



te kaunihera ā-rohe o
matamata-piako
district council



ATTACHMENT A - SUBMISSIONS

Submissions received: Fees and Charges

Submission summary

Option 1: Adopt the proposed Fees and Charges - 15 submissions in support (45.5%)
 Option 2: Keep Fees and Charges at the current level - 0 submissions in support
 Option 3: Reduce or remove Fees and Charges - 7 submissions in support (21.2%)
 Option 4: Other - 11 submissions in support (33.3%)

Submissions focused primarily on dog registration fees, the user-pays principle, and concerns about affordability.

Summary staff comment

- 1) Dog registration fees - Staff acknowledge that some dog owners believe that a larger proportion of animal control costs should fall to those owners with problem dogs. MPDC does provide a number of rebates to encourage responsible dog ownership. These rebates can reduce the cost of registration by up to \$80. Overall, the increase to the registration fees is to ensure we continue to cover costs and stay in line with our Revenue and Financing Policy.
- 2) Building consent fees - A number of process issues were raised. Overall staff acknowledge the comments and are focused on continual improvement.
- 3) Efficiency/ Reasonableness of costs - Council went through a robust process to look for cost savings and opportunities to improve efficiency wherever possible. Council has kept increases to rates and fees and charges as low as is possible while still retaining current levels of service and staying within the Revenue and Financing Policy. Council's new Community Outcomes have a focus on improving efficiency and enablement.
- 4) User Pays - Some submitters indicated a preference for fully user pays fees. Currently MPDC's fees are set in line with the Revenue and Financing Policy which determines what Council considers a fair balance between user fees and rates funding of activities. The Revenue and Financing Policy will be reviewed as part of the Long Term Plan and the community will have the opportunity to express their views as part of this process.
- 5) Other matters raised - other matters raised include the removal of urgent LIMs and cemetery drainage, these matters have been addressed below with individual staff comment.

ID	Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
FC - 01	Kristy		Option 3: Reduce or remove Fees and Charges	Why would the council increase fees around dog registration? People are going to stop registration of their pets due to costs. For me I haven't had to use any of the services around dog control yet my fees constantly go up each year.		No	No	Dog registration fees The registration fee has increased to reflect increases in costs and stay within our Revenue and Financing Policy. MPDC does provide a number of rebates to encourage responsible dog ownership which can reduce the cost of registration by up to \$80.
FC - 02	Anonymous		Option 3: Reduce or remove Fees and Charges	dog registration is too expensive for what is offered. No one but the ones who won't pay get any benefits. dog registration has already gone up extensively from 3 years ago. It's not fair. If they go up you'll find many dog breeders will move. We already get nothing for registering our dogs. Not even 1 poop bag. So what are we paying for?	Maybe lessen rates. If you have to reduce your salary in line with everyone else's so we aren't paying you a heavier wage then Maybe do that.	No	No	Dog registration fees The registration fee has increased to reflect increases in costs and stay within our Revenue and Financing Policy. MPDC does provide a number of rebates to encourage responsible dog ownership which can reduce the cost of registration by up to \$80.
FC - 03	G T Sarah		Proposed: Fees and Charges would change to proposed			No	No	
FC - 04	Sreenivasan Ramasamy		Option 4: Other	Do not increase fee or rates.	Council is not thinking about how to maximize efficiency and effectiveness or productivity increase from the current system so they don't increase cost. In the current setup every year cost increase is seen as only way to survive. How far this way of working will be viable?	No	No	Efficiency / reasonableness of costs Council went through a robust process to look for cost savings and opportunities to improve efficiency wherever possible. Council has kept increases to rates and fees and charges as low as is possible while still retaining current levels of service.
FC - 05	Daniel Scelly		Option 4: Other	Increase all fees and charges so all covered by user pays and lower rates instead.	All fees and charges should be 100% user pays, no "topping up" from rates	No	No	User pays Council's Revenue and Financing Policy reviewed alongside the Long Term Plan every three years, sets the split between rates and fees and charges for each service we provide. The fees and charges proposed are in line with this Policy.
FC - 06	Talia		Option 3: Reduce or remove Fees and Charges		Why should good, responsible dog owners be punished for bad dog owners? The bad dog owners who need the council to intervene should pay more. Even better, make it law that all dogs have to be desexed unless they have a breeding licence.	No	No	Dog registration fees The registration fee has increased to reflect increases in costs and stay within our Revenue and Financing Policy. MPDC does provide a number of rebates to encourage responsible dog ownership which can reduce the cost of registration by up to \$80. All dogs that are menacing or dangerous have to be desexed under the Dog Act. The proposed bylaw does reinforce dog control act requirements.

ID	Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
FC - 07	Kevin Stanley	Milestone Homes Matamata	Proposed: Fees and Charges would change to proposed	Attached find submission on behalf of Milestone Homes Matamata Ltd		No	Appendix B, page 2	<p>Building consent fees The submitter refers to Council's Building Consent fees having a commercial fee structure. In fact, the fees are structured to recoup reasonable costs only. In addition, not all the cost of the service is covered by the customer. Council's Revenue and Financing Policy sets a range of 50-90% of costs to be covered by users of the service and 10-50% of costs to be covered by all ratepayers.</p> <p>2. Reliance on Maximum Timeframes Building Consents are often issued near the end of the statutory time period because we are waiting for Planning / Engineering signoff. Staff are currently working on streamlining this process.</p> <p>3. RFIs Council acknowledges issues raised around Requests for Further Information (RFIs). Process changes have been reinforced with staff and contractors to improve the timing and clarity of RFIs, and improvement is expected.</p> <p>4. Out of Town Processors We acknowledge it would be advantageous to use local contractors however we are unable to do so at the present time due to staff shortages.</p> <p>5. Inspection services The legislative requirement is for 80% of inspections to be completed within 3 days. We are currently achieving 100% of inspections within 3 days. We encourage customers to ensure they book in advance to secure the dates they want.</p> <p>7. Impact on construction sector Some delays are caused by insufficient RFI information, and delays in providing the information. The team welcomes customers to get in touch, we will put you in touch with the correct processing officer to discuss and clarify information requirements.</p>
FC - 08	Karl		Proposed: Fees and Charges would change to proposed		Shouldn't rates be based on the service pressures ie if a house has multiple bathrooms and toilets instead of rateable value	No	No	<p>Other The number of bathrooms or toilets is not directly used in the calculation of rates. This information is considered by Council valuers when determining the property's improvement value, which forms part of the overall capital value. The capital value is then used to calculate the General Rate. Residential Water meters are only installed on properties with extraordinary water usage, such as swimming pools.</p>
FC - 09	Carmen		Option 4: Other	the above options dont make sense. however, it should absolutely be user pays. eg. building consent	yes, fully user pays not the 'appropriate share ' Also 4 month/seasonal membership to all pools, if your being consistent across districts.	No	No	<p>User pays Council's Revenue and Financing Policy (RFP) sets the split between rates and fees and charges for each service we provide. The fees and charges proposed are in line with this Policy. There will be an opportunity to provide feedback on the new RFP in March 2027.</p>
FC - 10	Isobel Worley		Proposed: Fees and Charges would change to proposed	Seem reasonable suggestions. Glad swimming pool stays reasonably accessible		No	No	
FC - 11	Tracey Ward		Option 4: Other	No increase in fees and charges to dog owners, we have already had ongoing increases to dog registration. Perhaps more effort into getting non-registered dogs registered rather than passing costs onto those who do the right thing		No	No	<p>Dog registration fees The registration fee has increased to reflect increases in costs and stay within our Revenue and Financing Policy. MPDC does provide a number of rebates to encourage responsible dog ownership which can reduce the cost of registration by up to \$80.</p>
FC - 12	Melissa Flower		Proposed: Fees and Charges would change to proposed			No	No	
FC - 13	Helen		Option 4: Other	Don't increase dog registration fees, instead bill the people who have dog control turn up for their legitimate reason & runaway dogs why should everyone pay for it when it's a handful of people that do it		No	No	<p>Dog registration fees The registration fee has increased to reflect increases in costs and stay within our Revenue and Financing Policy. MPDC does provide a number of rebates to encourage responsible dog ownership which can reduce the cost of registration by up to \$80.</p>

ID	Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
FC - 14	Linda Newton		Option 4: Other	Building consents are already extremely expensive - do they really need to be increased?? You want user pays for dog registration - in that case everything should be fully user pays for fairness and consistency including libraries and swimming pools etc. Rates have increased excessively over the last few years. Why do they need to increase again? I would like Council to adopt some of the Taxpayers Union 100 or more suggestions for reducing costs which it has received from them for more responsible fiscal management to reduce burden to taxpayers. I would also like the Council to withdraw from LGNZ which would save it thousands of dollars a year.	no	Yes	No	<p>Building consent fees The Building Consent fee has increased to reflect increases in costs and stay within our Revenue and Financing Policy.</p> <p>User pays Council's Revenue and Financing Policy (RFP) sets the split between rates and fees and charges for each service we provide. The fees and charges proposed are in line with this Policy. There will be an opportunity to provide feedback on the new RFP in March 2027.</p> <p>Efficiency / reasonableness of costs The rates increase for the 2026-27 year is in line with what was signalled in the Long Term Plan.</p> <p>Council has a new focus on efficiency and enablement to keep costs under control.</p> <p>LGZ provides valuable guidance to staff and elected members on a range of topics, thus helping to support robust decision making.</p>
FC - 15	Karen Sales		Proposed: Fees and Charges would change to proposed		dog registration for over 65 years.. is it possible to give Gold Card members a discount ? Many elderly have little dog companions and are struggling with cost of living.. in fact they feed their doggy first before themselves.	No	No	<p>Dog registration fees The registration fee has increased to reflect increases in costs and stay within our Revenue and Financing Policy. MPDC does provide a number of rebates to encourage responsible dog ownership which can reduce the cost of registration by up to \$80, however Gold Card discounts are not currently being considered.</p>
FC - 16	Lex Grason		Option 4: Other	Reduce dog registration fees. (\$20 a year) We own a dog and get nothing for our registration fee other than a plastic tag. we don't even get the hidatos pill in a piece of meat that used to happen. You talk about the fee's to self fund the dog service. This is a miss-nomer as the only people that need to use the dog control service are the drop kicks that can't look after there dogs. (who probably don't pay there registration anyway). The dog control service should be funded by very high fees for people who can't / won't look after there dogs.	Yes. Reduce all fees and rates and reduce services. Look after Roads, water, waste water and rubbish. The rest of the money sucking crap should be scrapped. and try to get back to a point where we can afford to live.	No	No	<p>Dog registration fees The registration fee has increased to reflect increases in costs and stay within our Revenue and Financing Policy. MPDC does provide a number of rebates to encourage responsible dog ownership which can reduce the cost of registration by up to \$80. There will be an opportunity to provide feedback on Council's priorities for the next ten years during the Long Term Plan consultation in March 2027.</p>
FC - 17	Steve Southall		Proposed: Fees and Charges would change to proposed	It's reasonable that fees reflect the cost of providing services to reduce the burden on ratepayers		No	No	
FC - 18	Denise Wilson		Option 4: Other	How about keeping all fees and charges as they are as no one should need \$200per hour and perhaps learn to budget better with what you already get.	As a very small business owner the fees I pay seem to be excessive for what I receive not only do I have to pay two types of fees but also for an inspection . And I still have to print out all the food safety info myself so. Basically paying over 100 just for access to these. Seems a bit of a ripoff	No	No	<p>Efficiency / reasonableness of costs Increases are to ensure we continue to cover costs and to slightly increase the proportion of costs recovered from users of the service compared to ratepayers in general. MPI levies are only administered by Council, we have no control over what is charged.</p>
FC - 19	Wilma van Orsouw		Option 4: Other	No increase to rates AT ALL. Increase penalties under the dog Control Act for dog owners who are involved in a breach, rather than penalising responsible dog owners by increasing their fees by \$10. In addition, ensure dogs kept at the pound are fed sufficiently and given adequate attention and exercise. Genuine, experienced dog lovers need to be employed in these roles (Animal Control Officers and Kennel Assistants).		Yes	No	<p>Efficiency / reasonableness of costs Council went through a robust process to look for cost savings and opportunities to improve efficiency wherever possible. Council has kept increases to rates and fees and charges as low as is possible while still retaining current levels of service.</p> <p>Dog registration fees Infringements are set by legislation, Council is not able to increase penalties. Animal welfare is a key consideration, supported by trained staff and established care and monitoring processes.</p>
FC - 20	Zammora		Option 3: Reduce or remove Fees and Charges		Many pet owners already face significant costs for food, vet care, and other responsibilities. An extra \$10 for dog registration can be a real burden. Keeping fees low helps make dog ownership more affordable, encourages compliance, and supports the welfare of pets in our community.	No	No	<p>Dog registration fees The registration fee has increased to reflect increases in costs and stay within our Revenue and Financing Policy. MPDC does provide a number of rebates to encourage responsible dog ownership which can reduce the cost of registration by up to \$80.</p>
FC - 21	Nuannang McLean		Option 3: Reduce or remove Fees and Charges			No	No	
FC - 22	Megan PAUL		Option 4: Other		I certainly dont think the cemetery fees should increase when our loved ones dont seem to be guaranteed a dry resting place. THERE IS NO EXCUSE FOR FLOATING IN WATER.Please get it right.	No	No	<p>Cemetery drainage Planning is underway to improve drainage at the cemetery.</p>
FC - 23	Lynnda McLachlan		Option 4: Other	Instead of increasing dog registration fees again, why not increase pound fees and fines to irresponsible dog owners. Why should responsible dog owners subsidize those that cause direct costs to council.	Great to see pool charges are not increasing. Council needs to be more proactive in encouraging families to use the pools.	Yes	No	

