



OBJECTION TO A MENACING DOG CLASSIFICATION HEARINGS SUBCOMMITTEE

9 June 2025

Order Paper for the hearing to be held in the
Council Chambers, 2nd Floor, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt,
on:

Friday 13 June 2025 commencing at 9:30 am

The purpose of the hearing is to consider an objection to a menacing dog classification.

Membership

Cr C Parkin	Cr S Edwards (Chair)
Cr G Tupou (Alternate)	Cr T Stallinger

For the dates and times of Council Meetings please visit www.huttcity.govt.nz

HUTT CITY COUNCIL

HEARINGS SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting to be held in the Council Chambers,
2nd Floor, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt on
Friday 13 June 2025 commencing at 9:30 am.

ORDER PAPER

PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. OPENING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA TIMATANGA

Whakataka te hau ki te uru	<i>Cease the winds from the west</i>
Whakataka te hau ki te tonga	<i>Cease the winds from the south</i>
Kia mākinakina ki uta	<i>Let the breeze blow over the land</i>
Kia mātaratara ki tai	<i>Let the breeze blow over the ocean</i>
E hī ake ana te atakura	<i>Let the red-tipped dawn come with a sharpened air.</i>
He tio, he huka, he hau hū	<i>A touch of frost, a promise of a glorious day.</i>
Tihei mauri ora.	

2. APOLOGIES

No apologies have been received.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

4. HEARING FOR OBJECTION TO MENACING DOG CLASSIFICATION

Report No. HSC2025/3/173 by the Principal Animal Control Officer

3

5. CLOSING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA WHAKAMUTUNGA

Unuhia!	<i>Release us from the supreme sacredness of our tasks</i>
Unuhia!	<i>To be clear and free</i>
Unuhia i te uru-tapu-nui	<i>in heart, body and soul in our continuing journey</i>
Kia wātea, kia māmā	<i>Oh Rongo, raise these words up high</i>
Te ngākau, te tinana, te wairua i	<i>so that we be cleansed and be free,</i>
te ara takatū	<i>Yes indeed, we are free!</i>
Koia rā e Rongo whakairihia ake	<i>Good and peaceful</i>
ki runga	
Kia wātea, kia wātea!	
Ae rā, kua wātea!	
Hau, pai mārire.	

Kathryn Stannard
HEAD OF DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

Report no: HSC2025/3/173

Hearing for objection to menacing dog classification

Purpose of Report

1. To review the information contained within the report and determine if the dog menacing classification should be upheld or rescinded.

Recommendations

That the Subcommittee:

- (1) notes the provisions of the Dog Control Act 1996 which apply to classification of a dog as a menacing dog;
- (2) hears the evidence of the Animal Control Officer which led to the classification being imposed;
- (3) hears the objection by the owner of the dog;
- (4) hears the evidence of the complainant;
- (5) considers any other matters relevant under Section 33B of the Act; and
- (6) decides to uphold or rescind the classification.

Background

2. The Hutt City Dog Policy has regard, under the Dog Control Act 1996 (the Act), to the following matters:
 - the need to minimize danger, distress, and nuisance to the community generally,
 - the need to avoid the inherent danger in allowing dogs to have uncontrolled access to public places that are frequented by children, whether or not the children are accompanied by adults,
 - the importance of enabling, to the extent that is practicable, the public (including families) to use streets and public amenities without fear of attack or intimidation by dogs; and
 - the exercise and recreational needs of dogs and their owners.

3. Under the Act and Hutt City Dog Policy, where a Dog Control Officer observes or believes a dog has attacked a person or animal, the officer may:
 - issue an infringement notice;
 - at the time, seize the dog if it is at large;
 - if the dog continues to be a threat to the safety of people or animals, seize the dog;
 - destroy the dog at the time of the attack;
 - classify the dog as dangerous or menacing;
 - prosecute the owner under the Act.

Penalties could be up to three years imprisonment or fines of \$20,000 for serious injury incidents.

4. In this case the dog has been classified a “menacing dog” under the Act and the dog owner has objected to the classification. The main requirements under this classification are that the dog must be muzzled at all times while in a public place and neutered or spayed within one month of the classification.
5. The owner of a dog which has been classified as a menacing dog may object to the classification within 14 days of receipt of the notification of the classification.
6. The following information is attached to the report:

Appendix 1 – Incident report;

Appendix 2 – Statement from complainant;

Appendix 3 – Notice of classification of a menacing dog;

Appendix 4 – Objection from dog owner; and

Appendix 5 – Letter in support of dog.

