

MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY ANIMAL CONTROL OF THE GREY DISTRICT COUNCIL**Held in Council Chambers, 105 Tainui Street, Greymouth****on Tuesday 18 August 2026 commencing at 1:10pm**

PRESENT: Cr Jack O'Connor (Chair), Councillor Kate Kennedy,

IN ATTENDANCE: Peter O'Sullivan (Group Manager Economic Development & Regulatory Services)
Shanelle Sampson (Animal Management Officer), Trish Jellyman (Democracy Advisor)

Cr O'Connor welcomed [REDACTED] to the meeting.

1 APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

APOLOGY

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION ACCCC 26/08/002

Moved: Cr Jack O'Connor

Seconded: Cr Kate Kennedy

That the apology received from Cr Birchfield be accepted and leave of absence granted.

Carried Unanimously

1.2 UPDATES TO THE INTERESTS REGISTER

There were no updates to the Interest Register.

1.3 IDENTIFY ANY CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS IN THE AGENDA

There were no declarations of interest.

1.4 NOTIFICATION OF LATE ITEMS

There were no late items.

2 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

2.1 CONFIRMATION OF THE ANIMAL CONTROL COMMITTEE HELD ON 20 JANUARY 2026

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION ACCCC 26/08/003

Moved: Cr Jack O'Connor

Seconded: Cr Kate Kennedy

That the minutes of the Animal Control Committee held on 20 January 2026 be confirmed as true and correct.

Carried Unanimously

3 AGENDA ITEMS

3.1 OBJECTION TO MENACING DOG CLASSIFICATION UNDER SECTION 33B (1) (A) (B) DOG CONTROL ACT 1996

Refer page 10 of the agenda.

Cr O'Connor invited [REDACTED] to speak to the objection. She provided an outline of [REDACTED] life to date and advised that [REDACTED] previous owners had moved overseas, and she and her family had adopted him. She stated that [REDACTED] has fitted well into her home and got on well with their other pets and children. He came to them with major hurdles and is now much better than when he first arrived.

Cr O'Connor clarified that [REDACTED] has been classified as a menacing dog, not a dangerous dog.

[REDACTED] outlined [REDACTED] medical conditions and previous life history. She stated that she walks [REDACTED] with a check chain and not with a collar. He attends duck hunting competitions, assists his owner with search and rescue operations and training. She stated [REDACTED] is a guard barker and is an aggressive snuggler. He is regularly taken on bush hikes and camping in the bush.

[REDACTED] advised that her family had moved and have been trying to get a fence built. They have a six-foot-high enclosed dog run. She stated that her dogs no longer wander but [REDACTED] does bark and run at people for a cuddle.

The day of the incident [REDACTED] barked and run out to the victim but was called straight away. [REDACTED] stated that she asked if the victim was okay and was contacted by the ACO a few days later and informed that there had been a complaint about [REDACTED]. She confirmed that she did not see the attack. She believes [REDACTED] would have rushed out to try to make contact with the victim who was running past at the time.

[REDACTED] viewed the photograph of the injury and stated that it looks more like a scratch rather than a bite.

Following the incident, the ACO visited the dog owners and requested that a temperance test be carried out on [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] declined the temperance test as she felt that due to [REDACTED] personality, health issues and how excited their dogs get when they come home from work, she felt that [REDACTED] would be set up to fail. She stated she would like to be home with him for a few hours prior to a temperance test being carried out. She stated that both herself and her husband work fulltime.

She confirmed that she has now purchased a gate. They are now trying to find boundary lines on their property but is wary of what could be accidentally dug up when building a fence. [REDACTED] now has a remote collar which he wears when outside and she now feels she has a bit more control. She stated that she no longer lets her dogs outside as it is now running season and people are sometimes running past her property.

[REDACTED] stated that when [REDACTED] is out with other dogs, or at competitions he does not wear a collar. She stated that having this classification will mean [REDACTED] will be disqualified as he cannot wear a muzzle when competing.

Cr Kennedy asked the ACO if there are ways of managing that the classification so that it does not impact on [REDACTED] gun club and other activities.

The ACO responded that she needs to ensure that the community is safe as this was an unprovoked attack and there is uncertainty as to what triggered [REDACTED]'s reaction. She advised that it is very important to ensure that dogs are fully secure when on their own property.

It was noted that if this classification was to be retracted Council would need to see progress and if there was another incident this would be instant reclassification.

Cr O'Connor explained where to from here and advised that public safety is the biggest concern. He thanked [REDACTED] for her attendance and advised that he will let her know the outcome of today's meeting.

Cr Kennedy stated that she appreciates the owner's responsibility and what she has done to date.

[REDACTED] left the meeting at 1.43pm.

The meeting adjourned at 1.43pm and reconvened at 1.59pm

Cr Kennedy stated that she would like to see the property fully fenced but noted that the dog owner is unable to provide this.

The ACO stated that temperance test is important and she was concerned that it was declined.

Cr O'Connor is also concerned that the owners are not home during the day and the property is not fully fenced.

The Committee came to the decision that the appeal against the classification of the menacing dog would be upheld in accordance with section 33B (2) of the Dog Control Act 1996 and in considering the objection under subsection (1), the objection to the classification be declined.

Cr O'Connor stated that these decisions are very difficult but public safety is most important.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION ACCCC 26/08/004

Moved: Cr Jack O'Connor

Seconded: Cr Kate Kennedy

That the Animal Control Committee:

1. Receive the report and,
2. In accordance with section 33B (2) of the Dog Control Act 1996 (committee) in considering the objection under subsection (1) may uphold or rescind the classification.
3. The committee must have regard to:
 - (a) The evidence which formed the basis for the classification; and
 - (b) Any steps taken by the owner to prevent any threat to the safety of persons or animals; and
 - (c) The matter relied on in support of the objection; and
 - (d) Any other relevant matters.
4. In accordance with section 33B (2) of the Dog Control Act 1996 (committee) in considering the objection under subsection (1) the Committee declined the objection and upheld the classification.

Carried Unanimously

4 SUB-COMMITTEE RESUMES IN OPEN MEETING

CLOSURE OR RATIFICATION OF DECISIONS IN OPEN MEETING.

The meeting concluded at 1.59pm.

Confirmed

J O'Connor

_____/_____/_____
Date

Chairperson