

11 January 2021

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

Official information request for DCC Animal Services Annual Report to the Department of Internal Affairs

I refer to your official information request dated 23 November 2020 for Council to provide reasons and evidence for a number of questions including:

- the expert advice received for the design of the Council dog parks;
- reasons for maintenance priorities of public spaces (which you considered were being held above the maintaining of dog parks);
- the mathematical formula used for the dog park to dog numbers ratio;
- the number of unregistered dogs;
- explanation of details provided in sections of the DCC Annual Report to the Department of Internal Affairs regarding the number of dogs neutered, microchipped; classified as dangerous, aggressive and for observed behaviours such as roaming.

As advised to you on 8 December 2020 that due to the level of research and collation to action your request (estimated as three hours of staff time), that Council intends to impose a charge of \$152.00 for this request. A copy of this advice and the Council's LGOIMA charging policy is attached again for your information.

Your response of 14 December 2020 advised that you do not agree to pay the proposed charge. Therefore the Council declines your request pursuant to section 17(f) of the Local Government Official Information Meetings Act 1987, due to substantial collation.

You have the right to seek an investigation and review by the Ombudsman of this decision. Information about how to make a complaint is available at www.ombudsman.parliament.nz or freephone 0800 802 602.

Yours sincerely



Lauren McDonald
Governance Support Officer
CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP

Encl: 2

From: Lauren McDonald
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Official Information request - Annual Report on Dog Control Policy and Practises
Date: Tuesday, 8 December 2020 10:39:00 a.m.

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your official information request of 23 November 2020. Having reviewed your request we estimate that it will take approximately 3 hours to collate and research the information requested. Pursuant to section 13 (1A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 the Council is entitled to impose a charge for requests that require substantial collation. The Council's charging policy detailed in the link below.

https://www.dunedin.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0010/187606/Charging-for-LGOIMA-requests-policy.pdf

As your request exceeds the one hour free we intend to impose a charge. The work is estimated to take 3 hours to research and collate, which equates to a charge of \$152.00, which would need to be paid in advance. If the time taken were to exceed this, we would let you know, and if less time was taken, a refund would be payable to you. Alternatively you may wish to refine your request.

As we will impose a charge on this request, you are advised you have the right to seek a review by the Office of the Ombudsman (info@ombudsman.parliament.nz) or 0880 802 602.

I await your instruction in regard to the processing or refinement of this request.

Yours sincerely

Lauren McDonald

Governance Support Officer
CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP

P 03 477 4000 | **DD** 03 474 3428 | **E** lauren.mcdonald@dcc.govt.nz

Dunedin City Council, 50 The Octagon, Dunedin

PO Box 5045, Dunedin 9054

New Zealand

www.dunedin.govt.nz

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 23 November 2020 12:56 p.m.
To: Official Information <officialinformation@oa.dcc.govt.nz>
Subject: Official Information request - Annual Report on Dog Control Policy and Practises

Dear Dunedin City Council,

My preference is to receive the requested information through the [REDACTED].

On 22 September 2020 Customer and Regulatory Services made the report "ANIMAL SERVICES

ANNUAL REPORT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS” to the Planning and Environment Committee.

1. At paragraph 10 the Report states:

“Each of the dog exercise parks has a unique design and has been built to maximise the use of the topography of the area. The surrounding areas are regularly maintained and upgraded. The ratio of dog exercise parks to known dogs (registered and unregistered) is 1:2,071.”

Please provide evidence to substantiate the following:

(a) The parks have been designed to “maximise the use of the topography”. For example, the reports from the experts involved such as the topographer, animal behaviourist, expert in the design of public spaces, design options that were considered, etc.

(b) The statutory authority that makes the dog control activity responsible for maintaining the surrounds of dog parks but not the dog parks, especially as all surrounds have access restrictions that mean they cannot be used by dog owners and their dogs.

(c) The reason maintaining surrounds takes priority over maintaining dog parks when the parks have been shown to fall below minimum legal levels for accessibility, usability and safe use for many years.

(d) The mathematical formula used to produce the 1:2071 park/dogs ratio given the majority of the dog population is prohibited from using the three “small dog/breed” parks which produces a different ratio when ordinary mathematics is applied to the disclosed numbers.

(e) The mathematical formula used to deduce the total number of dogs given analysing the stated dog/park ratio produces the precise number of 450 unregistered dogs, but applying reverse percentages to the figure of asserted known dogs produces only 371.

2. Paragraph 26 states a total of 11,012 dogs have been neutered under the neutering programme. Analysis of past reports produces an average of 227/annum which means it has taken approximately 49 years to neuter that number of dogs.