ID	Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
FC - 24	Diana Rout		Option 4: Other		Pool fees/charges: Could please consider the charges for children using the pool 3 and under. 3 and under free with a adult entry. Tauranga City Council currently has a policy of: Children under 2yrs free with adult entry Consession Cards: Could the expiry become longer?	No	No	
FC - 25	Steve Greene		Proposed: Fees and Charges would change to proposed			No	No	
FC - 26	Caroline Melville		Proposed: Fees and Charges would change to proposed			No	No	
FC - 27	Wendy Morgan		Proposed: Fees and Charges would change to proposed		I like the adopt a puppy idea but feel all puppies must be deleted before going you their new homes. Desexing is not mentioned anywhere.	No	No	Dog registration fees It is Council's view that desexing is the responsibility of owners. There are also age restrictions for de-sexing.
FC - 28	Ross and Janet Miller		Proposed: Fees and Charges would change to proposed			No	No	
FC - 29	August Law Limited - Evelyn Ryan		Proposed: Fees and Charges would change to proposed		Ideally, Council would continue offering a 3 working day urgent LIM option rather than extending it to a 5 working day option. When vendors and purchasers are trying to get a deal done quickly, they usually calculate their conditions in 5 working day blocks eg. 5, 10, 15 working days. If we can get a 3 working day urgent LIM from Council, then it's feasible to confirm a client's LIM condition within the first 5 working day block. If we can only get a 5 working day urgent LIM, it wouldn't be feasible to confirm a client's condition within that first 5 working day block because we wouldn't be able to order, receive, review and advise a client on it within that timeframe.	No	No	Urgent LIMs While Council acknowledges the inconvenience of no longer offering the urgent LIM, the new requirements to disclose additional natural hazard information mean it is no longer feasible for Council to continue providing this service. The statutory timeframe for issuing a Land Information Memorandum (LIM) is 10 working days. This timeframe is set under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA), which mandates that any person may request a LIM, and the council must respond within this timeframe. MPDC has previously offered an urgent LIM option outside this requirement as a extra level of service, however it is not requirement to provide this service.
FC - 30	Jeremy Mayall	Creative Waikato	Proposed: Fees and Charges would change to proposed	We acknowledge the proposal for no increases to pools and libraries this year. Libraries are an essential service. They contain resources, and spaces which support community wellbeing. Creative Waikato supports the provision of continued and future access to libraries. We commend the council for seeking more consistent fees across venues, and the distinction between commercial and non-commercial use of facilities. We also acknowledge that for some community venues, the non-commercial rate is half the commercial rate, making it more affordable for communities.	Note: our attached submission also refers to the rates remission consultation.	No	Appendix B, page 6	
FC - 31	dave mathews		Option 4: Other	Stop charging unreasonable fees for minor time based jobs like inspecting a pool gate for \$205 Perhaps consider how some inspections can be done remotely- via webcam or various tech	you just create your own revenue stream and we the rate payer continue to be reemed in all directions-eventually a Govt will reign you lot in	No	No	Efficiency / reasonableness of costs The registration fee has increased to reflect increases in costs and stay within our Revenue and Financing Policy.
FC - 32	Sharon Bailey		Proposed: Fees and Charges would change to proposed			No	No	

ID	Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
FC - 33	Isaac McIntyre	Federated Farmers	Option 4: Other			Yes	Appendix B, page 10	<p>Efficiency / reasonableness of costs</p> <p>1) Resource Consents Resource consents are fully user funded. The noted reason for the increase was therefore in error, and should have read, it was to ensure cost recovery.</p> <p>2) Roading The previous fees weren't covering the Engineer's time processing these applications, so the increase is to better cover this. Yes, the \$416 is a fixed fee.</p> <p>3) Inflation Adjusted Fees The fees and charges document outlines where fees have been increased by inflation or by a different amount. Where fees have been increased by more than inflation the reason for the fee increase has been noted.</p> <p>4) Building Consents 1. The definition of "Significantly Exceeds the standard processing time" is when processing takes more than one additional hour above the allocated time. 2. Yes there is an hourly rate for this additional time of \$218 per hour 3. If a building consent is processed within/ under budget, no refund is payable to the applicant.</p> <p>5) Water and Wastewater Detail of water and wastewater fees is included in the Fees and Charges schedule which was available on the website alongside the Statement of Proposal. Only inflation adjustments and a couple of minor corrections were proposed to the current fees.</p> <p>Dog registration fees 3. The registration fee needs to increase across all dogs to ensure we are covering costs and staying within the Revenue and Financing Policy band. 4. No further discounts are planned for this year. This suggestion can be considered for the Long Term Plan 2027-37. 5. There are 321 registered working dog owners. Twenty three of these owners have complaints logged against them in the current year. There are 114 that have a responsible owner licence.</p>

Submissions received: Easter Sunday Trading Policy

Sixty-one submissions were received and one submitter indicated they want to be heard at the Hearing.

Overall feedback received was as follows:

Option 1: Adopt the draft Policy (allowing shops to choose whether to open) – 37 submissions in support (61%)

Option 2: Retain the status quo – 0 submissions in support

Option 3: Revoke the Policy – 20 submissions in support (33%)

Option 4: Other – 4 submissions in support (6%)

Submissions focused on business choice and flexibility, as well as religious observance, family time, and employee wellbeing. The public preferred option is Option 1: adopt the draft Policy.

ID	Submitter name	Option selected:	Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
ESTP - 01	Keith Ferguson	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)		no	no	
ESTP - 02	Keryn Hogan	Option 1		no	no	
ESTP - 03	G T Sarah	Option 1	none	no	no	
ESTP - 04	Benjamin Ross	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)	This is a country with a liberal democratic tradition that respects freedom of religion. Census figures show that only 1/3 of people in the country identify as Christians. Forcing any trading rules on business owners and consumers over the Easter holidays is not justified and the central government should change policy to reflect this. In the absence of action from central government, councils should do what it can to give business owners the option to open over the Easter holidays.	no	no	
ESTP - 05	Brendon John Fiebig	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)	Church and state should be separate so business owners, and general public, should have the freedom to carry on with life as usual free from religious rules and restrictions. Therefore I say keep the current rule to open or shut as desired as a personal choice, not regulated.	no	no	

ID	Submitter name	Option selected:	Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
ESTP - 06	Carol Knowlton	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy	It's sad to think that some owners of businesses which have not opened at Easter in the past in New Zealand have even suggested they want to. The doors of such places have in the past respected their staff and treated them with the respect that should always come first. Since when did staff of any place in nz only count as a number on paper. Surely Easter.anzac and Christmas days will always be family time as days of remembrance. If the staff are told they HAVE to work or loss that days pay (if that is there normal day of the week to work) that is what a call bullying tactics. As far as i know we Don't encourage bullying in any part of society in Nz. Surely money and greed is what is really behind the new proposal. Money is not everything	no	no	Submitters points have been noted, this Policy allows businesses to open if desired it does not require them to open. Matters relating to employment obligations, workplace practices, and employee protections are governed by central government legislation and sit outside Council's direct control.
ESTP - 07	Isobel Worley	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)		no	no	
ESTP - 08	Milly Keys	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)		no	no	
ESTP - 09	Caron Stewart	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)	For personally owned and operated stores especially, being open over a long weekend encourages the community to support local before heading to larger cities if they choose to use long weekends for catching up on home maintenance for example	no	no	
ESTP - 10	Withdrawn	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy	We only have a couple of days a year when businesses are required to be closed. Out of respect for God and the Christian values and heritage on which New Zealand is built, businesses should be shut on Easter Sunday. This allows everyone to have a well needed break. I am sure there are employees who feel they must work even if they don't want to on that day. It is also healthy for the spiritual wellbeing of our society which has become very materialistic, that we acknowledge there are things that are more important than money and consumerism.	no	no	
ESTP - 11	Shirley MacLeod	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy		no	no	

ID	Submitter name	Option selected:	Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
ESTP - 12	Carol MacLeod	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy		no	no	
ESTP - 13	Justin Williams	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy	Society is now too much 24/7, people need to take a step back and realize having downtime is a good thing, and life isn't always about money, Family and taking a day or two for yourself is a good thing, its no wonder there are so many mental health issues these days	no	no	
ESTP - 14	Steve Southall	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)	Please retain and don't revoke. Business should have the right to choose, particularly those catering to tourism and visitors.	no	no	
ESTP - 15	Derek Bown	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)		no	no	
ESTP - 16	Graeme Alexander Guilford	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)		no	no	
ESTP - 17	Elsbeth Robinson	Option 4: Other	Our district supports Anzac Day by keeping the shops closed until lunchtime. I applaud them for doing that. Could not the same rule be applied to Easter Sunday? That way the days significance would be honoured.	no	no	Under legislation Council may allow shops to open either across the district or in parts of the district. Council is not able to specify times that shops may open (Shop Trading Hours Act 1990 Clause 5A).
ESTP - 18	Anthony Lile	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)	Option 1.	no	no	

ID	Submitter name	Option selected:	Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
ESTP - 19	John Howlett	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)		no	no	
ESTP - 20	Louise	Option 1		no	no	
ESTP - 21	Jess Smart	Option 1		no	no	
ESTP - 22	Saskia van Waaijenburg	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy		no	no	
ESTP - 23	Marilyn McNeil	Option 1		no	no	
ESTP - 24	Stacey Aldridge	Option 1		no	no	
ESTP - 25	Megan Gore	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy	There is precious little time protected for families and people to spend time together these days without the compulsion or obligation to work. Whether one believes in the religious significance of Easter or not we need to protect time for families. There are so few days that businesses have to close anyway.	no	no	
ESTP - 26	Nikki White	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy	There are not many days that shops are closed. If you can't organise shopping etc beforehand, it's very sad. Keep the family days sacred	no	no	
ESTP - 27	Andrea Hogg	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)	I have no issue with shops being open. It gives us who work Mon-Fri more days to spend shopping and buying local.	no	no	
ESTP - 28	Graham Hollis	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy	I think all families should have a chance to spend the day with the family an a day when children look forward to it	no	no	
ESTP - 29	Andrew Ellis	Option 1		no	no	

ID	Submitter name	Option selected:	Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
ESTP - 30	Ron Connor	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)	If they want to open let them!!	no	no	
ESTP - 31	Edward Kelly	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy		no	no	
ESTP - 32	Delwyn		Keep them closed, we only have 3 days of the year that we don't open. These are times to share with families etc. The shops open they put a surcharge on, I purchased a coffee from one of our local cafes on good Friday didn't see the sign until I paid \$8.40 . We have lost the meaning of Easter and Christmas . When I first started working in the retail business we shut all public holidays and guess what we all done it, we all got thru. Dont change nothing	no	no	
ESTP - 33	Alyssa	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy		no	no	
ESTP - 34	Jaime	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)	I am all for people having a rest and enjoying long weekends with their Whānau if desired or open if they want to as well. As long as there's no internal pressures on staff to work it	no	no	
ESTP - 35	Jacqueline Gillett	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy	No workers should be able to have a holiday too and the surcharge is too much.	no	no	
ESTP - 36	Sheree Gausel	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)	Allowing the sale of alcohol in supermarkets if they choose to open	no	no	Sale of Alcohol is managed under the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 and is not able to be managed under this Policy.
ESTP - 37	Lynette Allen	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy	Shops should stay closed on Christmas day good Friday an Easter Sunday thats family time its not about the \$\$\$\$\$\$	yes	no	
ESTP - 38	Greg Dring	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy		no	no	
ESTP - 39	Monika-Rose Nichols	Option 1		no	no	

ID	Submitter name	Option selected:	Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
ESTP - 40	Maggie Liddle	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)	We are no longer a solely Christian or even religious society. Only 1.6 million of our population identifies as Christian. This is a minority. Religion should not be involved in any central of local/regional government policies or bills.	no	no	
ESTP - 41	David King	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)	Some shops that follow a different religion to Christianity (Islam, Sikh, Hindu, etc) might close over Easter. Not a problem, as the policy allows that to happen.	no	no	
ESTP - 42	Charlotte Jenkins	Option 1		no	no	
ESTP - 43	Brendon John Fiebig	Option 1		no	no	
ESTP - 44	Jennifer Deacon and Cristopher Walker	Option 1		no	no	
ESTP - 45	Bronwyn Stewart	Option 1		no	no	
ESTP - 46	Laura Daniels	Option 1		no	no	
ESTP - 47	Marianne Bruce	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy	Easter is a sacred time. A time for worship, reflection and family. There is no need for anyone to be working on Easter Sunday. Its easy for people to get organised, even those travelling to our district for holidays etc.	no	no	
ESTP - 48	Ross and Janet Miller	Option 1		no	no	
ESTP - 49	Eve Kinane	Option 1		no	no	
ESTP - 50	Evelyn Ryan	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)	The vast majority of MPDC inhabitants are non-secular and therefore Easter Sunday is not a day of more significance than any other Sunday, so there should be no restrictions placed on businesses' opening hours on that particular day of the year.	no	no	
ESTP - 51	Rosemary Garaway	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy		no	no	

ID	Submitter name	Option selected:	Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
ESTP - 52	John McClintock	Option 1		no	no	
ESTP - 53	Vivian Laurie	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)	I think the current policy suits most people, particularly employees who don't want to work on the Sunday for religious reasons.	no	no	
ESTP - 54	Mike Hines	Option 4: Other	In my view we are now such a diverse population(as regarding religious views) it should be the shop owners view and no one else,s as to wether or not they open. No one else should dictate	no	no	
ESTP - 55	Angela	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)	I like that most of the shops have been shut on Easter Sunday amd if its been a choice ots good the supermarkets chose not to open, which is a bit of a surprise. Its good to see Easter Sunday which Christians regard as giving acknowledgement to our Lord Jesus Christ rising again as prophesied after being crucified to shed his blood for the world and enable mankind to choose to come into a relationship through Jesus.	no	no	
ESTP - 56	Helen Mead	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy	I firmly believe shops should remain closed on Easter Sunday. Retail workers should not be expected to give up yet another public holiday in a culture that already demands constant availability. Essential needs are still well covered by dairies and petrol stations, so extended retail trading is not necessary. What is necessary is protecting time for rest, family, and recovery. We are living in an increasingly fast-paced, "always on" world, where the pressure to be constantly working or consuming is already high. Creating and protecting space to pause is not a luxury, it is essential. Time away from work supports wellbeing, reduces stress, and plays an important role in maintaining good mental health. This is not a religious stance, it is a wellbeing one. Safeguarding this day is a simple but meaningful way to support healthier individuals, families, and communities.	no	no	
ESTP - 57	Michele Lee	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)		no	no	

ID	Submitter name	Option selected:	Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
ESTP - 58	Bryan	Option 4: Other	I would prefer the district to only allow shops whose main activity is tourism or hospitality to open on Easter Sunday. These activities directly relate to those in the district for holiday purposes. Aside from this I don't think there is a reasonable need for any other shops to open as other business activities can take place on the Saturday or Monday. I would like to know if employees are being g pressured to work. While this may be the responsibility of MBIE I'm not sure if it is being actively monitored and I don't see any harm in the MPDC doing its own district specific research in this area.	no	no	Under legislation Council may allow shops to open either across the district or in parts of the district. Council is not able to permit only some types of shops to open. Matters relating to employment obligations, workplace practices, and employee protections are governed by central government legislation and sit outside Council's direct control.
ESTP - 59	Priscilla Tarrant	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)		no	no	
ESTP - 60	K Webby	Option 3: Revoke the current Policy	We have enough commercial trading days, Easter Good Friday and Easter Sunday also Christmas Day need to remain sacred for families. Not all traditions should be thrown out - progress is not always positive and respecting traditions is import social responsibility.	no	no	
ESTP - 61	Lisa	Option 1: Adopt the draft Local Easter Sunday Shop Trading Policy 2026 as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option)		no	no	

Submissions received: Rates Remission and Postponement Policy

Five submissions were received and one submitter indicated they want to be heard at the Hearing.

Overall feedback received was as follows:

Option 1: Adopt the draft Policy – 3 submissions in support (60%)

Option 2: Retain the existing Policy – 0 submissions in support

Option 3: Amend the draft Policy – 0 submissions in support

Option 4: Other – 2 submissions in support (40%)

Submissions raised minor clarification points only. The public preferred option is Option 1: adopt the draft Policy.

