

**MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY MONTHLY MEETING OF THE
REGULATORY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE, HELD IN THE
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 29 CIVIC AVENUE, GORE, ON TUESDAY 9
MAY 2006, AT 4:43 pm**

PRESENT His Worship the Mayor (Mr Tracy Hicks JP), Cr McFadzien (Chairperson) Crs Bolger, Davis, Dore, Harvey, Hellier, McIntyre, McLennan, Sutherland and Turnbull.

IN ATTENDANCE The General Manager, District Assets (Mr Neil Jorgensen), General Manager, Community Services (Miss Su Mohan Das), Parks and Recreation Manager (Mr Ian Soper), Roading Manager (Mr Murray Hasler), Asset Manager, Utilities (Mr Ross Haslemore) Chief Financial Officer (Mr Doug Walker), Office Manager (Mrs Margaret Evans), HR/Administration Manager (Susan Jones), Corporate Support Officer (Mrs Jo Waddell) and one member of the public in the gallery.

APOLOGIES Cr Ogg and the Chief Executive apologised for absence.

1. MICROCHIPPING OF DOGS (34.4.1)

A memo had been received from the General Manager, Community Services advising that amendments to the Dog Control Act 1996 would require the following dogs to be microchipped:

- New puppies, namely those born on, shortly before, or after 1 July 2006.
- A dog that had never been registered in New Zealand.
- A dog classified as dangerous or menacing on or after 1 December 2003.
- Unregistered dogs that were impounded and subsequently released.
- Registered dogs that were impounded twice after 1 July 2006, and subsequently released.



Cr McFadzien read excerpts from a newspaper article highlighting the fact that a number of dogs were never registered and microchipping dogs was a punishment imposed on good dog owners.

A copy of a resolution passed at a recent joint Zone 5 and 6 meeting together with a submission from that meeting on the Local Government Law Reform Bill (Dog Control Act 1996) had been circulated to Councillors.

Cr Sutherland said he was against microchipping dogs.

Cr Sutherland recommended THAT the information be received,

AND THAT the Council take no action in the meantime.

The recommendation was seconded by Cr Hellier.

Cr Hellier agreed it was an unnecessary cost and process. He preferred to wait to see what happened with the Amendment currently before the Government.

Cr Davis referred to minutes of a *Local Government New Zealand Rural Sector* meeting held in Wellington and a suggestion that all animals may be microchipped in the future.

Cr Harvey did not think sitting back and waiting to see what may happen was the best option to take.

His Worship supported the Council protesting as much as it could on the issue, but questioned if the other recommendations were not adopted would it pose problems?

The General Manager felt it would. The report was similar to what had been proposed by the Invercargill City and Southland District Councils.

His Worship thought the Council should only do the bare minimum in order to comply with the law.

Cr McLennan moved as Amendment THAT the report be received,

THAT the Council approve the proposed procedures for the implementation and enforcement of the provisions of the Dog Control Amendment Act 2004, as they relate to microchipping of dogs,



THAT the Council approve the proposed fee of \$36 (GST inclusive) each, for standard microchipping of dogs released from the pound; while non-standard microchipping procedures will be charged at cost,

THAT the new charges for microchipping be included in the Schedule of Fees and Charges for the next financial year commencing on 1 July 2006,

AND THAT the Council convey its objection in the strongest possible term to the leaders of all political parties about microchipping, the unfairness of the proposed legislation and its implications.

Cr Sutherland believed there would be civil disobedience from the rural sector if microchipping was made legal.

His Worship said the issue was an urban and rural one and he acknowledged the work done by groups such as Federated Farmers in making the country aware of the implications. However, he believed the Council had to have the mechanisms in place in order for it to obey the law.

The Amendment was seconded by Cr Harvey.

The Amendment was put and it was carried.

The Amendment then became the recommendation, was put and it was carried.

2. PROPOSED FEES AND CHARGES FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (17.3)

A memo had been received from the General Manager, Community Services together with a schedule of proposed fees and charges for resource management services. As well as generating additional revenue, the new fees better reflected the actual costs of providing the services.

In response to a query from Cr McIntyre, the General Manager advised the cost of full notification subdivisions had been discussed with the Planning Consultant and the proposed charge brought it into line with the charges for full notification land use consents.

RECOMMENDED on the motion of Cr Dore, seconded by Cr Davis, THAT the proposed fees and charges for resource



management be approved and be included in the Fees and Charges Schedule for the financial year beginning 1 July 2006.

3. NATIONAL DOG DATABASE ANNUAL LEVY (34.7)

A memo had been received from the General Manager, Community Services advising that the Department of Internal Affairs had been developing a national dog database and it would be fully operational on 1 July 2006.

Cr Hellier felt the Council's dog control fees were quite high and he wondered if the levy could be absorbed by the Council this year.

RECOMMENDED on the motion of Cr McLennan, seconded by Cr Davis, THAT the report be received,

THAT the Council approve the inclusion of an additional charge (flat fee) of \$1.50 to be paid by each dog owner (regardless of the number of dogs kept), towards recovering the costs of the annual National Dog Database levy,

AND THAT the schedule of fees and charges for the financial year beginning 1 July 2006, be amended accordingly.

Cr Davis asked if this was also worth protesting to the Government. The Council would be faced with \$4,500 in extra costs towards a database. She suggested the Council could retain a database of dangerous dogs only.

RECOMMENDED on the motion of Cr Davis, seconded by Cr Sutherland, THAT the Council voice strong disapproval to the Government about the Council's unwillingness to agree to the national database other than for the purposes of retaining information about dangerous dogs.

The meeting concluded at 5:08 pm