(a) Please explain why the Council is reporting a running total without identifying it is the result of accumulated numbers spanning almost five decades and what meaningful information that provides given the current Act has been in force for ½ that period and there was no equivalent focus on neutering in the previous legislation.

(b) Please confirm the numbers relating to neutered dogs are correct given:

- The total number of dogs neutered under the programme is the same as the total number of neutered dogs in Dunedin, yet it can be proven many owners neuter their dogs outside of the Dunedin City Council neutering programme
- The percentage of neutered dogs given 11012 of 18190 dogs is 61%, not 64% as stated.
- The change in percentage given the figures provided to the DIA show a percentage of 60% for the previous reporting year which means the number increased rather than remaining the same as stated.

3. Paragraph 27 states 92% of registered dogs are microchipped and that is the same as last year. However paragraph 27 of the 2019 Report states 91% of registered dogs are micro-chipped while the numbers provided to the DIA for 2019 produce a total of only 90%. Please identify which number is correct.

4. The Dog Control statistics record that 5 dogs were designated dangerous due to owner conviction, but only three prosecutions were taken during the reporting period. Please confirm

the number of dogs designated dangerous, and the number of prosecutions. Please also provide copies of the relevant judgements.

5. Paragraph 22 states 29 dogs were classified as menacing in the last 12 months, and 19 were due to behaviour. Please identify how many were classified due to displaying aggressive behaviours, and how many received that classification due to being considered a threat because of reported or observed behaviours such as roaming.

Note I expect this information will be easily to hand given the Report has only just been complied and presented.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

This is an Official Information request made via the [REDACTED].

Please use this email address for all replies to this request:

[REDACTED]

Is officialinformation@dcc.govt.nz the wrong address for Official Information requests to Dunedin City Council? If so, please contact us using this form:

https://fyi.org.nz/change_request/new?body=dunedin_city_council

Disclaimer: This message and any reply that you make will be published on the internet. Our privacy and copyright policies:

[REDACTED]

If you find this service useful as an Official Information officer, please ask your web manager to link to us from your organisation's OIA or LGOIMA page.

CHARGING FOR LGOIMA REQUESTS POLICY



Approved by:			
Sponsor:	Manager, Governance		
Department responsible:	Governance		
Date approved:		Reviewed:	30 November 2012
Next review date:		DOC ID:	

BACKGROUND

LGOIMA aims to make official information held by local authorities more freely available. It allows for effective participation by the public in actions and decisions of the local authority and promotes open and public transportation of business of the council. It also promotes the accountability of council members and staff. There are protections from disclosure where non-disclosure is in the public interest or to protect personal privacy.

If the reply to a request for information is likely to take a significant amount of research, collate and copy, the Dunedin City Council is entitled under LGOIMA, to impose a charge for the provision of information.

POLICY

1. Key guidelines

- 1.1. This policy details the amount that we may charge for the supply of information and is based on the Ministry of Justice Charging Guidelines for Official Information Act Requests.

2. Charges

- 2.1. The first ~~three~~ one (1) hours of time spent on fulfilling official information requests will be free; and then all additional time will be charged at \$38/half hour;
- 2.2. The first twenty (20) pages of black and white photocopying will be free, with a charge of 20c per page for all additional black and white pages.
- 2.3. All other charges incurred shall be fixed at an amount that recovers the actual costs involved. This includes:
 - 2.3.1. Producing a document by computer or other like equipment;
 - 2.3.2. Colour photocopies
 - 2.3.3. Reproducing a photograph, film, video or audio recording;
 - 2.3.4. Arranging for the requestors to hear or view an audio or visual recording;
 - 2.3.5. Providing a copy of any maps, plans etc.
- 2.4. NB: These rates are as outlined in the Ministry of Justice Guidelines and this policy will be amended to reflect any changes in the Ministry Guidelines.

- 2.5. We will notify the requestor of the estimated cost of their request before we begin working on the request. The requestor then has the option of proceeding, withdrawing or refining their request.
- 2.6. In accordance with section 13(4) of LGOIMA, we may require that the whole or part of any charge be paid in advance. A deposit will only be requested when the decision has been made to release the information.
- 2.7. Requestors are able to make a complaint to the Office of the Ombudsman in regards to the proposed charge.
- 2.8. Charges may be waived in whole or in part at the discretion of the Principal Administrative Officer. This will generally be in a situation where there is an agreed public interest in the disclosure of the information requested. This policy will be formally reviewed every three years ~~beginning in 30 November 2012.~~

Relevant Legislation:	Local Government Official Information Meetings Act
Associated Documents:	