ID	Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
RR - 01	Keith Ferguson		Option 1: Adopt the draft Policy (this is Council's preferred option)		no	no	
RR - 02	Gayle Dickson		Option 4: Other	Re this clause..... Changes to reflect new legislation for granny flats, including a new remission so that if no extra refuse or recycling bins are requested for a small additional dwelling, the extra kerbside targeted rate can be removed. Why does council now appear to be able to target rated when we were told they couldn't when the new food waste bins etc were introduced at a fee to ratepayer? We were told you could not opt out as it was too hard to manage.. Yet now it seems feasible?? Could needs to clarify why there is suddenly the ability to target specific rates items when it couldn't previously	no	no	This policy is only dealing with the additional refuse levy that would occur if the property owner did not request an extra set of bins for the additional dwelling. Each property that is within the refuse collection area to receives the refuse levy, this is unchanged.
RR - 03	Catherine Tunnicliffe			The government value of property is actually not related to how much waste and other council services a family uses. The rates should be connected to "a standard person "charge.	no	no	The refuse levy is not based on the CV of the property.
RR - 04	Jennifer Deacon and Christopher Walker		Option 1: Adopt the draft Policy (this is Council's preferred option)		no	no	

ID	Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
RR - 05	Jeremy Mayall	Creative Waikato	Option 1: Adopt the draft Policy (this is Council's preferred option)	<p>We acknowledge the inclusion of a purpose and scope which provides clarity on what the policy includes as well as the inclusion of specific categories of remission, situations such as financial hardship, community or not-for-profit use, unused or marginal lands, and circumstances where rating legislation allows or anticipates a remission. Further to this, under 'Part 2 - Remission of penalties on unpaid rates', we acknowledge the inclusion of clause g: [that] in circumstances where a ratepayer's situation does not strictly meet the criteria [outlined in the clause] the Rates Team Leader (or higher delegated officer) may exercise discretion to remit a penalty where exceptional, compassionate, or otherwise compelling circumstances exist, and where remission is considered fair, reasonable, and consistent with the intent of this policy. Given that employment in the arts and creative sectors is mostly cyclical and/or inconsistent, it can be challenging for people working in those sectors to maintain a regular wage, and if they do, it is lower than average. Taking such circumstances into account is important. The study: A 'Profile of Creative Professionals 2022, provides a picture of remuneration in the arts sector and the sustainability of creative careers. Income growth is very low, and it continues to be a struggle for the majority of creative professionals to plan financially. Further information can be found here: https://creativenz.govt.nz/development-and-resources/research-and-reports/a-profile-of-creative-professionals-2022</p>	yes	Appendix B, page 6	This doesnt seem to be pointing to the penalty remission policy at all, rather rates in general.

Submissions received: Land Transport Bylaw

Twenty-one submissions were received and three submitters indicated they want to be heard at the Hearing.

Overall feedback received was as follows:

Option 1: Adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw – 10 submissions in support (47.6%)

Option 2: Retain the existing Bylaw – 1 submission in support (4.8%)

Option 3: Adopt the draft Bylaw with amendments – 3 submissions in support (14.3%)

Option 4: Revoke the Bylaw – 0 submissions in support

Option 5: Other – 4 submissions in support (19.0%)

No option selected – 3 submissions (14.3%)

Submissions raised issues including heavy vehicle traffic, horse rider safety, cycling behaviour, and enforcement. The public preferred option is Option 1: adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw.

ID	Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
LT - 01	H.O.R.S.E. - Fiona Scott		Option 5: Other	It is unsafe for horse riders to use our roads to exercise their horses on the road verges in Matamata Piako district, even though they are legally allowed. Many farmers have moved boundary fences out to graze these, to keep them tidy. This forces horse riders to ride on the seal. Motorists often do not slow down and allow extra room to pass safely. Many horse riders have died on the roads around New Zealand because of this. Can horse riders share the edge of the rail trail in lue of no other public land being available in this region? Council have suggested using Thompsons Track but the 4 wheel drive vehicles using this track make it dangerous to try using. Horses and motorsport Do Not mix!	yes	no	The concerns raised about horse rider safety and the lack of suitable alternative riding areas are acknowledged; however, requests for horse access to the rail trail or use of other recreational areas fall outside the scope of the Land Transport Bylaw. Pre-draft consultation on the Parks & Open Spaces Startegy 2021-51 indicated some community interest in bridle trails for horses. The majority of submitters on this topic were not resident in the Matamata-Piako District. None of Councils current parks or reserves are considered suitable for the development of horse trails. They are either too small for horse trails or have already been developed to an extent that does allow for new horse trails.
LT - 02	Jeff Johnson	Sustainability Matamata		MPDC must do something about the HGV traffic along Broadway. It is noisy, polluting and dangerous. It is also destroying the road surface. Many other towns have re-directed this traffic, due to the above. MODC must confer with Waka Kotahi around solutions, for example, redirecting and setting time restrictions, such as no large HGV between 8am and 10pm. A 12 months trial may be worth applying.	no	no	Council continues to work with Waka Kotahi to monitor HGV movements through Matamata and consider longer-term network options if necessary; restrictions on heavy vehicles are not commonly applied unless suitable alternative routes exist and there is agreement from the state highway authority.
LT - 03	Jeff Johnson	Sustainability Matamata	Option 5: Other	Limit HGV through Traffic to week-days only, leaving Matamata Broadway clear for light vehicles and cyclists / pedestrians at the week-ends. This long-standing problem of large Truck and Trailer traffic through town needs at least a partial solution. Allowing liquid gas HGV traffic along Broadway for example, is a disaster waiting to happen. The week-end restrictions could be put into place as a 12 month trial to begin with. MP-DC needs to do something about this long standing issue and not just say it is out of their hands.	no	no	Council acknowledges a wider congestion issue with HCV's through SH24/Broadway. See staff comment for Submission LT-02
LT - 04	G T Sarah		Option 1: Adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw 2008 (Amended 2026) as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option).		no	no	

ID	Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
LT - 05	Keith Ferguson		Option 1: Adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw 2008 (Amended 2026) as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option).		no	no	
LT - 06	Stephen Cope		Option 1: Adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw 2008 (Amended 2026) as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option).	Item 11.1a is a good addition. So long as it is enforced and does not fall between the responsibility of the Council and the responsibility of the Police.	no	no	Where pathways form part of the road corridor or shared paths, the bylaw may apply. If paths are within a reserve and not part of the legal road, this matter is outside the scope of the Land Transport Bylaw
LT - 07	Isobel Worley			Thought needs to be given to cycling in the Te Aroha Domain. Bicycles come down very fast sometimes. Seems odd to me that it is allowed. Similarly school age children, and adults, should not be allowed to ride on pavements in my view.	no	no	The concern raised about cycling behaviour is noted. It is not clear from the feedback whether this relates to cycling on the road through the Te Aroha Domain, use of the shared paths within the Domain, or cyclists accessing or leaving the mountain bike trails. To date, Council has not received other complaints regarding cycling speeds or safety issues in this area. Cycling is legally permitted on roads and on shared paths where indicated, and children are also permitted to ride bicycles on footpaths under national rules. Council will continue to monitor feedback received through this process and consider whether any wider issues are identified that would warrant further investigation or site-specific interventions.
LT - 08	Milly Keys		Option 1: Adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw 2008 (Amended 2026) as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option).		no	no	
LT - 09	Steve Southall		Option 1: Adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw 2008 (Amended 2026) as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option).	Option 1: Adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw 2008 (Amended 2026) as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option). looks good. Under "Current issues" I definitely agree with "Activities that damage roads will be clearly prohibited, and Council will be able to recover repair costs from the person responsible." I'm assuming this will apply to boy racers who damage roads through burnouts, donuts etc. Good if Council clarifies this, and provides guidance on what residents should do when they observe these activities taking place	no	no	confirming this is correct.
LT - 10	P Kampenhout			The maintenance of the rail trail between Te Aroha and Matamata is a disgrace in parts. See it has been sprayed in places and big parts missed so it is gradually breaking down the sealed track. Put a round about in by Stanley's dairy or a traffic camera so MPDC can collect some serious money each day as even council vehicles drivers don't know how to interpreted STOP sign	no	no	Asset maintenance and operational standards are outside the scope of the Land Transport Bylaw. This feedback is noted for operational teams.

ID	Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
LT - 11	Tracey Ward		Option 2: Keep the existing Land Transport Bylaw	Section 12(4) requiring owner/ occupier to remove trees, hedges etc is totally unreasonable! If Council needs to do work then council should remove vegetation at their cost and fix/replace as agreed by both parties prior to work starting.	no	no	Proposed Bylaw places responsibility on the owner or person responsible to remove or trim vegetation.
LT - 12	Peter Bosson		Option 1: Adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw 2008 (Amended 2026) as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option).		no	no	
LT - 13	Laura Daniels		Option 1: Adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw 2008 (Amended 2026) as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option).		no	no	
LT - 14	Wendy Morgan		Option 3: Adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw 2008 (Amended 2026) with further amendments.	Activities that damage roads, no where do you mention boy racers or burnouts. We know fro other areas how much damage this can do to roads. People who get charged for burnouts should be liable to pay for repairs. Council should NEVER have removed the bypass planned for Matamata. While trucks are getting heavier and longer road damage will be a massive ongoing problem. Truck and trailer units going through the centre of town are a major problem, they block up the clock tower roundabout daily because of the pedestrian crossing. There are meant to be clear ways left but they are often blocked. Trucks are taking Rawhiti Ave which is also a problem. It's a busy area with the Doctors and medical facilities. Angle parking on road "corners" is a massive problem. The intersection by the council buildings, and Rawhiti Ave/Tawari St intersection and Farmers access are 3 good examples. Because of the angle parking right on the corner or in the case of Farmers right on either side of the entry you have to stick your car nose half way across the oncoming traffic lane just to see if the road is clear. This is dangerous, especially with the size of some of the parked vehicles if you are in just a normal saloon or small car. You often can not see over or around these other vehicles because of the length/height if them. Freedom camping on council land. We are getting too many examples of permanent "residents" in areas like RAILSIDE, the carpark beside the info office and even out at the Tower. This needs a better eye kept on it and no one should be able to live in these areas in their vehicles permanently. There are only 2 major events each year that ask for road closures around town. ANZAC parade and Christmas Parade. One is a National event, the other a local event. Both are only once a year and should not cost these organisations anything. The council fee for the ANZAC day parade is \$10000. This is ridiculous when everything else is being donated. Swaps donate the traffic management but council charge for remembering our fallen service men and women. The Christmas Parade is a couple of hours enjoyment to numerous Matamata families. It is a community event. Surely these 2 nit for profit events could be supported by council??	no	no	The proposed bylaw provides for activities that damage the road corridor to be prohibited and enables Council to seek recovery of repair costs from those responsible. The bylaw also supports controls on parking near intersections to protect sightlines and road safety, and operational issues raised at specific locations have been noted. Comments relating to the Matamata bypass, freight route selection, freedom camping, and fees for community event road closures are governed by separate policies, legislation, or Council decisions and sit outside the scope of the proposed Land Transport Bylaw.

ID	Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
LT - 15	Ross and Janet Miller		Option 1: Adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw 2008 (Amended 2026) as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option).		no	no	
LT - 16	Evelyn Ryan		Option 5: Other	Adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw 2008 (Amended 2026) as proposed to the community with the following amendment to clause 12.1: "No Person may, without the prior Approval of the Council, place, erect, or allow any building, structure, object, vegetation, or other item on, over, or under any part of the Road Corridor. This includes any permanent or semi-permanent encroachment that may obstruct, endanger, or otherwise interfere with the safe use, maintenance or operation of the Road Corridor. Council will not unreasonably withhold its Approval for the placement of any vegetation on a Berm which the Person seeking Approval agrees to maintain until the vegetation's maturity."	no	no	The proposed Bylaw makes provisions for any permanent or semi-permanent encroachment that may obstruct, endanger, or otherwise interfere with the safe use, maintenance or operation of the Road Corridor. Staff don't think the additional wording is required.
LT - 17	Clem Melville		Option 1: Adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw 2008 (Amended 2026) as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option).	Enforce the law on vegetation over footpaths. I feel the minimum clearance height from the footpath should be 2.7 metres. This allows children on bikes, those riding mobility scooters and pedestrians to have safe vision. As a person who uses a mobility scooter, I find it difficult crossing certain roads from the footpath onto the road as there is no proper entry points.	no	no	Vegetation overhanging footpaths is addressed in Clause 12 of the proposed bylaw. Matters relating to clearance heights and kerb crossings are operational and sit outside the scope of the bylaw.
LT - 18	Margaret Teague		Option 1: Adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw 2008 (Amended 2026) as proposed to the community (this is Council's preferred option).	Please give us an Island at the Town Clock Intersection where we all Give Way to the Right.	no	no	Intersection design and changes where state highways are involved sit outside the scope of the Land Transport Bylaw as State Highways are the responsibility of the New Zealand Transport Agency - Waka Kotahi. The feedback in the submission is noted and will be passed to roading team.
LT - 19	Vincent Andersen		Option 3: Adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw 2008 (Amended 2026) with further amendments.	School Buses should be legally required to have flashing lights on them in our district. On foggy days they are really dangerous as they are hard to see. Many of my drivers have reported near misses with school buses on foggy days.	no	no	The safety concerns raised are acknowledged; however, requirements for school bus lighting and vehicle equipment are set through national regulations rather than local bylaws, meaning this matter cannot be addressed through the proposed Land Transport Bylaw.
LT - 20	Isaac McIntyre	Federated Farmers	Option 3: Adopt the draft Land Transport Bylaw 2008 (Amended 2026) with further amendments.		yes	Appendix A, page 2	The references to Schedule 5 (Stock Movement) in the draft Bylaw are incorrect. These have been corrected (for Council approval) and an explanatory note added to reference the Development Manual and Stock Control Strategy where further detail on the permits and conditions can be found.

ID	Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
LT - 21	Rachel Cook	Herenga ā Nuku Aotearoa, the Outdoor Access Commission			no	Appendix D	Amendment has been made in the Draft Bylaw (for Council approval) to include the following: <i>"For the avoidance of doubt, 'road' includes all formed and unformed legal roads, including paper roads, that are vested in or under the control of the council, whether or not they are constructed or maintained."</i>

Submissions received: Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw

The consultation on the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw resulted in a large number of submissions, with many option based response fields in the submission form. To improve readability, responses have been collated into summary tables, with percentages shown. The table below captures submissions with written comments only. The full submissions for Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw can be found in Attachment D - Full Submissions for Policy on Dogs on Dog Control Bylaw 2026

The submissions show broad alignment with the overall direction of the proposed Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw, particularly the clearer structure, clearer expectations for responsible ownership, and retention of existing welfare standards. Most submitters agree with the need for updated policy settings and improved clarity.

There is general acceptance of allowing dogs in Central Business Districts and on the Hauraki Rail Trail when dogs are on leash and under control, with many submissions noting that effective implementation will rely on signage, waste management and enforcement.