Consultation

7. The Animal Control Officer collects evidence from the complainant, the owner of the dog and any witnesses. Council records for previous warnings or actions are also checked prior to deciding to classify a dog as menacing.

Legal Considerations

8. The process regarding the classification of a dog as menacing is outlined in the Act. The relevant sections of the Act follow:

33A Territorial authority may classify dog as menacing

- (1) *This section applies to a dog that –*
 - (a) *has not been classified as a dangerous dog under [section 31](#); but*
 - (b) *a territorial authority considers may pose a threat to any person, stock, poultry, domestic animal, or protected wildlife because of –*
 - (i) *any observed or reported behaviour of the dog; or*
 - (ii) *any characteristics typically associated with the dog's breed or type.*
- (2) *A territorial authority may, for the purposes of [section 33E\(1\)\(a\)](#), classify a dog to which this section applies as a menacing dog.*
- (3) *If a dog is classified as a menacing dog under subsection (2), the territorial authority must immediately give written notice in the prescribed form to the owner of –*
 - (a) *the classification; and*
 - (b) *the provisions of [section 33E](#) (which relates to the effect of classification as a menacing dog); and*
 - (c) *the right to object to the classification under [section 33B](#); and*
 - (d) *if the territorial authority's policy is not to require the neutering of menacing dogs (or would not require the neutering of the dog concerned), the effect of [sections 33EA](#) and [33EB](#) if the owner does not object to the classification and the dog is moved to the district of another territorial authority.*

9. Owner's right to objection to the classification

33B Objection to classification of dog under section 33A

- (1) *If a dog is classified under [section 33A](#) as a menacing dog, the owner –*
 - (a) *may, within 14 days of receiving notice of the classification, object in writing to the territorial authority in regard to the classification; and*
 - (b) *has the right to be heard in support of the objection.*

10. Considering the objection

33B Objection to classification of dog under section 33A

- (2) *The territorial authority considering an objection under subsection (1) may uphold or rescind the classification, and in making its determination must have regard to –*
 - (a) *the evidence which formed the basis for the classification; and*
 - (b) *any steps taken by the owner to prevent any threat to the safety of persons or animals; and*
 - (c) *the matters relied on in support of the objection; and*
 - (d) *any other relevant matters.*

- (3) *The territorial authority must, as soon as practicable, give written notice to the owner of –*
- (a) *its determination of the objection; and*
 - (b) *the reasons for its determination.*

11. Effects of classification as menacing dog

33E Effect of classification as menacing dog

- (1) *If a dog is classified as a menacing dog under [section 33A](#) or [section 33C](#), the owner of the dog –*
- (a) *must not allow the dog to be at large or in any public place or in any private way, except when confined completely within a vehicle or cage, without being muzzled in such a manner as to prevent the dog from biting but to allow it to breathe and drink without obstruction; and*
 - (b) *must, if required by the territorial authority, within 1 month after receipt of notice of the classification, produce to the territorial authority a certificate issued by a veterinarian certifying –*
 - (i) *that the dog is or has been neutered; or*
 - (ii) *that for reasons that are specified in the certificate, the dog will not be in a fit condition to be neutered before a date specified in the certificate; and*
 - (c) *must, if a certificate under paragraph (b)(ii) is produced to the territorial authority, produce to the territorial authority, within 1 month after the date specified in that certificate, a further certificate under paragraph (b)(i).*

Financial Considerations

12. Any costs associated with a hearing will be met from the Animal Control operating budget.

Appendices

No.	Title	Page
1	Appendix 1 - Incident report	7
2	Appendix 2 - Statement from complainant	11
3	Appendix 3 - Notice of classification of a menacing dog	16
4	Appendix 4 - Objection from dog owner	18
5	Appendix 5 - Letter in support of dog	24

