

---

**MINUTES**  
of the  
**ANIMAL CONTROL SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

held  
**1:30pm, Thursday, 20 March 2025**  
at  
**Heaphy Room, 189 Queen Street, Richmond**

---

The [video recording](#) of this meeting is available on the Council's YouTube channel.

**Present:** Councillors C Hill (Chair), M Kininmonth (Zoom) and K Maling

**In Attendance:** Regulatory Manager (S Bruyns), Team Leader - Regulatory Support (S Green), Regulatory Support Officer (S Vale) and Governance Manager (E Stephenson)

**1 OPENING, WELCOME**

The Chair opened the meeting with karakia and welcomed everyone in attendance. Meeting attendees were introduced and the meeting process was outlined.

**2 REPORTS**

**4.1 Menacing Classification Appeal**

The Chair invited Briar-Leigh Hughes to provide a statement on the matter before the Subcommittee.

The following matters were stated:

- Ms Leigh was not involved in the altercation, she had asked Jean Love to take the dog Boy for a walk,
- Boy was one of three dogs involved, he was attacked first, he was bigger and able to protect himself

- This was the only altercation that Boy had been involved in to her knowledge
- After the incident, she had taken Boy to meet the Ranger at the dog pound, who was impressed by Boy's quiet nature
- They regularly took Boy to the beach and river
- Ms Leigh had a number and variety of pets and animals
- Boy was a well socialised dog
- Ms Hughes grew up on cattle farm, and understood what it meant to be a good dog owner
- Ms Hughes trusted that this would not happen again, she knew the dog and its recall, she had quality of life concerns for Boy
- She felt punishment would confuse and stress the dog, and believed that, had she been there, the outcome would have been different.

In response to questions from the Subcommittee, Ms Hughes provided the following answers:

- Boy was not on a lead, this was an unleashed area
- Boy was not kept on a lead or in a kennel at their normal residence
- Boy had full access to people at the residence
- There were a number of people on their property, including regular visitors, and a shared visitor carpark
- She was unable to dispute the events as she wasn't there, she believed Ms Love, and had not spoken to the other women, and had not seen photographs of the dogs or injuries
- She confirmed that she had read the account from Lilian Tuku, the owner of the dog Franklin, and that the account was different to their version
- Ms Love was shaken up by the incident, with visible cuts on her hands and a bite on her face
- Both dogs were going at each other, no help was offered to Ms Love by the others at the incident
- The other two dogs were on a fully extended leash, the women admitted that their dogs had just been in an altercation with another dog, which was why they were put on leash.

A supporting letter from Ms Hughes' landlord was tabled. This is available on the Council's website in the Minutes Attachment document.

Regulatory Support Officer, Sandy Vale presented the report, which was taken as read. She noted that in making the classification, that:

- Staff had received reports from dog control staff that had taken the statements and spoken to the parties involved
- The reports stated that Boy was off leash, the other two dogs were on leash
- Boy had dragged the dog Franklin into the bushes
- Staff had looked into Boy's history, and there were no complaints against Boy
- Staff felt the best course of action was to classify Boy as menacing, this was the lowest classification, and required Boy to wear a muzzle in public

In response to questions from the Subcommittee, Ms Vale and Team Leader – Regulatory Support, Shannon Green provided the following answers:

- There had been no other complaints regarding this incident
- This position had been taken by staff because both statements stated that Boy was off leash, the other dogs were on leash, the dog Franklin ended up worse off, the attack had been quite severe

- Staff did not feel that anything higher than a menacing classification was required
- This was an isolated incident, however staff did need to consider public safety
- This classification meant that the dog had to be muzzled whilst in public, but there were no further restrictions, such as neutering, or a dangerous dog classification, staff did not see those as required for this case.

Ms Hughes was offered a right of reply. In response to Ms Hughes noting that she had not seen photographs of Franklin's wounds, staff shared a photograph of the dog's wounds.

It was noted that a statement had not been provided by the vet, which would be useful for future cases.

In response to further questions, Ms Hughes answered:

- Boy could be left at the property and would still be there when she got home
- She walked Boy once a day, he would be on or off leash depending on the rules at the location and whether other dogs were on or off leash, she tried to follow the dog control rules.

The meeting was adjourned at 1.52pm and reconvened at 2.04pm.

In its deliberations, the Subcommittee considered the officers report, the mitigating factors presented during the hearing, and the Council's responsibilities under Section 31(4) of the Dog Control Act 1996, being:

- a) the evidence which formed the basis for the original classification; and
- b) any steps taken by the owner to prevent any threat to the safety of persons and animals; and
- c) the matters advanced in support of the objection; and
- d) any other relevant matters.

The Subcommittee determined that the Menacing Dog Classification was to be upheld and resolved the following:

**Moved Councillor Maling/Councillor Kininmonth  
ACS25-03-1**

**That the Animal Control Subcommittee**

- 1. receives the Menacing Classification Appeal report RACS25-03-1; and**
- 2. pursuant to Section 33A of the Dog Control Act, upholds the Menacing Classification for Boy, owned by Briar-Leigh Hughes.**

**CARRIED**

Attachment 1 Briar-Leigh Hughes tabled supporting information

**3 CONFIDENTIAL SESSION**

Nil

The meeting concluded at 2.07pm.

Confirmed as a correct record of proceedings by resolution on Enter date .

Unconfirmed