The most contested issue raised through submissions relates to proposed changes to off-leash exercise areas in Matamata, particularly Centennial Drive and Tom Grant Drive. Feedback on this issue is divided, with submitters raising a range of reasons both for and against change, and frequent references to the availability, accessibility and distribution of alternative off-leash areas.

Across submissions, enforcement and roaming dogs are repeatedly identified as key operational concerns. Many submitters note that compliance outcomes are seen as dependent on enforcement capacity rather than policy wording alone.

Overall, submissions reflect support for the policy framework and mixed views on specific access changes, with consistent emphasis on implementation, enforcement and practical impacts

PREFERRED OVERALL OPTION

Option	Count	Percentage
Option 1: Adopt Policy	49	31.60%
Option 2: Keep Existing	22	14.20%
Option 3: Adopt with Amendments	33	21.30%
Option 4: Revoke Bylaw	5	3.20%
Option 5: Other	18	11.60%
No Response	28	18.10%

QUESTION-BY-QUESTION RESPONSES

Question	Yes ✓	No ✗	Other	No Response	Support Rate	Status
Q2: Clearer layout & responsible ownership	120	8	8	19	93.80%	🟢 Strong Support
Q3: Updated policy objectives	90	15	16	34	85.70%	🟢 Strong Support
Q4: Farmer St Reserve prohibited	34	13	84	24	72.30%	🟡 Moderate
Q5: Dogs in CBDs (on leash)	111	26	9	9	81.00%	🟢 Strong Support
Q6: Dogs on Hauraki Rail Trail	111	11	20	13	91.00%	🟢 Strong Support
Q7: Six-month trial for changes	96	30	14	15	76.20%	🟡 Moderate
Q8: Centennial/Tom Grant → on-leash	53	57	30	15	48.20%	🔴 CONTENTIOUS
Q9: Two dogs in town rule	115	17	9	14	87.10%	🟢 Strong Support
Q10: Current housing/care standards	119	7	9	20	94.40%	🟢 Strong Support

🔍 SPOTLIGHT: off-leash vs on-leash?

Q8: Should Centennial Drive and Tom Grant Drive (Matamata) change from off-leash to on-leash?

🔑 KEY CONCERNS RAISED:

- Lack of alternative off-leash areas in Matamata township
- Dogs need space to run and exercise safely
- Current areas are well-used by responsible owners
- Concerns about accessibility of alternative locations

🔑 KEY THEMES FROM SUBMISSIONS

✅ STRONG SUPPORT	Policy Clarity	93.8% support clearer layout and responsible ownership focus
✅ STRONG SUPPORT	Rail Trail Access	91.0% support dogs on Hauraki Rail Trail (on-leash)
✅ STRONG SUPPORT	Dogs in CBD	81.0% support allowing dogs in town centres on-leash
🟡 MODERATE	Trial Period	76.2% support a 6-month trial for CBD/Rail Trail changes
🔴 DIVIDED	Off-leash Areas	Only 48.2% support changing Centennial/Tom Grant to on-leash
⚠️ CONCERN	Enforcement	Multiple submitters want stronger enforcement for roaming dogs

Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
Royce WILES	Matamata Historical Society	Option 5: Other	In the October 2025 MHS committee meeting we asked all MHS committee members their views on allowing dogs into the Firth Tower Museum grounds, we also canvassed our member volunteers on site on the Wednesday morning working bees. The following points were raised in the discussion, you will see that our choice is NOT to make any changes in current rules. Some of our museum buildings are left open for the public during opening hours (some permanently and sometimes for individual events) and we would do not think it appropriate for dogs to go through our displays or indeed the heritage buildings—also the risk of someone (eventually) walking in something left behind by a dog, and then walking it through the heritage buildings was not considered worth the risk); Although dog owners are mostly considerate there are a few who may not be (we have all seen dog 'do' left behind around Matamata) and we prefer not to have even an elevated risk of this anywhere on site (partly for aesthetic reasons but also because we have a vegetable garden on site that supplies the Matamata food bank)—we have had no problems of this kind whatsoever in recent years and so we think the current by-law/regulation is working well and does not need any changes; The MPDC listing of Wai Tapu at https://www.mpdc.govt.nz/wmmp/96-district-plan/district-plan-part-b/347-schedule-1-heritage-waahi-tapu includes the Tamihana monument in the museum grounds, this is not in anyway fenced off and we definitely prefer not to have this site at risk, or any disrespect possible for this Ngati Haua significant site. There were other discussions, notably that MPDC staff on site MAY have to take on clean up duties after dogs and this was best avoided.		no	no	Staff support keeping Firth Tower Historic Reserve as a "no dogs" area.
Glenys udy		Option 5: Other	Using the public pool for dogs only event is not good idea. They should have special pool for dogs if they want it. Spoke to some friends about it and very much against it. This pool is for people not animals. I refuse to go to the pools knowing animals have been using it. I rather go to Te Aroha .		no	no	The dogs in Togs event held in the Morrinsville Pool is held on the last day of the pool being open each summer, and was only open to dogs. The pool is then shut for the winter. In spring, before the pool is reopened to the public it is completely cleaned out, filters changed and all Health and Safety taken care of.
Natasha walsh		Option 4: Revoke current Dog Control Bylaw	i Also think its wrong i have a fully fenced section my dogs have never caused trouble and i have to pay \$160 each year when we have wild dogs roaming the neighbourhood and nothing is done about this		no	no	Dog registration fees are set to recover the cost of animal control services in line with Council's Revenue and Financing Policy. Council acknowledges concerns that responsible owners may feel they are subsidising roaming or unregistered dogs, and improving compliance remains a priority.
Nicola Slade		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	After a very frightening experience concerning a dog recently, I suggest that dog wardens are obliged to visit the complainant, not just drive round the area. If this had occurred in my case my neighbours and I could have pointed out where the dog came from, etc. As she didn't bother to contact me nothing happened. I was furious.		no	no	Animal control officers endeavour to visit complainants when possible.
Katrina Mcintyrw		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw			no	no	
Laura Daniels		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	Would prefer up to 3 dogs in urban areas as long as you are a responsible owner and have no complaints against you regarding owning dogs. Also that your property is large enough to support 3 dogs.		no	no	The draft Bylaw provides that no occupier of a property within an the Urban Area shall keep or permit to be kept on each separate premises more than two dogs of a greater age than three months without obtaining a permit under this clause. To obtain a permit for 3 or more dogs, the applicant must seek the consent of the adjacent property owner(s) or occupier(s) most likely to be affected by the application.
Billie Naessens			I strongly disagree with centennial drive and Tom grant drive being changed to on leash areas. There are really limited off leash areas in Matamata and this will massively effect the quality of life for my dog. My dog is trained to heel and recall. He does not need to be on a lead at all, these areas are my every day walk routes. I don't understand		no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive are shared spaces and not separated from the road. It was deemed by staff to be the safest option to make this on leash.
Priscilla Tarrant		Option 5: Other	Regarding Dog limits: Up to two dogs may be kept in urban areas without a permitThis is ridiculous..... All dogs should have a permit. Unlimited dogs in rural areasthis short sighted and pandering to people whose dogs just keep having pups. Farmers who can prove they have working dogs is a different kettle of fish.they should have special reduced prices for their Dog licences. There is a DOG problem in NZ especially in the country areas. Up to 32,000 dog attacks per year in NZ plus people are getting killed yearly by dogs. The cultural aspect of Dog control is also ridiculous and biased towards a certain sector of Dog owners who use them for fighting dogs and allow them to run freely (They will love the Free for All country allowance. This is a cop out by councils who have no back bone or courage to protect the MAJORITY of New Zealanders and the 32,000 people (and the number that is growing) who have been attacked (and killed) by dogs, myself included.	Nobody can have picnics anymore because of DOG faeces/ urine everywhere plus unleashed dogs keeping people away from walking freely because of their liability to attack. ("everyone says Oh my dog doesnt bite") It is always the case that those that dont care about rules will spoil it for others. Dogs on leashes can lash out at people plus the defaece and urinate every where. Dogs on leashes can lash out at people plus defecate and urinate everywhere. We need leaders who have courage and justice thinking, and not those who pander to outlaw groups of wild dog owners because they are afraid of being threatened I dont think dogs should be in the Central Business Districts at all. It is naive to thing that those who always disregard the rules are going abide by that. Those that dont care about rules will spoil it for others. Dogs on leashes can lash out at people on bikes plus the defaece and urinate every w It is always the case that those that dont care about rules will spoil it for others. The law has to be VERY STRONG because those that dont care (because they are being pandered to) will always keep breaking the law and NOTHING will improve. (For example) I have often seen the same man with 3 dogs down at the Morrinsville Rec Ground, walk through there to the bush area at the end and entering the bush from there. This way he doesnt enter by way of the proper track that has a sign saying 'no unleashed dogs), so then he has an excuse if he is ever pulled up about it. The rules with dogs are being broken left right and center and I believe the Dog Control Officers	yes	no	Council acknowledges the submitter's concerns about dog attacks, public safety, and enforcement. All dogs must be registered, and the draft Bylaw allows up to two dogs in urban areas without a permit, with permits required for additional dogs. Dog control officers operate within national legislation and respond to complaints about roaming or aggressive dogs. Improving compliance and enforcement remains an ongoing focus, supported by reporting from the community. Kuri inclusion was recommended by TMF. As part of the development of the Policy and Bylaw, staff reviewed the complaint trends from 2019-2024 in the district. The most common reported issue is wandering dogs, barking dogs, and aggressive dogs. Within the district, aggressive dog complaints increased steadily from 37 (2019/20) to 51 (2023/24), peaking at 57 in 2021/22. Dog bite complaints climbed from 11 (2019/20) to a high of 25 (2021/22 & 2022/23), then slightly decreased to 21 in 2023/24.

Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
				have their own rules and are not protecting our freedom to walk anywhere in town. Also I think Councillors are not responsible if they do not clamp down hard on Dog Control. 32,000 people attacked by dogs - does anyone really care ??????????????????			
Jason Tidmarsh		Option 5: Other	Centennial Drive and Tom Grant Drive to remain off lead areas. I walk my dog through both Centennial Drive and Tom Grant every day of the week and have never had nor ever seen any issues with other users with or without dogs. Making these areas car free would be much beneficial to the community.	There is nowhere else in Matamata where you can walk your dog for any reasonable distance other than the drives. The whole Drive loop is approximately 4km with a bit of on lead time when outside of the drives.	yes	no	[Closing the road to cars] Centennial Drive is a Recreation Reserve. The internal road through the reserve is not a public road/part of the public roading network. Council may temporarily close the road under the provisions of the reserve management plan however any permanent closure of the road would require public consultation.
Yvonne Mortensen		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	Would not be happy to see any dogs on leash in the main shopping areas. What about entering shops with the dog? If that is not ok, then why allow them into the CBD at all. Older persons are more likely to have a fall or be discouraged to go into these areas. I am not anti dog but I am anti bad owners and feel there will be no control over the CBD if this is allowed.		no	no	It is proposed to change the CBD areas from prohibited to dogs during business hours to an on-leash areas. Council will need to consider this in light of the public feedback.
Andrea Ritmeester		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	This is one of the few places in Matamata (other than the dog park on Peria Rd) where dogs can be walked off leash, and the only area that you can easily walk to from anywhere in Matamata. We walk our dog here every day and it is very rare to come across a dog being walked off leash that is not social with people and other dogs and under control. I feel strongly that as long as the dog is under control at all times this area should be preserved as an off-leash area to exercise dogs. The vehicle traffic currently through these areas pose a much greater danger to pedestrians and children that the dogs being being walked there and, in my opinion, these areas should be turned into proper green spaces by closing them off to motorised vehicles.	Please don't punish the many people who have well educated and socialised dogs by removing the off-lead walking areas in Matamata.	no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.)
Sharon Neal		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	There is no place for off-leash dogs in a public area		no	no	There are designated off-leash dog exercise areas available in each of the district's three towns. These areas are intended to provide opportunities for dogs to exercise off-leash in appropriate locations. Information on the location and rules for these dog exercise areas is available on the Council website.
Chris Gifford		Option 5: Other	No Dogs on the Waihou recreation reserve which is now mainly Equestrian focussed and no signage posted. Needs to be a sign All the Dog areas you have mentioned, not once is Waihou Recreation Reserve mention as being allowed Dogs and just a query, the 4 user groups of the grounds Rugby Club, RDA, Te Aroha Hack and Hunters and Morrinsville Te Aroha dressage Group, which I understand all have a lease agreement so why is it open for public access, dogs off leashes, mini bikes racing round and people practicing golf?		yes	no	Waihou Recreation Reserve is currently an 'on leash' area. Regulatory signage advising that dogs must be on leash were vandalised and had to be replaced. The leases referred to only apply to specific portions of the reserve. The leases do not grant exclusive rights of occupation over the entire reserve. The public have a legal right of access to most of the reserve land. The public must however comply with the law, including the Dog Control Bylaw and the Community Safety Bylaw when accessing the reserve. Staff are aware of one complaint about mini motorbikes accessing the reserve. Motorbikes accessing parks and reserves is a challenging issue across the country. Effective physical measures to keep motorbikes out unfortunately also keep out legitimate park users like people in mobility scooters, people pushing baby buggies etc. Motorbike-related issues also tend to move around from one park to another. Staff are not aware of any complaints about people practicing golf at the reserve.
G T Sarah		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	Excessive barking has not been addressed and should be part of the dog control by law as well as under noise control.		no	no	Complaints relating to excessive or persistent barking are addressed under the Dog Control Act 1996 and responded to appropriately.
Bridget Gill		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	in Matamata you take away the only two areas where mothers with prams can take their dogs off leash. You are not adding any new ones. Logically fence founders park anyone who does not want to be with dogs off leash can easily walk around it. Have certain areas of the drive fenced. Back on Leash when out of these areas.	These are the only areas families, with prams, kids scooter and bikes and mobility scooters can take their dogs off leash it is discriminating against families and those with disability. Tom grant is the only one in this area as Founders park is not fenced and dangerous !!	no	no	Founders Park was not originally intended to be a dog exercise area. It was originally developed by community groups as a picnic area. It became an 'off lead' area prior to the development of the Peria Road dog exercise area. Fencing is likely to detract from the open character of Founders Park making it appear less inviting. Fencing would also increase maintenance costs. Founders Park is only 3 mins drive from the Peria Road Dog Exercise Area which is already fenced. Council could consider changing Founders Park back to an 'on lead' area given its proximity to the Peria Road dog exercise area. Centennial Drive Reserve was developed as a green belt and contains a significant tree collection largely established and maintained by a volunteer community group. Fencing parts of the park is likely to detract from the aesthetics and would also increase maintenance costs. If Council wishes to investigate fencing options and costs this could be done as part of the LTP process.
Becky		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	Morrinsville needs more dog exercise areas and areas where dogs are allowed to walk on-leash, including in the nearby countryside / local walks.	Yes, but there also needs to be an emphasis on more dog exercise areas, and countryside walks / areas dogs are allowed to walk on-leash in Morrinsville.	no	no	Council may wish to consider providing and funding additional dog exercise areas as part of the Long Term Plan process. Dogs are already allowed 'on leash' at all public parks in Morrinsville except for the fenced playground at Thomas Park which is a 'no dogs' area. Dogs are already allowed 'on leash' at all walking tracks in Morrinsville that are managed by MPDC.

Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
Natalie Feek		Option 2: Keep existing Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw		This is the perfect place for dogs to explore, socialise, and walk freely in an open environment. It provides a wonderful space where dogs can exercise, interact with other dogs, and simply enjoy being outdoors. For many dog owners, it is also a valuable community space, a place to connect with others, and watch their dogs play happily. Restricting vehicle access would help preserve the space as a safe and enjoyable area for everyone who uses it.	no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Yash Murti		Option 2: Keep existing Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw					
Karen Huitema			I have just read your rules on dogs..leash areas..every where which is ridiculous. Matamata dog owners..the ones just I know are devoted to their dogs.They are well trained and we trust them...we can walk them leash free in the drives and Swap park where we know and trust them to run around and play together..otherwise we wouldn't be there. It's the dogs that aren't walked that are not controlled. There is no way my dog is going to go 'walkies' every day leashed! He loves to meet his doggie friends and they zoom around together.. If there is any hostility its at the Peria road dog park where I've broken up a couple of confrontations! My Cooper is 6 and adored by all the dogs and humans..lots of kids want to come pat him. I disagree with your rules..I think you need to leave the decisions up to the owners..we know our dogs better than anyone. Thankyou for your time and please consider what I'm saying Karen and Cooper Huitema.		yes	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Bev Jackson		Option 5: Other	I agree with all dogs on lead in town with safety for both dogs and people. The saddest thing would be for dogs not allowed to be off leash in centennial drive - all dogs I have meet there have been under control and REALLY enjoying a small piece of matamata off leash allowing times to sniff. Yes I know there is the dog park but good grief what can a dog do there for a very short run and usually being attacked by another dog - which is why I don't go there. One of the main reasons for shifting to Matamata was the ability to have a place where myself and my puppy can walk through a beautiful place together		no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Linnea McDonald	Te Aroha and District Riding for the Disabled		We want people to stop using the area for dogs off lead. This can spook our horses. I love dogs but not around our horses.		no	no	Waihou Recreation Reserve is currently an 'on leash' area. Regulatory signage advising that dogs must be on leash were vandalised and had to be replaced. Council may choose to make Waihou Recreation Reserve a 'no dogs' area or retain it as an 'on lead' area.
Craig Le Vaillant		Option 2: Keep existing Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	Tom Grant drive is a valuable dog exercise area that is readily accessible to many living in the area. This should stay as an off leash option.		no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive are shared spaces and not separated from the road. It was deemed by staff to be the safest option to make this on leash.
Brendon John Fiebig		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	I like the option to allow dogs in CBD if leashed and responsible, and cleaned up after.		no	no	
Stuart Davey			Dogs should not be allowed in hospitality areas. Dogs should be on a leash when in public areas		no	no	It is proposed to change the CBD areas from prohibited to dogs during business hours to an on-leash areas. Council will need to consider this in light of the public feedback.
Colin Simpson			I believe all the options are useless, and will not address the dog problem. All unregistered roaming dogs are dangerous. This is an unfortunate reality. I am a dog owner myself, and have been for 60 years. As unpalatable as it seems, these dogs need to be killed. There is no shortage of dogs, just a shortage of good owners. Allowing these dogs to live, even desexed, is wrong. These dogs, in fact all dogs, are always looking for a pack to belong to. If they can't belong in a human pack, they will make their own. Sometimes we just have to harden up and do the hard yards. Doing the hard yards is what councils are voted in to do. If any councilors find this repugnant then they should probably stand down.	I don't believe it is working now and I don't think it will work in the future without tougher consequences.	no	no	Dog management under the bylaw must operate within legislative requirements and focus on public safety, animal welfare, and responsible ownership, supported by a range of enforcement and education tools
Stephen Cope		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	Yes, changes to the use of some of these areas mean we need to change how dogs are treated in these spaces.	Another companion animal that would benefit from similar bylaws are our cats. Please apply these same rules to cats. Many other councils have done similar with great result	no	no	Cat bylaws aren't being considered without the backing of legislation.
Miru Hotene		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	If they are used for personal care and support ONLY, these dogs are trained to behave accordingly in public places. Other dogs, not used for these purposes can cause unnecessary trauma to some that have had bad interactions with dogs in the past. I am one who was bitten by a dog when attending a whanau call out. It came quietly from behind and ripped into my leg. I complained to Council after getting medical attention.	Should be a higher standard especially in rural communities such as Rukumoana Road! My neighbours have dogs that run rampant all the time. I do not believe any are registered except my neighbour next door, whose dog only stays in his yard.	no	no	All complaints are dealt with through the bylaw and Dog Control Act 1996.

Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
Jill Gibbs			No I prefer to not allow dogs on the main shopping streets. The footpath are nI don't enjoy seeing dogs running along side cyclists, I feel its too hard on the dogs .ot wide enough and most dog owners don't keep their dogs on a short lead.	There should be a maximum period of how long a dog is allowed to be tied up. Fencing should be compulsory. More than 2 visits from dog control should amount to removal of dog until issue sorted.	no	no	SPCA look after animal welfare and have new rules around how long dogs can be tied up. Removal of dogs from owners is governed by the Dog Control Act 1996.
Isobel Worley		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	Dogs need to be well under control, on leads. Young children can be really frightened by dogs sniffing around them, as can many adults. Higher focus on dogs needing to be on leads on tracks in the bush, particularly the track to the Whakapipi Lookout.		no	no	The Council website and signage at Te Aroha Domain entrances indicate dogs must be 'on leash' at Te Aroha Domain and on the track to Whakapipi. Regulatory signage along the Te Aroha Mountain Track is in the process of being upgraded (larger sign with a repeat of regulatory icons). Note: MPDC does not control signage on public conservation land above Whakapipi/Bald Spur which is managed by DOC.
Heather McIntosh		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	I'm not so keen for Centennial Drive and Tom Grant Drive to be on leash areas. I am a high user of these areas, dog off leash - & have not had a serious issue in the 15+ yrs. Compromise? On leash from 8am-3.30pm, off leash outside of this times? Gives school kids freedom, and a big time slot for nervous dog uses		no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Chris applebee		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	Number of dogs allowed per home should be 3 as long as the owners have a clean history of good dog ownership and can safely confine the dogs on the section. Neighbours should not be able to veto said number as this relies on good neighbour relationships and any negativity may not be the fault of the dog owners but just vexatious neighbours.	Number of dogs allowed per home should be 3 as long as the owners have a clean history of good dog ownership and can safely confine the dogs on the section. Neighbours should not be able to veto said number as this relies on good neighbour relationships and any negativity may not be the fault of the dog owners but just vexatious neighbours.	no	no	A permit for three dogs can be applied for. There is no fee for this permit.
Deirdre Bretherton		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw		Absolutely support these changing to on-leash areas. A community safety issue that's long overdue for implementing	no	no	
Amy Barker		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments		this is so disappointing. as usual it's the good dog owners being penalised. i compete in three different sports with my dogs, they never roam despite being entire males and we've never had any complaints. go and PROPERLY target the shitty dog owners who don't desex, let their dogs roam and create more puppies - there's several of these houses within 200m of me meaning i have to drive to a different suburb of Morrinsville to feel safe enough to walk my dogs. those people are the multi-dog owners causing issues not people like me. there's also the issue of renters, how is someone meant to get a permit when there's a never ending cycle of new tenants?!? also not sure why i should have to pay an additional fee to the council each year for the permit? what on earth would that be covering in terms of costs?	no	no	Permit does not have to be renewed when occupants. Fees cover administration and monitoring.
Lyn Shaw		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	Most of the proposal I agree with, but I am concerned about the closure of centennial drive in Matamata as a no leash area.	I frequently walk my small dog through Centennial Drive as it is near my home and easily accessible to me. I have a small section and need to walk her 2 or 3 times per day to maintain her health. All the other off leash areas are too far away to walk to and I would have to drive there, which is becoming more prohibitive as petrol costs increase. If Centennial Drive is closed to off leash dogs, I feel an alternative area is needed that is within walking distance, especially with the housing developments happening on this side of town and the potential for increasing dog numbers. I know that Swap Park has been suggested previously and maybe it is time to revisit this as an alternative.	no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Jessye Marshall		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	The policy seems great but I think taking away the off leash on centennial drive and Tom grant is a bit harsh as I notice it's alot of older people that want a safe space for their dog to be able to freely walk without being pulled all over the place, but isnt as restricting as being locked in a dog park		no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Talia Thornley		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw		Dog rego do not need to go up. Good dog owners should not be paying for bad owners. Dog rego should be cheaper and bad dog owners pay more consequences. As a responsible dog owner, I'm in favor of a law that all dogs must be micro chipped and desexed unless the owner has a breeding license. And all dog should be on leash in public places, including beaches and parks.	no	no	Dogs do need to be registered and microchipped. The fee increase is necessary to ensure we cover costs and stay within our Revenue and Financing Policy which requires 80% of the costs of this service to be covered by dog owners. However, as part of developing the Long Term Plan we plan to review this split.
Rhonda Fawcett		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	I do not like you taking away the option of dogs off the lead in Centennial drive. It is my favourite place to walk my dog off the lead. He gets to meet many other dogs. Every one is so friendly. I have never once had problems with other dogs in this area but I have at the dog park so I don't use that now. It's nice that you purpose to allow dogs in the CBD and I think adding extra spaces is great for dog owners but taking away off lead spaces is definitely a bad thing. Also Centennial drive provides a shaded walkway for both owners and dogs. Where else do we find that?		no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive are shared spaces and not separated from the road. It was deemed by staff to be the safest option to make this on leash.
Emma Miles		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	I agree with the new amendments proposed in the letter. Hopefully, that is Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw. The options above are not easy to follow, and I would not be surprised if you receive inaccurate results because of this.		no	no	

Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
Rose		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	Being a dog owner myself I think dogs should be allowed every where except for children's playgrounds and schools. More dog exercise areas should be around, look at doing something like Waikato canine adventure park great revenue maker for the council and great area for dogs also	Any dogs that are not cared for properly, escape continually and are not registered should be removed from the house and rehomed to responsible people	no	no	Council may wish to consider provision and funding for any future dog exercise areas as part of the LTP. Waikato Canine Adventure Park is a private business located near Taupiri.
Milly Keys		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	I have absolutely no problem with dogs being allowed onleash in the CBD, however I do have concerns with the potential of dog poop and urine not being attended to. I would assume that dog bag, and specific disposal bins will be installed. Dog poop is not all the same "consistency" so would be concerned that less easier poop pickups would cause unsightly and odorous residue on our footpaths. Very happy to hear onleash for Tom Grant drive. Our home backs on to Tom Grant Drive, and have witnessed a couple of altercations between dogs that have been off lesh, thankfully without any serious incident.	I have absolutely no problem with dogs being allowed onleash in the CBD, however I do have concerns with the potential of dog poop and urine not being attended to. I would assume that dog bag, and specific disposal bins will be installed. Dog poop is not all the same "consistency" so would be concerned that less easier poop pickups would cause unsightly and odorous residue on our footpaths. Our home backs on to Tom Grant Drive, and have witnessed a couple of altercations between dogs that have been off lesh, thankfully without any serious incident.	no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use. There are enforcement options for dog owners that dont clean up after their dog. Onus is on dog owners to dispose their dog excrement.
Caron Stewart		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	I agree Centennial Drive and Tom Grant Drive should be on-leash areas. A number of people use both for regular walks with or without dogs and for many, an off leash dog can be intimidating regardless of its size. I think dogs in the CBD should remain during restricted hours		no	no	
		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	Current policy allows dogs to be tied up all day and even 24/7. That is cruel and no dog should be forced to live chained up like that. There should at the very least be a requirement that dogs should have freedom to move about on their section unrestrained as every house is required to have fencing. I would like to see a requirement that no dog is permitted to be tied up without exercise. Council needs to take more responsibility for the welfare of dogs which are cruelly treated in this way.		no	no	SPCA look after animal welfare and have new rules around how long dogs can be tied up. New dog tethering regulations were introduced in September 2025 under the Animal Welfare (Care and Procedures) Regulations. These are designed to address situations where dogs are being harmed as a result of being chained or tied up for long periods and to protect vulnerable dogs such as puppies and mothers.
Kevin Whaley		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	Most of the options contain far too many words, which ultimately lead to a situation where policy becomes vague. The policy should be short, sharp and to the point.	There is a great need to be bold. This applies to Central Government also. Dogs are NOT more important than humans and the recent spate of dig attacks around the country highlight a much stronger approach must be taken. I do not dislike dogs, I should make that clear, but unless more significant steps are taken to force dog owners to be responsible then nothing will change. Just more words and more lengthy policies. One simple way to have an immediate effect is, ALL un-registered dogs, whether they be out loose or on a property, are immediately destroyed. NO discussion. If an owner cannot afford to register a dog then how do they feed it properly. Some would say this is cruel, but no, if owners care then they will do the right thing an register them. Second simple way, owner of any registered dog caught loose, have 48 hours to reclaim their dog or it is destroyed. This will give time for the Dog Control officer to contact the owner. A register to be maintained of roaming/loose dogs and if a dog is caught loose twice, then it is destroyed. Many will say this is a very harsh approach, but if we wish to be serious about what has become a significant issue within communities then a bold approach must be taken. Widely publicise the changes so that everyone is quite clear, provide a lead in time of 3 months and then implement. Thank you for your time, I await with interest.	no	no	Rules are set by the Dog Control Act 1996.
Chris Bennett		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw		More enforcement of dogs off lease particularly when using on lease areas.	no	no	Animal control carry out regular patrols.
Lynette Beer		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	Submitters may have genuine concerns/suggestions that could be considered prior to the Policy being ratified.	1) Visit all residences in area to determine unregistered dogs and have owners comply - there are more than one in our small village 2) Prohibit the use of vehicles to exercise dogs i.e. use of vehicle driving at speed with dogs following loose on open road - make this an offence 3) Limit number of dogs held on property to maximum of 2 - in builtup areas the noise of barking/howling is unacceptable	no	no	Properties with dogs are checked once a year by animal control at registration time. Dogs are to be on leash in public areas unless in a specified off leash. There is a limit of two dogs per household unless the recieve a permit.
Sebo Bruins		Option 5: Other	I dont understand these laws or changes well enough to have an opinion	They are extraordinarily poorly written for example ; Dog exercise area approach (??) - removing the previous policy statement that exclusive dog exercise areas would not be provided This is a very complicated way of saying "we'll provide dog exercise areas" I'm assuming for a lot of dog owners in town this will be a main point especially if other areas are now only for leashed dogs. So please just be clear Most of the wording of the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw is cluttered with pointless over statement that requires repetitive reading to understand Recognition of Kuri- strengthened and expanded in partnership with Te Manawhenua Forum Why? Why is a council needing to make that statement ? We all are aware of the Kuri already, it doesnt require laws or exercise or treatment so why are we making a policy for something that doesn't exist ? Operational updates- clearer neutering rules for menancing dogs and rules around what might happen in serious situations No Clear rules for dangerous dogs and what will happen in serious situations- is a clearer more accurate way of communicating without the fluff	yes	no	

Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
lynn needham			most of the adoptions don't concern me apart from dogs in towns dogs in cafe's Why would you want to take your dog to town. I was having a nice lunch in a morrinsville Cafe where these 2 dogs started to have set to. which resulted in a customer being hurled into the lap of a couple have tea and cake which just got spewed to the ground. luckily no one was hurt, and I managed to grab the lead of the offending animal. now these were small dogs. so would it be ok for my daughter and myself to take the Rottweilers to town. no I wouldn't anyway because it's these small irritating yapping dust mops that course the most upsets. all dogs should be on a leash. have you seen the "Fenton" dog on utube it's funny but could have been dangerous		no	no	It is proposed to change the CBD areas from prohibited to dogs during business hours to an on-leash areas. Council will need to consider this in light of the public feedback.
Marie Wright		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	I do agree with everything, including a stronger focus on responsible dog ownership. However, it appears that the council has a different understanding of what responsible dog ownership means. A responsible dog owner knows when it is appropriate to put their dog on leash, and when it is safe to allow their dog to walk off leash. A responsible dog owner knows to pick up their dogs droppings. A responsible dog owner knows their dog, how their dog behaves when meeting other dogs and people, and acts accordingly to not put their dog or others at risk. A "stronger focus on responsible dog ownership" to me means enabling that behaviour, not restricting it by cutting down off leash dog exercise areas. You should reword the proposed changes to "stronger focus on controlling dog owners and their dogs". As a responsible dog owner myself I do not feel empowered by this proposal but restricted. Cutting down off-leash dog exercise areas does not focus on responsible dog ownership, but on people who do not own dogs.	Please do not make Centennial Drive on-leash only. It would be a great disservice to the dog loving and responsible community of Matamata.	no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Carol Bennett		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw		Cars don't always drive at 25kmh and electric vehicles are so quiet it sometimes hard to know a car is behind me. So many dogs off leash with little regard for on leash dogs. On leash would negate any excuses for not picking up after dog. I quote Founders Park as classic example of off leash area where owners simply don't pick up afterwards (my kitchen overlooks the Park - so sad when so many have picnics in the park). I have a miniature poodle on 10m Longline lead and so many larger dogs in the Drives terrify him or bowl him over and owners just say "it's OK, my dog is friendly". Mine is a rescue and still reactive to larger dogs.	no	no	
Kay Tappin		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	It is disappointing to see the proposed changes to Centennial Drive and Tom Grant Drive to be on leash. There are many owners who use these areas to give their dogs a bit of a run, leg stretching opportunity, myself included. Founders Park remains of leash but is more open and exposed to traffic, posing dangers. There are many older people who use Tom Grant Drive, (my area), that cannot afford a DAILY drive (and that will get worse!) across the other side of town to access the Peria Rd dog off leash park. Some of us are also limited with our own physical restrictions and do not go far from our homes meaning access to off leash in these areas is close by and needed. Please let Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive remain off leash areas. All the dogs I have witnessed and met that use , at least Tom Grant Drive as off leash are always well behaved and well trained. I even call my dogs and they sit while cars pass us as we walk a short portion of Tom Grant for daily 30 walks. To the best of my knowledge I have never heard of any complaints regarding off leash problem dogs in at least my area.		yes	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Syntyche		Option 2: Keep existing Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	For smaller dogs centennial drive and Tom Grant are safe places for off leash. We've had bad experiences with bigger dogs at the other off leash exercise areas. We don't feel safe there.		no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
ashlie		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	I have epilepsy type disorder. So with the current by-laws, cannot physically get my dog to the vet. Appreciate the proposed change to dogs being allowed in town, so long as on leash and they're, 'tided up after'. Thank you.	Find it quite awful - would you treat a child (your child), the way you treat you dog. I.e., put on a leash while at home, being kept in a cage (aka a kennel where you do not have the space to turn around, let alone not-being able to 'toilet' while in cage.	no	no	Animal welfare matters of this nature are primarily overseen by the SPCA, and Council works alongside the SPCA where appropriate to support.
Aleicia Harley		Option 2: Keep existing Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	Small dogs need to be leashed		no	no	All dogs are required to be on lead while in public unless at an off leash park.

Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
Jacqueline Steyn		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw		A lot of dog owners do not understand dog mentality. Socialising dogs does not mean just letting them run up to any dog. Not all dogs are friendly with other dogs but if the owner is keeping it on a leash and under control they deserve to be able to go out in public and not get accosted by all the 'friendly' off leash dogs that are out of owners control and may run up and cause a dog fight with the responsible owner's dog that is on a leash. These off leash dogs that are not under the owners control cause a lot of dog fights and anxiety for the owners that spend time properly training their dogs. We want dogs to socialise under a controlled situation. In most cases people are just lazy and want the dogs to run wild and exercise themselves. I think there should still be areas that dogs can run off leash but everyone needs to know where this is so they can be avoided if you want to.	no	no	All dogs are required to be on lead while in public unless at an off leash park.
Lorraine Hutchison		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments		One of the pleasures of our seniors and myself is walking their furbabes up Centennial Drive. All the dogs I have met are a pleasure for us. noted people will secure their dogs if they are willful! My boy loves the freedom of sniffing and running around with other friendly 4 legged family pets.	no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Suzanne OConnor			I am just concerned about the amount of dog attacks on innocent people particularly the elderly and young children. I'm not familiar with the new changes but trust the right decision to be made. I wonder if people are not registering dogs due to cost? I do think there are some breeds eg pit bulls etc that can be lethal so that could have a higher penalty? Also my concern is that gangs often have dogs for protection etc but maybe too intimidating to monitor.		no	no	
Denise Anderson		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	I believe clear and enforceable rules must be made to further protect kuri. My questions around this further below in the form.	I would like to know what the bullet point 'Recognition of kuri- strengthened and in partnership.....' etc, actually means. Does this give greater protection to the animal, or to the whanau who own them? How is this enacted and policed in the real world outside of a cultural construct?	no	no	
David Irwin		Option 2: Keep existing Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw		We have been walking our dog on lead (by choice) twice a day in Centennial Drive for 9 years and have never seen a dog attack another. I am on the committee for the Centennial Drive Development society who support putting dogs on leash but unlike most of the members, I am a dog owner and as an individual I do not support their decision. I do not know the details of the purported minority attacks that have occurred, but I do know timid dogs often have timid owners and attract attention. Timid/small dogs on leads can feel threatened as they are unable to adequately defend themselves which makes them more defensive around unleashed dogs. As the majority of dogs are walked in the mornings and early evening a fairer system would be to allow off lease between 4pm and 9am and on leash between 9am and 4pm as is done in other countries. That gives everyone a choice as to when and how they walk their dog and avoid the inevitable altercations which will occur if your proposal goes ahead. It will not be the dogs that you have to worry about. In my experience Centennial drive has been a successful off leash area. A dog must be walked. Not by car which has a dangerous element and owners that are less likely to pick up.	no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Murray Reid		Option 5: Other	Firstly I would comment that the dog issue in MPDC is relatively minor compared to some districts. I have been a responsible dog owner for nearly 30 years and have concluded that my registration fees in the main go toward creating a Council team whose focus is on control of dogs owned by people less responsible. "The goodies pay for the baddies". We seem hell bent on desexing, again at my expense. I think we should take a much harder line. All dogs should be chipped and registered. Any found unsupervised should be impounded and if after a week no owner has claimed it it should be put down, by the cheapest means. If an owner does claim the dog then a very healthy fine should be applied, big enough to suggest to the errant owner that the best option is to have the dog put down. Their choice!		no	no	Dog registration is not optional, it is a requirement under the Dog Control Act that all dogs are registered. Council do enforce this requirement and assist with microchipping where required.
Roy Brimblecombe		Option 5: Other	All dogs to be on leads at all times, excluding designated exercise areas. Dogs on leads permitted in main shopping area. Dog control officers to be given more power to ensure animal and public safety and to detain any and all wandering dogs. Dog control officers to carry out random property checks to expose the massive number of us registered and improperly cared for dogs. The onus has to be on the dog owner, not the public, to be safe.		no	no	Government is currently reviewing the Dog Control Act.
Greg Aspinall		Option 5: Other	Hi there, Thanks for allowing me to make a suggestion restricting access . What about having time-bound access for off-leash and on-leash for Tom Grant and Centennial Drive, much like a beach provides? As a dog owner and walker, I notice limited people except for joggers and dog walkers in the early morning. ie 5.30 am-7.30 am Mon, Friday, and 5.30am-8.00am Sat/Sunday. Anyway go well. really appreciate the consultation		no	no	Laws that are time framed do add confusion and are harder to regulate, but could be further considered.

Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
Keith Walters			Only one dog per household. Focus completely on dog-barking. (Always overlooked, perhaps intentionally by Council).	Stop people suffering with stress from now on. Dogs, even include murderous ones (they're all capable) They dogs aren't even put down! The only good dog is a working dog. Don't be afraid to stand up to pushy and demanding dog owners. Those days should be gone. Dogs are quieter when their owners are home. How nice for them! (discussed with MP's local office)	no	no	Barking dog issues are covered under the Dog Control Act 1996
Laurel Amon		Option 5: Other	Unless in exercise/dog areas all dogs should be on a leash. Owners all think they can control their dogs but many do not respond to command instantly. Not every one likes having dogs rushing up to them, jumping up on them etc etc. Don't like dogs in outdoor eating areas....means those who do not like or fear dogs do not have the option to dine out in fresh air. . Have some in our area who take their dogs for walks..with at least one off leash and allow it to tear off and pee on neighbours letterbox, garden etc.. Would like to see Dog Ranger patrolling more often.		no	no	Animal control carry out patrols as part of their duties.
Fiona Scott		Option 5: Other	Dog walking on leash on rail trail is excellent idea. Dogs in CBD should Not be allowed unless they are a guide dog. Shoppers dont want to see or smell dog poo or urine!		no	no	
Jodi Hilliar				Have to have dogs on a short/very short leash. Not a long lease like the ones where you can release or wind in the leash. So dog has to be beside the legs of the owner at all times. Especially applies when in the CBD, or in places where there are a lot of people gathering, eg; market place or farmers market or concerts. It's important the dog gets out of the way of people, not the other way round	no	no	There are not restrictions on leash length however dogs must remain under control even while on a lead.
Rogenvald Staffenmeir		Option 5: Other	I am always astounded at the binary either or approach. How about the both and approach? In Central Park NY you may walk your dog off lead until 9am and then on lead is enforced on lead from 9am to 9pm. I suggest that the same compromise be adopted here. Most people who are timid of dogs do not walk before 9am and most dog owners have walked their pooches well and truly before this time apart from a few stragglers.	Personally I believe if you decide on the heavy handed approach you will only encourage bloody mindedness most dog owners I have seen especially in the drive are very responsible.	no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Dianne Burnadette Squires		Option 4: Revoke current Dog Control Bylaw		There is nothing in the changes for those dogs whose owners let them roam and do not register them. The ones who are paying for the privilege of owning a dog are paying for the Animal Control to deal with them. The Lack of Registration and roaming dogs should be shown front and fore most not just in small print.	no	no	The fee increase is necessary to ensure we cover costs and stay within our Revenue and Financing Policy which requires 80% of the costs of this service to be covered by dog owners. However, as part of developing the Long Term Plan we plan to review this split.
Christine smith			Can we have more rubbish bins at parks for dog poos		no	no	Outside the scope of the bylaw review. Rubbish bins and removal of waste comes at a cost that is funded from rates. We currently provide bins at high use sports and community parks that attract large groups of people and visitors from other areas during tournaments and events. We do not provide bins at most neighbourhood parks (residents are expected to take rubbish and recycling home and dispose of them responsibly). We also do not provide bins at remote rural sites due to the costs of servicing. These have a 'carry in, carry out' approach. Council may wish to consider the provision of bins, the associated costs and funding options as part of the LTP process.
Eve Kinane		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	Section A Control Requirements, point 9 Confinement and General Control, in the explanatory notes add another bullet to include "runners" and "cats", in other words, a dog is not considered under control if it runs after runners or after cats.	Where is the policing on the less populated parts of the rail trail for dogs that are found wandering off leash? How will that be policed? What can people using the rail trail do to help bring to the attention of Animal Control a dog that is being allowed to breach the rules in that area eg photographs, video footage?	no	no	Compliants will be investigated, any information provided may help progress the compliant.
Chantelle McQueen		Option 4: Revoke current Dog Control Bylaw		I have lived backing onto Tom Grant Drive for 30+ years and have specifically chosen to stay in this area due to the fact we can walk our dogs off-leash along the Drive. I walk the Drive daily and have never seen any situation that would require changing to on-leash. Personally I always leash my dog/s when I think it's necessary (young family approaching etc) / passing the playground. We do not let our dogs run up to people, they know they need to stay close to us. I have seen very scary situations with dogs being aggressive when visiting the Peria Road and Cambridge dog parks, but never in the Drive. I think there should be more poo bag stations at each end of the Drive, and that owners should be more responsible and carry their own rolls. I realise people without dogs enjoy walking along the Drive, but so do people with their dogs. Others have the chance to walk anywhere they like, we don't. One of our dogs loves to play fetch with her ball, how are we supposed to do that while she is on a leash? Where else do we do that? Founders Park is not suitable as a dog park, the fence is non-existent, and it's surrounded by roads.	no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.

Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
Phil Beetham		Option 2: Keep existing Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	I have no problem with any bylaws regarding dog control and other owner's responsibilities. We have a medium size dog who is totally bonded to us; avoids other dogs and people unless we take her there, and because of our age and condition exercise her by running her slowly beside the car. She loves this and we are completely happy to keep her fit and healthy this way. Because of this, as we have NEVER had any problem with her behavior or from other dogs, PLEASE DO NOT MAKE CENTENIAL DRIVE A LEASH ONLY AREA. It is the most handy and suitable area for us, and keeping our 10 year old girl fit and healthy without any problem. Thanks for this opportunity, and thanks for listening.		no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Trish Tribble			Dog registration charges are already too high with rates. We cannot keep up!	The \$10 per dog increase is outrageous! Along with extra hike in rates yet 150 is not enough PER DOG!!! Make it \$10 per household but not per dog. syp making us the responsible ones pay for the irresponsible ones! If pound is running at that big of a loss then you need better staff and model for it.	no	no	The fee increase is necessary to ensure we cover costs and stay within our Revenue and Financing Policy which requires 80% of the costs of this service to be covered by dog owners. However, as part of developing the Long Term Plan we plan to review this split.
Linda & Peter Lintern		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	As we each day walk our Teacup Chihuahua along CBD, we very much appreciate that. We find it very safe and at all times Remy is on a leash & any dropping immediately attended to.	Illegal to walk dog unleashed in CBD and all built up area's in Matamata. Also dropping to be picked up at all times.	no	no	Dogs should be on leash at all times in public unless in an off leash area.
Edward Dean		Option 2: Keep existing Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	I do not know if this applies to Swap Park. As dog owners we are responsible and always take away dog poo, etc. I know there are many people in Matamata, like myself and my wife, who love exercising their dogs at Swap Park, there are hardly any alternative areas of a decent size in Matamata at present; it is necessary, fitness wise, for the dogs to get proper exercise which they can't get, to that degree, on-leash, and also it is good exercise for the owners to walk or run with their dogs over the park! I feel that this is a necessary occupation for all concerned, dogs and people. So I hope that Swap Park will continue to be an available venue for exercising dogs off-leash, and I know there are many people that think the same. Hopefully the regulations stated in your plan does not impinge on the facility of Swap Park, but in case it does, this is why we feel we have to make a statement. Thank you. Eddie and Kerry Dean.		no	no	Swap Park is an on leash area in the bylaw. There was a proposal a few years back to make Swap Park an off leash dog exercise area, but there was mixed feedback from the community and it was decided to develop Peria Road Reserve as a dog exercise area instead. Over the years various ideas have been floated to develop Swap Park for various sports, recreation, and othr activities. Council may wish to consider developing a masterplan for Swap Park with the community to guide future use and development of the space.
Barry Patchett				As responsible dog owners, we like to be able to walk our dog off leash through sections of Centennial Drive. This she enjoys, opposed to dog parks, because she does not run around with other dogs, and prefers the company of humans more. It would be a shame to loose the option of off lead walks through this beautiful section of town. We have never experienced any problems with other dogs, or people when we take this enjoyable option. We did used to walk her off lead on the outskirts of town until we got to the busier roads, then put her on the lead. Someone objected, and reported us to animal control. We have owned dogs at our address on and off for thirty odd years, and never before been reported for any issues.	no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Nicole		Option 5: Other		Submission on Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw To the Matamata-Piako District Council, As a resident of Waharua and a responsible, law-abiding dog owner, I am providing feedback on the proposed updates. To be blunt, the majority of the proposed changes - such as CBD access and Hauraki Rail Trail rules - feel like minor administrative distractions compared to the significant, unaddressed issue of wandering dogs in our community. My feedback is as follows: Prioritize Safety over Perks: While the Council is focused on "increasing access" in town centers, residents in Waharua are dealing with the daily safety risk of roaming, unsecured dogs. It is frustrating to see resources spent on debating leash rules for the CBD when basic street safety in our township is being ignored. Enforcement is the Real Issue: Changing the wording of a bylaw doesn't matter if there aren't enough boots on the ground to enforce it. I want to know why the Council is prioritizing "repurposing policy statements" over actual, proactive Animal Control patrols in areas like Waharua where wandering is a known problem. The Burden on Responsible Owners: As someone who keeps my dog secured and follows the rules, I am the one most impacted by the Council's failure to control roaming dogs. The "public confidence" the Council claims to seek cannot exist while we cannot walk down our own streets safely. Conclusion: I urge the Council to stop focusing on low-priority "amenity" changes and instead provide a clear, funded plan for how they intend to solve current issues like the wandering dog crisis in Waharua. I would like to see more accountability and more frequent patrols rather than more rules that only impact the people already following them. Thank you	no	no	Council is currently developing its plans for the next 10 years. As part of that it may be possible to look at increasing staffing for animal control. No decisions have been made. The submissions received through this process will be used as part of what is considered.
Brett Johnstone		Option 5: Other	Ban all dogs in the business area of Morrinsville.		no	no	
Belinda Duncan	Wildflower Animal Care	Option 2: Keep existing Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw		It would be great if off lead dog play areas are properly fenced.	no	no	
Donna Bjerring		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw		There are no dog waste or council bins in the Waihou area, most people exercise their dogs on the 'paddock' by the Waihou Rugby Club so is it possible to get a bin at this location to dispose of dog waste as there are issues daily with people picking up after their dogs in this area and its used by many sports / people including children as well as dog owners.	no	no	

Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
Lynnda McLachlan		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	Why do you need recognize a dog for cultural reasons? No other local council stipulate this. A dog for the majority of the responsible dog owners is an integral part of our family unit. We care for our dogs and fully socialize our dogs. By contrast the minority (part maori) are inevitably the irresponsible dog owners, who chain and mistreat them.	Also need to ban dogs being on chains permantly. How is council going to monitor compliance to new standards? The dog owners need to be educated on being a responsible dog owners. Vicious and aggressive dogs are generally due to how the owners treat their dogs.	yes	no	Animal welfare matters of this nature are primarily overseen by the SPCA, and Council works alongside the SPCA where appropriate to support.
Róisín Mc Quillan		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	Some of the proposals over over leash areas are a little strict		no	no	
Steve Greene		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	If the community want change, then make the change. Trial periods just drag out the consultation and democratic process.	Strongly support the feedback already received regarding the need for more and larger off-leash dog exercise areas in the district, particularly in Morrinsville where options are very limited and compact. Rules and signage need to be more clearly displayed so they can be understood and followed accordingly.	no	no	
Graham & Sue Callis		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	The 2010 Policy on Dogs ammendment has been clarified and the language simplified to be more inclusive of owners requirements and easily undersatood. We believe some of the proposed changes, as detailed in our submisson, require changing to maintain the intent of this update to be clear and meaningful to dog owners and residents across the district.	This proposed change does not make sense for dog owners or residents in the Matamata ward. Currently Matamata has five designated areas for dogs to exercise off-leash - Furness Reserve, Founders Park, Peria Road Reserve, Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive. The total land area of these five areas (derived from the Passive Reserve Management Plan 2009) totals 12.1394 hectares. Removing Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive would take away 8.5156 hectares or 70% of the current available exercise area for dogs off a leash. The remaining three sites available (3.6238 hectares) are small and not easily accessable for all dog owners within the Matamata district. In particular Founders Park is a small area with heavy pedestrian use, bordered by four carriage ways and any increase in use woud be detrimental to all users. Additionally the proposal does not provide any background information as to why this change has been proposed - is there data supporting this proposal that relates to incidents or complaints about owners and their dogs in these two areas? We note that of all the submissions made during the September/October 2025 consultation process on unsuitable dog spots in Matamata, a total of 90 submissions were received which only represents 0.24% of the district population - meaning this would appear insufficient data on which to base any proposal for change. If the two areas proposed are to be removed as off-leash exercise areas, there must be alternate areas allocated within the district to maintain equitable access for off-leash dog exercise areas within the Matamata district. Matamata has the largest resident pouppulation (14,883 residents - compared to Morrinsville of 13,782 and Te Aroha of 8,430) of the three wards comprising the Matamata Piako district, yet this proposal would see the Matamata ward with the smallest area available for off-leash exercise, something that is out of sync and disproportionate compared to the remainig wards. Additionally as the population of Matamata continues to grow, particulary with residential lifestyle villages, the remaining facilites would not be able to easily meet any growth in demand of dog owners. Large numbers of residents use the two drives for exercising their dogs responsibly and within the current regulations. Many of these users are elderly and can walk to these areas from their places of residence. Any proposed change should also consider the impact on residents having to use private transport to access the remaining off-leash exercise areas and the impact this would have on existing parking at these remaining facilities. Additionally the use of the two drives by dog owners adds to the social and community intergration that is highly beneficial to the vibrant and supportive community spirit that currently exists within the ward.	yes	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Wendy Morgan		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	1/. I disagree with the "cultural" section. It doesn't matter whether you're black, white, brindled, pakeha or Maori, the same rules should apply to everyone without having to put a cultural section in. This by-law is about DOGS, not people or their race. 2/. Nowhere undsr the menacing dogs is it mentioned the dogs will be euthanised. A warning and prosecution is not enough for a dog attack. If it is a serious attack that dog should be taken and destroyed immediately. Too much time and money is spent on keeping dangerous dogs alive because the owner wants to take the issue to court. If a dog does serious damage it must go. 3/. You speak of neutering but any dog that is entire and continuously roams or gets picked up should be neutered before being returned to the owner. No cultural rubbish in there either. There's too many unlooked after dogs as there is. Roaming dogs breed, simple. And finally people mentioned Founders Park quite a bit but you are leaving it as a leash free area. Rawhiti Road is way too close and busy for this to be a leash free area with trucks going down it all the time. You are taking away the other leash free areas but I don't see one new area included where dogs can go leash free. From what I see you're just removing the options?	As a dog owner who uses Tom Grant regularly I totally agree because there are a lot of owners who just let their dogs off when they have no control over them, they're in the playground and people's sections and half the owners don't bother to pick up after them. Alot of owners are responsible and take dog bags with them and I see you have put a bag dispenser on the eastern end of Tom Grant, it would be good to also have one on the Western end, preferably up near the Tawari Street entry so anyone who may have forgotten a bag can take one with them.	no	no	

Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
Lea Stanley		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments		My property backs on to Centennial Drive and I walk both Centennial and Tom Grant drives almost daily - I am not a dog owner. I find the proposal to make these particular areas on leash only, totally unnecessary and a huge restriction for responsible dog owners in this town as they have so few alternatives. I understand there may be an issue with the small playground in Tom Grant Drive but this could be so easily remedied with a fence around the playground that would stop any dogs and children meeting by accident. The alternatives for dog owners are not very user friendly - Founders Park is bordered by 4 roads, one of which is very busy. The Peria Road Reserve is also beside a busy road. The actual dog park is very small and not ok when you get small and large dogs together. That only leaves Furness Reserve which is not ok for all the dogs and owners that live on the other side of the railway line. People that are not ok with dogs off leash have plenty more spaces that they can walk where dogs do have to be leashed, than the other way around. This proposal puts dog owners at a huge disadvantage and I certainly don't agree with it.	no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Evelyn Ryan		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	It would be good if Council would also try to get the trail administrator to remove the prohibition on dogs on the Rail Trail section from Stirling Street to the MPDC/HDC border.	Trials cost money, just be brave and implement the changes.	no	no	
Cathy O'Callaghan		Option 2: Keep existing Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw		This proposed change disappoints me. We live near Centennial Dr and walk two dogs off lead there every day. In eight years we've not had a single issue with people, children, cyclists, vehicles or other dogs. It's so sad this will be changed.	no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Margaret Troughton			As a dog owner and I walk this area everyday I propose -Centennial Drive & Tom Grant Drive are a community relaxation area and dogs should be on a lead from 8am - 5pm - The only problem is dogs that are roaming free and this causes problems for other dog owners and the public. We love this walk and appreciate an area to walk our dogs on a lead and well supervised.	Dogs should be on a lead at all times- we have a local dog park for roaming & exercise.	yes	no	
Rosemary Locke			I have a guide dog and walk the centennial drive and Tom Grant drive every day , problems are Dogs not on a lead .		no	no	
Christine Coley		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	There needs to be very clear, larger colourful (red/yellow) signage where dogs need to be leashed. I see dogs off leash most days I walk the Tūi Domain track.	More & larger signage for on leash walks on Mt Te Aroha, particularly the Tūi Domain Track. Need signs facing both ways at the Water Treatment Station, Hamilton Street, the start of the Tūi track by the Domain etc. plus a social media campaign to educated for people with dogs who don't read policy.			Our website advises that dogs along Tui Domain Track must be 'on leash'. Signage along Tui-Domain Track is in the process of being upgraded. Red and yellow signs along tracks have specific uses as outlined in the <i>Good practice guide for outdoor safety signs</i> . Red signs warn of Danger and yellow signs advise Caution . This system is used nationally by DOC and also by MPDC. It is therefore not appropriate to use these colours on regulatory dog signs.
Nicola McDonald	Companion Animals NZ	Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	Please see the attached document 'Matamata Submission 2026'		no	Appendix C, page 2	
Angela		Option 5: Other	The responsible owner rebate should be for attending an approved dog training school and if there any issues of threatening behavior or actual harm such as with an attack the owner should not only deal with the charges but also be made compulsory to attend dog training. The number of reports made on mm noticeboardof threatening begaviour or actual attacks is quite worrying for many people out walking with dogs and children and themselves Dogs or properties around Matamata of which it is said there are many that are permanently chained and never let off their leash or out of their cage should be checked at least once each year for maltreatment. My neighbours have a dog they told me is a Rottweiler which ive heard barking but never ever seen it. One of my lawnmower ladies said it killed her cat years ago. So its obviously never let off its chain		no	no	Changes to the Dog Control Act 1996 are being reviewed by central government, any council does in the dog space need to a line with legislation. SPCA look after this type of welfare concern.
Peter Hayes		Option 2: Keep existing Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	Existing policy is fit for purpose. What is not fit, is resourcing to ensure the policy is implemented. A small increase in monitoring capability, increased penalties where infringement occurs. A very small percentage of our dog owners are responsible for the majority of incidents or bad behaviour.		no	no	
Colleen Smith			I'm not choosing My rules are no dogs in retail area. Definitely not in cafes or outside. More control on wandering dogs. Dogs on leash in suburban streets.		no	no	

Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
Leith and Cheryl Shearman		Option 2: Keep existing Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	We do not see a problem with keeping things as they are, why change something that has worked for years? We walk our dog daily through Tom Grant Drive, seeing/meeting many owners/dogs and have never had a problem with our dog or any others. Being off leash allows them to explore and is much more enjoyable for them. If dogs are going to be unnecessarily restrained then we would suggest that 1. speeding cars through both Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive should be stopped as they are dangerous for walkers, runners, children cycling and dogs; 2. cars must stay on the tarseal and not go onto the grassy areas; 3. people in those cars need to take their rubbish with them or put it in rubbish bins provided instead of littering		no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Catherine Tidmarsh				Living in Matamata, this is the only walk that allows you to take your dog on a long-distance walk without having to put them in a vehicle and leave town to walk them off-leash. I believe that if your dog has good recall, you are able to control them, and you are picking up after them, it would be a shame to revoke this opportunity to take them off lead. I am happy to discuss this further in person if required.	no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Diana Bird		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	Roaming dogs are clearly a problem. Will reports be promptly acted upon? That appears to be an issue at the moment. Education is obviously a key part of your process. I applaud this, and would like to know who will be doing it and how? Is it the first course of action once a problem is identified or do you have the time and people for preventative education? If not, please utilise your community. I'd be happy to help and I'm certain other local trainers would too.		no	no	Education is carried out through face to face interaction and council communication mediums.
Mark Walton		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments		It works well as a dog exercise area as it is, we walk our dog there daily and have never had any issues. Owners are very responsible and keep dogs on leash if they are not social, most dogs are well socialised and no bother. Our dog is never on a lead, is always under control. is social with people, kids and dogs, doesn't chase birds or cats and has good recall. This is one of the few remaining exercise areas in Matamata that we can walk to (the dog park is too far out of town).	no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Christopher Randal		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments	Support the new policy, however do not support making Centennial/Tom Grant Drives being on leash only. Dogs benefit from mental, visual and location stimulation and the dog park on Peria Road does not offer that.	Although not part of this proposal do not agree to the increase in dog fees without a commensurate increase in dog control measures. In Waharoa we are unable to walk our dogs due to the number of roaming dogs There seems to be an unfortunate increase in councils restricting the movement of dogs within their areas of control. Examples in our area are Tauranga and Rotorua. I would hate MPDC going down the same path. I think that people who are, at best, ambivalent about dogs are writing these restrictive rules without considering the ramifications for dog lovers.	no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Lisa			I would like to see this happen but its also hard for dog owners as people ideas of what a dog is or should be ie size, looks and colour or even what dog owners look like can make it hard when you want to walk your dog through towns. Also our foot paths are small so contact between dog and people are unavoidable. In Morrinsville you do see business who are dog friendly who have dog water bowls out the front of their shops. Its almost like you need a walk way like bikes have on roads for dog owners but this will limit car parking if we widen foot paths. Also I dont think dog owners know there is time restrictions as i dont think ive seen signage in town or ive completely missed seeing them?If this is safe to do so, I think a trial or pilot program would have been good to test this ie different dog types, sizes and possibly behaviors meaning well behaved, hypo dogs with lots of energy etc Also council may want to consider that families take their dogs for walks and often stop at play grounds for children to have a play and some play grounds are not all fenced, those that are, especially if only one parent with children can't enter with dog according to policy could it be looked at that can enter if on lead and possible tie up post? Just a suggestion. If this is safe to do so, I think a trial or pilot program would have been good to test this ie different dog types, sizes and possibly behaviors meaning well behaved, hypo dogs with lots of energy to see if the can co exist but also signs up with poo bins available for dog owners. I have seen these types of bins in Cambridge. Ive also seen them with bags available if owners run short. All this cost but great incentive for more areas to have the bins rather than filling normal bins with animal faeces.	When you as a responsible dog owner/s who takes responsibility of the actions their dogs when they commit an offense as i was first informed that my dogs were detained as DNA had to be taken and sent away to confirm they had a right dog even though a witness said it was the dogs so when another person started dealing with me directly i was given mixed messages over this. Dog owners shouldn't be pressured to put down their dog (cause council are looking at time frames at having to hold a dog not the fact the dog has been part of your family for years) especially when you know the nature of your own dog and the fact they safely interact with people and other dogs but just dont like cats especially when they are not brought up together, it was stressful as we worked full time and trying to find money and solutions to get your section fit to have dogs returned was hard, when you did something to make improvements you were told thats not enough or thats not good enough or each improvement you made and you sent evidence in to show what you had done there was no acknowledgement to say yes that will or will not work was also frustrating and also one minute your dealing with one person and then not advised that someone else is now handling to followed up of what your decisions are etc. Better transparency around this needs to be improved. Also information your are handing out needs to be accurate around getting your dog desexed as I was told I could get a voucher and it wasn't until I was getting the other dog returned that I was told that this doesn't happen for dogs anymore. When you make the decision to allow your pet to be put down you as the owner should have the option to do it at your home and provide a vets death certificate that you have complied or you should be allowed to be with your dog when vet does it and you should have the option to have your dog given back to you after it is put down. I was prepared to pay for this service through Truly Treasured Pet's loss & Cremation services in Horsham Downs whom i did use to cremate my dog. My family went through this traumatic experience recently with council, we had not seen our dogs since they were impounded and when I made the decision to put one of the dogs down (as i told council i can't guarantee my dog wont get out as it takes one person to make a mistake and not shut a gate properly, so that is why i surrendered him) we weren't given the option to see our dog before it happened and I had to ask to have my dog back cause if council cremated we dont get ashes back and though I surrender him he was still part of our family whom we wanted to cremate and keep. Picking up my dog from vets after he passed was the worse experience as this was how my family remembered seeing him one last time. I dont want any other family to experience this. I know council have rules and regulations and I abide by them but believe some areas of interaction between owners and council could be reviewed. I dont have a problem with cats but why is it that council dont have a policy about registering cats as they are considered as pets, they can roam freely in and out of properties that isn't there own, like dogs can cause accidents on roads but also who is responsible for collecting a cat if killed on the road and no one claims it? Who pays for cost of disposal if council collects it? I am a pet owner and always respect laws and policies as it showed i co operated with all that was asked of me by council when dealing with this and all that I ask is a review on how to handle this better especially when you as an owner have taken responsibility even before test results came back. I don't mind this being discussed but I dont wish to speak in a public forum and be at risk at being publicly verbally abused because I saw how people reacted on social media reacted when my dogs were said they have killed a cat (though I wasnt publicly outed as owner and I never commented on post) some reactions were not nice. I know there are probably others out there who may have gone through this but probably never had any follow up after this happened. I want to make it clear I am not in	no	no	Staff note the distress and personal loss experienced and recognises the significant emotional impact that situations involving the impoundment or euthanasia of a pet can have on owners and their families. Council's processes in these circumstances are guided by legislative requirements and established procedures; however, feedback about how those processes are experienced and could be improved are important. We take your comments seriously and although Council is required to follow the requirements of the Dog Control Act, we will review our processes and ensure dog owners receive clear communication from Council staff in these circumstances. Thank you for taking the time to share your experiences and how we can improve. In terms of cats, there is currently no legislation that Council can enforce. Any complainants or concerns can be logged through our infoline at any time.

Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
				this but probably never had any follow up after this happened. I want to make it clear I am not in any way opposing council follow policies, I just feel some areas just to be reviewed.			
Caroline Thompson		Option 3: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw with amendments		This would impact me directly and be very disappointing, as it is the only place in Matamata that I consider suitable for off lead dog walking (I do not consider the dog park on Peria Rd a suitable design). The overwhelming majority of dogs that I see off lead in this area are well-behaved and under control, and those that are not well trained or socialised are usually kept on lead (unlike at the Peria Rd dog park). Losing this area would be a significant blow to the dog-owning community, and as an alternative I would suggest imposing time restrictions as to when dogs can be off lead, or only making certain areas/sections on lead.	no	no	Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Danny Boeglin		Option 5: Other	<p>Little is suggested about real deterrents to keep dogs on leashes in any public place. Too many people are blaze about keeping their dogs on a leash. Excuses are: 'my dog is friendly, my dog does not bite, it is inconvenient to my dog and myself to keep the dog leashed'. The excuses are endless. As a country we are failing people when it comes to being safe around dogs. Far too many maulings and killings of stock and even people. (Please check with ACC) Councils have for years tried to educate people about being responsible dog owners. Yes many are however not enough is being done about the careless, sloppy dog owners. I suggest instant heavy fines for owners who do not keep their dogs on a leash in any public place. No warnings anymore. Confiscate their dogs and hand them back after the heavy fine has been paid. Present laws do not address peoples' and dogs' state of mind after having endured a horrific attack. Many people have given up taking their dogs for walks because of the constant 'triggers' when coming across an unleashed dog. A good example is of a person who's calf muscle has been ripped off clean off his/her bone. This person possibly will be scared for live to venture out. I would like Council to consider this. All up I have no qualms about the present laws. My concern is that real deterrents are not in place. I am a dog owner. The dog is always leashed in public places and I clean up after him. Too many people simply leave their dog's excrement where it landed. This is why I would not want dogs in any City center. I would like to see bigger signage at the start of any public walk way and signage along the way highlighting fines if the dog is unleashed. Present signage is far too small. I have given up walking around the Wetlands as on most walks I come across unleashed dogs. My wife, dog and I have been molested by un leashed dogs on several occasions. Prior to returning a roaming dog Council should be satisfied that any fencing and gates are adequate. Unless an owner can provide secure fencing any dogs found roaming should not be returned to its owner. Thank you.</p>	<p>We as a society have for far too long tried to educate people about keeping dogs responsibly. Allowing dogs in City Centers brings back memories of overseas where dogs are allowed in CBDs. What a mess. I guess people get used to anything. Please maintain shopping to be a pleasant experience by keeping dogs out of the CBD. People will enter shops and as they do what are they going to do with their dogs? Tie them up outside and let them pine for their owners? Or at a later date allow people to take their dogs inside shops? Being a dog friendly Council is fine but please keep matters reasonable.</p> <p>Owners of roaming dogs must prove to Council that they can/will provide secure fencing/gates before any dogs are returned. A dog can be returned after the owner has paid a hefty fine. No more warnings unless there is a genuine reason the dog was on the lose.</p>	no	no	Our website indicates the rules for dogs at our parks and tracks. Council is working on better & larger signage, including a portable large sign reminding dog owners of their responsibilities, which can be moved by the Dog Control team to problem spots. There are currently on-lead signs at each official entrance to the Wetlands Walk as well as at the main entrances to Boyd Park. These signs do vary in size as some form part of larger site identification signs while others are standalone A3 or A2 signs installed at different times. There is currently no budget specifically for dog control signage.

Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
Annelies England			<p>thankyou so much for allowing me to have a say, I have had my dog training business local in matamata for 10 years and been doing 6 week courses for the past 8 years, I also do private sessions and courses in te aroha and morrinsville but mainly based in matamata, my main point of the classes is to teach owners to have control of their dogs in all situations and I train down centennial drive most weeks during all hours and at least 4x a week.</p> <p>its fantastic as there are so many different distractions, cars, bikes, Kids, dogs ect its a very diverse walk where I find alot of different people use, its shaded, concreted and wide enough for everyone to share.</p> <p>In my 8 years of doing courses and hundreds of private sessions down centennial drive I can honestly say I have never once had an issue with an off lead dog, and every 3rd dog I see would be off lead. the owner will either put dog on a lead, turn around or move to the side if they see us coming with an on lead dog.</p> <p>Everyone is respectful, welcoming and in general comments how nice it is down there, I dont understand where this idea has come from ? Where are people meant to walk dogs off lead ?</p> <p>Furness reserve - yes if you drive there and it is a good spot.</p> <p>Central Matamata off rawhiti street ? - how is one meant to ssfety let a dog off a lead when that small square is open to 4 direct streets/ roads at all angles ? there is no safe place at all. no area to run, throw a ball. It's a terrible area for off lead.</p> <p>Dog park down peria road ? - im a dog trainer and I would never take my dogs there nor would i safely do training there, far to small and nothing for the dogs to do or get distracted with - its like putting 10 out of control, off lead dogs in a small space and tell them to behave. there are multiple fights and behavioral issues at that park.</p> <p>If you are proposing to take away centennial/ tom grant drive as an off lead area, then what are you replacing it with ? Where are people suppose to properly excercise their dogs ?</p> <p>20min walk on a lead then back home to be left there all day is nothing - drives the dogs insane. 20min off lead, sniffing , ball throwing, playing." being a dog" is completely different.</p> <p>Barking dogs who are left at home bored are going to get worse, behavioral issues will get worse, escaping dogs will get worse - 90% of the trainings I do privately with people I tell them to increase excercise, they dont nearly do enough of it. but where are they meant to go ?</p> <p>Who are the people complaining about off lead dogs ? the residents ? who should have a fence around their property other users of the drive ?</p>	<p>The problem that needs to be addressed in our town is the dogs who arent contained at home, arent looked after and continuously wander, kill cats and rabbits. there should be a law that someone who gets a dog must be in a fully fenced , dog proof section. there are so many attacks and incidents thar occur with wandering dogs attacking on lead dogs walking past. these should be targeted, Waharoa should be targeted, not the people who are doing right by their dog and exercising it properly.</p> <p>I would use the drive at least 4x a week and at all different hours - not once seen or had an issue, so I find it interesting this has come up ?</p> <p>It would be an absolute disaster taking that privilege away from dog owners, considering there are thousands in town. waiere falls and most of the bush walks are also no dogs now - so where do people go ?! there should just be a certain time frame your allowed up waiere with dogs.</p> <p>I have recently heard so many upset people that this is even getting considered so thought I need to have my say as these are the people who are doing their best by there dogs to get full control.</p>	yes		Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.

Submitter name	Organisation	Option selected:	Comment	Further comment	Attending hearing	Attachment	Staff comment
Sabena Roberts		Option 1: Adopt the Policy on Dogs and Dog Control Bylaw	<p>Barking dogs who are left at home bored are going to get worse, behavioral issues will get worse, escaping dogs will get worse - 90% of the trainings I do privately with people I tell them to increase exercise, they don't nearly do enough of it. but where are they meant to go ?</p> <p>Who are the people complaining about off lead dogs ? the residents ? who should have a fence around their property other users of the drive ?</p> <p>The problem that needs to be addressed in our town is the dogs who aren't contained at home, aren't looked after and continuously wander, kill cats and rabbits. there should be a law that someone who gets a dog must be in a fully fenced, dog proof section. there are so many attacks and incidents that occur with wandering dogs attacking on lead dogs walking past. these should be targeted, Waharoa should be targeted, not the people who are doing right by their dog and exercising it properly.</p> <p>I would use the drive at least 4x a week and at all different hours - not once seen or had an issue, so I find it interesting this has come up ?</p> <p>It would be an absolute disaster taking that privilege away from dog owners, considering there are thousands in town. waiere falls and most of the bush walks are also no dogs now - so where do people go ?! there should just be a certain time frame your allowed up waiere with dogs.</p> <p>I have recently heard so many upset people that this is even getting considered so thought I need to have my say as these are the people who are doing their best by there dogs to get full control.</p>				Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive function as shared spaces and are not physically separated from the road. The draft proposal includes on-leash controls in these areas due to safety considerations associated with shared use.
Jocelyn Cole					Yes	Appendix E	The draft bylaw proposes on-leash control in these areas to support safe and consistent use of high-use shared spaces. Concerns raised about vehicles, parking, littering, and other antisocial behaviour are outside the scope of the Dog Control Policy and Bylaw review and are addressed through other Council processes.
Dr Arnja Dale	RNZSPCA				No	Appendix F	<p>The support for adoption of the draft Policy and Bylaw is noted. Support for the Policy on Dogs is also noted (clearer structure, objectives).</p> <p>The draft bylaw proposes on-leash control on Tom Grant Drive and Centennial Drive to support safe and consistent use of high-use shared spaces. It is proposed to retain the three existing dog exercises in Matamata - being Furness Reserve, Matamata Founders Park and Peria Road Reserve (Portion excluding memorial plantings and pathway). This provides alternative places for dogs to exercise in Matamata.</p> <p>Support for the limit on two dogs within the urban areas, is noted.</p> <p>The draft Policy on Dogs sets out guidelines for dog classifications, including menacing dog classification (which includes consideration of the attack circumstances e.g where no physical contact was made/no injury vs where the victim was attacked, physical contact made /severe injury occurred.</p> <p>Clause 11 of the Policy discusses how Dogs may be classified based on reasons such as attacking a person or animal, rushing or behaving in a threatening manner, showing repeated uncontrolled or aggressive behaviour, or where the Owner has been convicted of an offence involving the dog. These classifications are behaviour-based and support public safety and responsible dog ownership.</p>
Public petition Redacted Version						Appendix G	