Author: Keri Te Kawa
Principal Animal Control Officer

Approved By: Duncan Pratt
Animal Services Manager

ANIMAL SERVICES INCIDENT REPORT

Incident	
HCC Enquiry No.	SRC0251317
Date of Offence	22/02/2025
Time of Offence	1450
Alleged Offence	Uncontrolled dog / displays threatening behaviour
Investigating Officer(s)	Virginia Van Dooren
Complainant Name	
Complainant Address	[REDACTED] Stokes Valley
Complainant Contact Number	
Dog Owner Name	Joshua Ward
Dog Owner Address	[REDACTED] Stokes Valley
Dog Owner Contact Details	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Person in charge of dog	Joshua Ward
Person in charge address	[REDACTED] Stokes Valley
Person in charge contact details	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Dog Name	Mahi 2 years 10 months Ani ID 751029
Dog Breed	Staffordshire Bull Terrier Crossbreed
Dog Registration Tag	[REDACTED] / [REDACTED]
Dog Seized:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Date Impounded:	11/03/2025
Seizure Notice Number:	11828

Officers Report**Introduction:**

The complainant in this matter made a report to the Hutt City Council in relation to a dog which he knows as his neighbours dog called 'Mahi' which was on his property as he arrived home with his family on 22/02/25 at approximately 1450. He stated as the dog was barking at him aggressively which he felt threatened by the behaviour of the dog.

Background:

'Mahi' is a Male Staffordshire Bull Terrier crossbreed 2 years 10 months old and coloured Brindle and White. 'Mahi' resides with his registered owner Mr Joshua Ward at [REDACTED] Stokes Valley 'Mahi' has come to the attention of the Hutt City Council Animal Services previously being for uncontrolled dog off the owners property / barking and displaying threatening behaviour.


Incident:

1. On Saturday 22 February 2025 at approx. 2.50pm, the complainant arrived home with his family to the address of [REDACTED] Stokes Valley
2. The complainant could hear his own dog barking on his property and went and saw at his back gate Mahi the neighbours dog on his property.
3. He yelled at the dog to get out and Mahi started barking aggressively at him.
4. Complainant felt threatened by the dogs behaviour and did not feel safe on his property.
5. Mahi eventually went home via the rear of the property to where the dog was from.
6. The complainant went down to the front of the property at [REDACTED] where Mahi is from in an attempt to speak to the dog owner but the dog owner Josh did not come out to talk to the complainant.
7. The complainant knows his neighbour as Josh Ward.
8. A report of the incident was given to the Hutt City Council Animal services by the complainant.
9. A further report was made to Hutt City Council by another complainant in relation to the same incident.

Incident outcome:

1. Armour Guard the Hutt City Council after hours Animal Services Contractor were the first responders to the complaint 22/2/25 1804 'Mahi' seized and impounded 11/03/2025 S57A(3) Rushing /Startling
2. Classified as menacing 13/3/025 S33A(2) Dog Control Act 1996
3. Dog owner spoken to in relation to control of the dog to owners property 13/3/25
4. Returned to owner 13/3/25

Victim Statement	YES	1	
Photographs of Injuries	NO		No physical injuries
Photographs of Scene	NO		
Alleged Offending Dog Identified	YES		
Photograph of Dog	Yes		Animal Services upon impoundment
Dog Owners Statement	NO		Not present at time of incident
Previous Service Requests	NONE		
Entered onto Complaint Database	YES		HCC SRC0251317
Medical Notes / Bills	NO		
Copy of Seizure Notice	YES	1	Seizure notice number 11828
Victim Impact Statement	NO		Not proceeding to prosecution

