

**To:** [Local Government Division \(DPaC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission re Amendments to the Dog Control Act 2000  
**Date:** Thursday, 26 September 2019 4:12:11 PM

---

I have read the proposed amendments and herewith submit my comments for your consideration.

### **Penalties for dog attacks on wildlife**

re Section 19AB - Dogs must not injure or kill sensitive wildlife. I endorse this amendment.

re Section 19AC - Collection of a sample by authorised officer. I endorse this amendment.

re Section 22 amended - Prohibited areas. I endorse this amendment but have doubts about how the prohibition can be effectively policed.

### **Greyhounds**

re Section 18 amended - Effective control of greyhounds. I endorse this amendment.

### **Miscellaneous**

re the 'minor technical drafting improvements' made to remove ambiguity in the Act, these have not been specified.

re 'These amendments will clarify the intent of the dog management policy and declared area provisions to reflect the current practice in the sector', since January 2019, I have made many pleas by email correspondence to the Director of Local Government and the two Ministers for Local Government, Hon Peter Gutwein and Hon Mark Shelton, to publicise the **effective dog control** obligations ( *Dog Control Act 2000*, amended 20 December 2017, Part 1, item 4 Dogs under effective control).

From personal experience, anecdotal information from family and friends throughout Tasmania and local newspaper columns and abc radio 'talkback' comments (especially immediately after the deaths of significant numbers of penguins and livestock), it is obvious that many dog owners are either unaware of or choose to ignore their obligations. Irresponsible dog owners take no notice of Signage, Local Council Dog Control Policies on websites etc. I request that you source my emails to the Director and Ministers of Local Government which will qualify the reasons for my pursuing this issue as a matter of urgency for the health and safety of the general public.

I respectfully submit that Part 1, item 4, Dogs under effective control (1 a) be amended so that ' on a road or road-related area in a built up area, or any other public place declared under Division 2 of Part 3 to be an area where a dog must be on a lead,... ' should specifically include all Tasmanian beaches, coastal paths and tracts. I submit that Division 2 of Part 3 should also be amended to include all Tasmanian beaches, coastal tracts and paths as Declared Areas (of course other than the Prohibited areas as Section 22 amended above) where all dogs must be on a lead of no more than 2 metres in length. This would not preclude dog owners from exercising their dogs but would provide consistency for the 'policing' of the *Act* throughout the state so that every person (and dogs being exercised by responsible dog owners) ) could safely enjoy the beach amenity.

I would also like to draw your attention to

\* the lack of trained personnel/‘rangers’ to police the *Dog Control Act 2000*, thus making it imperative to publicise the obligations of dog owners and penalties which may and should be incurred;

\* the anomaly of land zoning where the responsibility for areas such as the beach at Greens Beach is classified as a Conservation Area under the regulation of Parks and Wildlife, not the West Tamar Council;

\* the need for immediacy of action to publicise the effective dog control obligations of dog owners according to the *Act*, especially with the summer season approaching.

Gillian Morris

