



Clarence City Council

38 Bligh Street / PO Box 96
Rosny Park Tasmania Australia
Telephone 03 6217 9500
Dx 70402
Email clarence@ccc.tas.gov.au
Website www.ccc.tas.gov.au

3 October 2019

Local Government Division
Department of Premier and Cabinet
lgd@dpac.tas.gov.au

Dear Mr Tay

COUNCIL FEEDBACK ON AMENDMENTS TO THE DOG CONTROL ACT 2000

I apologise for the delay in providing Council's comments on the *Dog Control Amendment Bill 2009*. Council overall supports the proposed amendments to the *Dog Control Act 2000*, however, has some comments and suggestions on the *Dog Control Amendment Bill 2019*.

Greyhounds

There are sections of the Bill which are clumsily drafted and result in the intent of the legislation being lost. For example, there is no definition of greyhound. If the intent of the legislation is to treat greyhounds differently to other dogs, they should be defined. It is suggested that there could be two definitions to differentiate between a greyhound which has passed a greyhound suitability program and a greyhound which has not. A greyhound which has passed a GSP could be defined to be treated the same as another dog.

It is also unclear how GSP greyhounds are differentiated and identified from non-GSP greyhounds. It is noted that greyhounds adopted through the Greyhound Adoption Program can wear green collars to identify as a greyhound which has passed the GAP process. This requirement is not legislated. It would be beneficial if the legislation provided that GSP greyhounds were required to wear an identifying collar and/or tag.

Under section 18, it is unclear how greyhounds are to be controlled in declared areas. Section 18(2) has not been amended to include reference to the proposed section 18(1)(ba). Section 18(2A) also contradicts section 18(1); it is unclear whether a greyhound must be muzzled and on a lead on private premises or if there is another test for "securely confined".

The proposed amendments appear to confuse the intention of the provision. It is suggested that section 18 could be rewritten to make it clearer what is effective control and to clearly set out requirements for greyhounds.

Section 7 – Dog magement policy

Section 7 currently only requires a council to develop, make and implement a policy regarding declarations made under the Act. The section should require a council to publish a schedule of declared areas. It is Council's experience that most dog owners simply want to know where they can and cannot take their dog.

Council is supportive of the amendment to section 7(3)(a) which enables a council to make amendments to its dog management policy and follow the same process for making a proposed dog management policy. During the term of a dog management policy, it is likely a council will need to make amendments to its policy, for example, to declare areas in a new subdivision.

Section 19AB

It is unclear why proposed section 19AB has the threshold of sensitive wildlife in a sensitive area; the intention of the provision appears to be to protect sensitive wildlife whether or not it's in a sensitive area. The proposed section should also expressly enable an authorised officer to humanely destroy a dog found at large in a sensitive area.

If you have any queries in relation to Council's submission please contact me on 6217 9526 or cshea@ccc.tas.gov.au

Yours sincerely



Clare Shea
ACTING MANAGER CORPORATE SUPPORT | LEGAL COUNSEL