		<h1>Outcome Report</h1>			
		Council: Hutt City Council		Product: ANIMAL	
Council Reference No.:	1066286	Problem Code:	Aggressive Dog		
Caller Name:		Caller Phone No.:			
Caller Address:	Private Bag 31-912, Lower Hutt (Bag)				
Time Job Received:	22-02-2025 15:25	Time Job Dispatched:	22-02-2025 15:25		
Address Sent To:					
Address Attended:					
Date & Time Officer on-site:	22-02-2025 18:04	Date & Time Officer off-site:	22-02-2025 18:38		
Outcome:	Other				
Problem Description:	Caller came home and the neighbouring dog was on her property. The dog was snarling, growling and snapping at her, rushing at her whilst she was trying to pick her toddler up to keep him safe. She tried to get it off her property but he was refusing to leave and getting more aggressive towards her. The dogs owners were inside their house at the time. She has had previous encounters with this dog before on her property and it lunging through the fence and gate at her, but she has never felt as frightened as she was today and feels very unsafe knowing the dog is able to get out of the property. The dogs name is Mali and is tan with white spots - medium sized and lives at [REDACTED] The issue happened at [REDACTED] (Customer Address)				
Additional Notes:	Resolution Notes: Arrived at the address given, meet the caller at the front driveway of [REDACTED] She mentioned when they come home around 3pm and the neighboring dog was on her property. Meet DO Joshua at the front gate of their property [REDACTED] he mentioned that their dog was not going anywhere. He mentioned he was at home all time. Dog was, Medium size and Brindle. Dog was look like very aggressive, when I approach the property gate, dog was running towards me at the front gate barking and act aggressive. Everything record on bodycam. ML				
Officer Name:	Wellington 617		Officer Number:		
Was animal impounded?	No	Was contact made with owner?		Was a message left?	
Was there a dog attack?	No	Time of attack:		Location of attack:	
Was a person attacked?		Victim name:			Victim phone:
		Victim address:			
Was another dog attacked?		Dog name:			Dog ID:
		Dog Breed:			
Person in charge name:			PIC Address:		
			PIC Phone:		
Witness name:			WIT Address:		
			WIT Phone:		
Did person or animal require medical/vet treatment?		Have you advised victim to gather evidence?			
Have you advised a council officer will investigate?		Are there other photos or CCTV evidence to be supplied?			
Description of Incident: (facts only)					

Ref: SO250220317@@1

Issued At: 2/22/2025 6:38:39 PM



Fw: [EXTERNAL] Urgent Safety Concern: Reference SRC0251317

From Virginia Van Dooren <Virginia.VanDooren@huttcity.govt.nz>

Date Mon 24/02/2025 9:30 AM

To Jane Schuitema <Jane.schuitema@huttcity.govt.nz>

Cc Keri Te Kawa <keri.tekawa@huttcity.govt.nz>; Jenn Sytsma <Jenn.Sytsma@huttcity.govt.nz>; Samantha-Courtney Lightfoot <Samantha-Courtney.Lightfoot@huttcity.govt.nz>; Debora Parsons <Debora.Parsons@huttcity.govt.nz>

FYI

From: \

Sent: Sunday, 23 February 2025 9:34 am

To: Virginia Van Dooren <Virginia.VanDooren@huttcity.govt.nz>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Urgent Safety Concern: Reference SRC0251317

Hi Virginia,

I am writing to formally express my deep concern regarding a serious incident that occurred yesterday involving our neighbor's dog, Mahi. Upon arriving home, we found Mahi on our property, where he had been for some time. As we rounded the corner, he began barking, snarling, and aggressively advancing toward my husband. I was holding our two-year-old child at the time, and I was extremely frightened for our safety.

Mahi showed no intention of leaving. It took approximately a minute for my husband to get him to retreat, at which point he made his way back through the bush onto Josh's deck. Throughout this time, Mahi continued barking, snarling, and lunging at my husband. My husband, who has extensive experience with dogs from growing up on a farm, stated that he genuinely felt unsafe and kept his distance, fearing an imminent attack. This clearly indicates that Mahi is not adequately confined within Josh's property.

Despite my husband loudly commanding Mahi to leave, Josh made no effort to intervene, even though another neighbor emerged from their house in response to the commotion—confirming that Josh must have heard it. After the incident, I immediately contacted animal control, as I was extremely shaken. My husband then went to Josh's main gate, calling out to him, but Josh refused to come out. Even when addressed from his back deck, Josh appeared indifferent to the fact that Mahi had aggressively confronted us on our own property. If my husband had not been present, I would have had no choice but to retreat to my car, unable to safely enter my own home.

This is not an isolated incident. Mahi has been on our property more than once now, and I now fear how often he may have terrorized our dogs in our absence. He routinely stands at his driveway gate, barking, snarling, and lunging whenever we pass. This ongoing issue has reached a point where I no longer feel safe walking down my own driveway—even for simple tasks like taking out the bins.

Most distressingly, this situation is now affecting our children. We have three children, our older two regularly play in our backyard and around our garage. Due to Mahi's persistent aggression and

- the risk he poses, we can no longer allow them to do so safely. Our two-year-old, who loves playing outside, is now being deprived of this freedom because we cannot guarantee his safety in his own home environment.


You are already aware of the numerous issues Mahi has caused, both for us and for other neighbors. Given this most recent and frightening encounter, I need to know what immediate steps will be taken to ensure Mahi is properly secured within Josh's property. It is evident that the current fencing is inadequate, and this cannot continue.

