved: Cr Hope Woodward
Seconded: Cr Kevin Taylor

That the minutes of the District Dog Control Committee meeting held on Thursday 30 April 2026 be approved and adopted as a true and correct record, as amended.

CARRIED

Note: All members present at the District Dog Control Committee meeting voted in favour of resolution DDC202605/02 above.

5 NGĀ KAUPAPA HERE ME NGĀ WHAKATAUNGA | POLICY AND DECISION MAKING

5.1 OBJECTION TO MENACING CLASSIFICATION - EMMAUS 255922

The Chair explained the process for the hearing and said the Committee had read through all the information provided including the objection. The Committee would hear from compliance and the objector. He explained there were four things the Committee had to take into account under the Dog Control Act 1996 when making a decision, these were evidence of classification, any steps the owner had taken to prevent any more harm to animals or humans, reason for objection and any other relevant matters.

The Compliance and Regulatory Manager explained the purpose of section 33A(1)(b)(i) of the Dog Control Act 1996 was to manage risk before a serious incident occurred. He explained it was about the threat from the dog and reducing that risk, it was not about punishing the owner.

The Senior Compliance Officer provided a summary of the incident in March 2026. They deemed Emmaus as a risk to other dogs and humans under section 33A(1)(b)(i). He explained that after a property inspection, the fencing on the kennel was not completed properly, the back section of the property was fenced however Emmaus was not always in the contained area and had access to the road.

In answer to questions, the following was clarified:

- Compliance had tried to communicate with a witness to the incident however they could not get in contact with them.
- It was not uncommon for there to be differing views on the same incident however it was the Committee's job to evaluate the evidence provided and make a decision.
- The injuries to the victim dog Harry's owner's hands could have been from Emmaus or from his own dog during the incident which was not uncommon however it was hard to say without witnessing the incident.
- Regarding the puncture wounds on page 34 of the agenda, dogs typically do a grip and grab which these injuries looked consistent with.
- Under schedule 4 of the Act, any dog that was a pitbull breed was considered a dangerous dog. It appeared that Emmaus had some pitbull breed.
- At the time of the incident Emmaus was not registered.
- Harry was a miniature cross schnauzer.

The dog owner believed the incident showed a brief lapse in control. She explained that Emmaus attended doggy daycare for two weeks at the time. She also built the kennel for her to keep her safe. When she became aware of the incident she took it very seriously, she took Emmaus around other dogs in a controlled environment to understand her behaviour, she showed no sign of aggression to other dogs. She also purchased a muzzle for walks. On page 26 of the agenda, she explained she had concerns regarding statements made in points 4, 5, 7 and 8 because from what she had been told by her partner, Emmaus had gone and sniffed Harry, Harry then bit her on the nose and Emmaus reacted. She thought the reports differed and she understood when emotions were high this could happen. She believed that Emmaus being a large breed dog and Harry being smaller should be taken into account because it would impact how hurt Harry got. She felt Emmaus showed restraint. She believed Emmaus should not be at fault for the marks caused to Harry's owner's hands when trying to break up the dog attack. She explained she would house Emmaus in her kennel and she was happy to muzzle her. She asked the Committee that Emmaus' history of temperament be taken into consideration, she had been around other dogs and kids her whole life with no issues.

In answer to questions, the dog owner clarified the following:

- There was fencing at the back of the property and Emmaus was kept there unless she was going for a walk by which she would always be on lead and muzzled.
- Adding additional fencing and a gate to the property was discussed.
- She had been in Hamilton studying and had Emmaus living in the Taupō District full time.
- Emmaus was not registered the day of the incident but once it happened, they got her registered. She was two years old and had previously been registered but it had slipped her mind.
- Emmaus was not a pitbull breed and she had the documentation showing her breed which was a purebred American Bully.
- She was part of the Apex Working Dogs club and there were people in the club who worked with

behaviour of dogs.

- If she felt that Emmaus was dangerous, she would take that very seriously.

The dog owner provided extra documents to the Committee showing breed certification (A3950330) and her written statement (A3950327), which the Chair explained would be added to the minutes but not the file.

At 12.36pm, the Committee moved to go into confidence and deliberated. The Committee moved out of confidence at 12.51pm and re-entered the Council Chamber.

The Chair summarised the hearing and explained they felt the injuries to Harry’s dog owner’s hands were likely caused by his own dog during the incident. He noted that Emmaus’ owner had built a substantial kennel and also purchased a muzzle, he advised that she needed to be registered moving forward. Emmaus had no prior history of incidents and had been around other dogs and kids her whole life. She did show a degree of restraint by not killing Harry however it was noted that she had to be choked until she passed out so she would let go of Harry.

The Committee then voted on the resolution.

DDC202605/03 RESOLUTION

Moved: Cr Kevin Taylor
 Seconded: Cr Hope Woodward

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

I move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject matter of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution	Plain English reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter
<p>Agenda Item No: 5.1 Objection to menacing classification – Emmaus 255922</p>	<p>Section 7(2)(a) - the withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons</p>	<p>Section 48(1)(a)(i)- the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 7</p>	<p>The Committee needs to deliberate in private and will provide a summary of decisions when the meeting moves out of public excluded.</p>

CARRIED

Note: All members present at the District Dog Control Committee meeting voted in favour of resolution DDC202605/03 above.

DDC202605/04 RESOLUTION

Moved: Cr Kevin Taylor
 Seconded: Cr Christine Rankin

That the District Dog Control Committee upholds the menacing dog classification for Emmaus.

In Favour: Cr Kevin Taylor, Cr Christine Rankin

Against: Cr Hope Woodward

CARRIED

6 NGĀ KŌRERO TŪMATAITI | CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS

Nil

The meeting closed at 12.57pm.

The minutes of this meeting were confirmed at the Ordinary District Dog Control Committee Meeting held on 21 July 2026.

.....
CHAIRPERSON