

---

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

held  
**1.30pm, Tuesday, 1 July 2025**  
at  
**Tasman Council Chamber, 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 and K Maling

**In Attendance:** Regulatory Support Officer (S Vale) and Senior Governance Advisor (K McLean)

**1 OPENING KARAKIA, WELCOME**

**2 REPORTS**

**4.1 Menacing Classification Appeal**

The Chair invited the appellant, Dina Schulze, and her support person, Pia Muensing, to the table. Solicitor – Molly Batts Lawyers & Advisors, Grace Piddington, provided a statement, via Zoom, on behalf Ms Schulze, on the matter before the Subcommittee.

The following matters were stated:

- Late notice had been given
- No witnesses were at the incident
- There was tension between the appellant and victim
- Stanley was a well-socialised dog
- The risk of Stanley re-offending had been minimised with the implementation of an automated gate, self-closing hinges, and an external fence
- Statements indicated Stanley was calm in nature with no signs of aggressive behaviour

- Ms Schulze offered to muzzle Stanley for six months while further training was sought.

In response to questions from the Subcommittee, Ms Schulze and Ms Piddington answered:

- Stanley was desexed and microchipped
- They did not accept that there was a dog bite and thought Stanley might have scratched Arlo when he went for a stick
- They believed the issue was that there was no control over the dog which led to the altercation and felt the intention of the classification and Stanley being muzzled would not be effective as the issue was not that he was aggressive
- Reported behaviour from external parties was that Stanley was not aggressive and had good recall
- Ms Piddington confirmed she understood that there were concerns around Stanley's behaviour off-lead and she was unsure of any further measures Ms Schulze could have taken to mitigate this, other than the steps they had already taken.

Ms Schulze tabled three supporting documents.

Regulatory Support Officer, Sandy Vale, presented the report. She noted that in making the classification, that:

- Stanley had escaped from the property and attacked another dog on the beach, witnessed by the person in charge of Arlo
- It was acknowledged that Ms Schulze paid Arlo's vet bill
- Injuries sustained to Stanley; dog behaviourists, trainers and psychologist reports were not taken into consideration when writing the report as most of these were undertaken after the event and the owners or trainers were present
- No evidence had been presented to show that a similar situation would not happen again if Stanley was to escape from the property
- Ms Vale confirmed that all factors had been considered and recommended that the classification be upheld.

In response to questions from the Subcommittee, Regulatory Support Officer, Sandy Vale, answered that:

- She confirmed that Ms Schulze had been contacted earlier than the date on the classification letter
- Ms Vale did not have any reason to doubt the validity of Carole Syme's statement (the person in charge of Arlo) and that Stanley was the dog that was not under control, he had escaped from his property and attacked another dog.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:10pm and reconvened at 2:15pm.

Ms Schulze was offered a right of reply and the below additional information was supplied by Ms Piddington:

- She felt the Council shouldn't attach too much weight to Ms Syme's statement as this was uncorroborated and the injuries sustained could have been through rough play
- The nature of the attack should be assessed by Stanley's nature and background
- The victim and appellant had had unpleasant altercations.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:18pm. and reconvened at 2:25pm.

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 Kininmonth/Councillor Maling**  
**ACS25-07-1**

**That the Animal Control Subcommittee**

- 1. receives the Menacing Classification Appeal report, RACS25-07-1; and**
- 2. pursuant to Section 33B of the Dog Control Act, upholds the Menacing Classification for Stanley, owned by Dina Schulze and Paul Atkinson.**

**CARRIED**

Attachment 1 Ms Schulze - Tabled Supporting Material

### **3 CONFIDENTIAL SESSION**

The meeting concluded at 2:30pm.

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