If Mahi were a calm and non-threatening dog, this would not be an issue—I would have no hesitation in simply directing him home if he wandered onto our property. However, his aggressive behavior is a serious safety risk. I need assurance that measures will be taken before someone is seriously injured—or worse.

I contacted the Council call center this morning to follow up on the outcome of animal control's visit yesterday. Unfortunately, the security company and guard who attended last night were unable to provide the call center with much information.

My family has the right to feel safe in our own home, and I expect prompt action to address this situation. Please let me know what steps will be taken immediately to resolve this dangerous issue.

Thanks,



Enquiry Reassigned - Animals Control - Enquiry 1066425

From confirmnotify <confirmnotifyhcc@huttcity.govt.nz>

Date Mon 24/02/2025 2:11 PM

To __Animal Services ACO Team <__AnimalControl@huttcity.govt.nz>

Enquiry Number: 1066425

Status: Call Logged

Follow Up Date: 24/02/2025

Action Officer: Virginia Van Dooren

Notes:

Logged By: Report A Problem

Subject: Dogs Threatening

Description: Yesterday, an email was sent to Virginia (animal control officer) regarding an aggressive dog that has been entering my property. I have not yet received a response, and I want to ensure this serious issue is addressed promptly.

As I mentioned, the dog poses a significant threat to my family's safety, particularly my children, who can no longer enjoy playing in our backyard due to the intimidation and risk this dog presents. The owner Josh Ward has shown a lack of concern for our safety, which makes the situation even more concerning.

I kindly request an update on this matter and an action plan to address our safety concerns. We would like to feel secure in our own home and backyard.

Thank you for your attention to this urgent issue.

Attached is a screenshot of the email (I was unable to copy and paste due to the length)

Thanks,

Site: [REDACTED]

Location: [REDACTED] STOKES VALLEY

Contact: .

Telephone: .

Alt. Telephone:


Fax:

E-Mail:


Place	
Time	
Name	states
(Type in statement)	
<p>On Saturday the 22nd of February 2025 at 2:50pm we came home, parked the car and heard [REDACTED] (my [REDACTED] dog) barking out in the backyard of our property. We walked towards our front door and heard a second larger dog start barking. I came around the corner and saw Mahi, the dog from [REDACTED] by our black gate which leads to the top of our section. [REDACTED] and my son [REDACTED] were behind me. I started yelling at the dog to get out. [REDACTED] quickly ran behind me and I blocked a safe path for her and [REDACTED] to get under the porch by the front door. The dog continued to stay in the same spot barking at me while I yelled at him very loudly. Mahi's barking was aggressive and territorial and I immediately felt threatened. Mahi shot off into the bush and stopped a few metres below the bank and was snarling at me even from a distance. Mahi shot back home and I immediately walked down to confront Josh and Mahi met me at the gate displaying extremely aggressive and territorial behaviour, he was barking, showing teeth and growling with intent to protect his property, Josh didn't come out.</p> <p>30minutes after the incident [REDACTED] saw Josh out on the side deck and I yelled out to him "Oi Josh, your dog was up here" and Josh said "Oh was it?" and then i told him to make sure it didn't come back up here. Josh said he will come up and speak to me. He didn't. Josh was very unworries about his dog being out.</p> <p>Mahi is a large brown and black male dog with some white on his chest. He looks like a staffy cross.</p> <p>Our CCTV cameras have caught Mahi roaming on our property approximately 9 months ago too but i believe Animal Control spoke with him then and it was temporarily resolved.</p> <p>Soon after i got inside i checked the cameras and reviewed the footage. I could see Mahi had come from the top of my section down to my steps at 2:42pm. The footage has been available to Hutt City Council.</p> <p>My main concern is that i work late some nights which means [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] may come home without me and he'd be out and act this way towards them. [REDACTED] was terrified during this incident and would be beside herself if it was only her at home.</p>	

Name	further states .
(Type in statement)	

I have read this statement and it is true and correct

Signature 	Date 15th October 2024 25/2/25
--	---

Statement taken and signature witnessed by

Dog control officer 	Date 15th October 2024 25/2/25
--	---

for Flutt City Council

Statement finished at

Time and date 2:01pm 25/2/25

FORM 4A

NOTICE OF CLASSIFICATION AS A MENACING DOG

Section 33A, Dog Control Act 1996



IMAGED

To Joshua Ward		
Address [REDACTED] Stokes Valley		
Name of dog Mahi		Animal ID/SR [REDACTED]
Registration number [REDACTED]	Desexed <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Microchip number [REDACTED]
Colour Brindle and White		Breed Staffordshire Bull Terrier Crossbreed

This is to notify you* that **this** dog has been classified as a menacing dog under section 33A(2) of the Dog Control Act 1996

This is because (*under section 33A(1)(b)*):

on Saturday 22nd February 2025 at approximately 2.50pm your dog Mahi was seen to challenge a person in an aggressive manner on private property in [REDACTED] Stokes Valley.

Hutt City Council considers the dog may pose a threat to any person, stock, poultry, domestic animal, or protected wildlife because of –

(i) Any observed or reported behaviour of the dog

A summary of the effect of the classification and your right to object is attached.

Dog Control Officer D2	Date 13/03/2025
---------------------------	--------------------

*For the purposes of the Dog Control Act 1996, you are the owner of a dog if–

- You own the dog; or
- You have the dog in your possession (otherwise than for a period not exceeding 72 hours for the purpose of preventing the dog causing injury, or damage, or distress, or for the sole purpose of restoring a lost dog to its owner); or
- You are the parent or guardian of a person under 16 who is the owner of the dog and who is a member of your household living with and dependent on you

Animal Services | 21 Meachen Street, Seaview, Lower Hutt 5010 | animals@huttcity.govt.nz
Hutt City Council | 30 Laings Road, Private Bag 31912, Lower Hutt 5040 | 04 570 6666 | huttcity.govt.nz

EFFECT OF CLASSIFICATION AS A MENACING DOG

Sections 33E, 33F, and 36A, Dog Control Act 1996

You—

- (a) must not allow the dog to be at large or in any public place or in any private way (other than when confined completely within a vehicle or cage) without the dog being muzzled in such a manner as to prevent the dog from biting but to allow it to breathe and drink without obstruction; and
- (b) must, if required by the Council, produce to the Council, within one month after receipt of this notice, a certificate issued by a registered veterinary surgeon certifying—
 - (i) That the dog is or has been neutered; or
 - (ii) That for reasons that are specified in the certificate, the dog will not be in a fit condition to be neutered before a date specified in the certificate; and
- (c) Where a certificate under paragraph (b)(ii) is produced to the Council, produce to the Council, within one month after the date specified in that certificate, a further certificate under paragraph (b)(i).

You will commit an offence and be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding \$3000 if you fail to comply with all of the matters in paragraphs (a) to (c) above.

A dog control officer or dog ranger may seize and remove the dog from you if you fail to comply with all of the matters in paragraphs (a) to (c) above. The officer or ranger may keep the dog until you demonstrate that you are willing to comply with paragraphs (a) to (c).

As from 1 July 2006, you are also required, for the purpose of providing permanent identification of the dog, to arrange for the dog to be implanted with a functioning microchip transponder. This must be confirmed by making the dog available to the Council in accordance with reasonable instructions of the Council for verification that the dog has been implanted with a functioning microchip transponder of the prescribed type and in the prescribed location.

You will be committing an offence and be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding \$3000 if you fail to comply with this requirement—

- within 2 months from 1 July 2006 if your dog is classified as menacing on or after 1 December 2003 but before 1 July 2006; or
- within 2 months after the dog is classified as menacing if your dog is classified as menacing after 1 July 2006.

If the dog is in the possession of another person for a period not exceeding 72 hours, you must advise that person of the requirement to not allow the dog to be at large or in any public place or in any private way (other than when confined completely within a vehicle or cage) without the dog being muzzled in such a manner as to prevent the dog from biting but to allow it to breathe and drink without obstruction. You will commit an offence and be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding \$500 if you fail to comply with this requirement.

Full details of the effect of the classification of a dog as menacing are provided in the Dog Control Act 1996.

RIGHT OF OBJECTION TO CLASSIFICATION UNDER SECTION 33A

Section 33B, Dog Control Act 1996

You may object to the classification of your dog as menacing by lodging with the Council a written objection within 14 days of the receipt of this notice setting out the grounds on which you object.

You have the right to be heard in support of your objection and will be notified of the time and place at which your objection will be heard.

Animals @huttcity.govt.nz

Object

Keri Te Kawa

From: Virginia Van Dooren
Sent: Thursday, 10 April 2025 10:56 am
To: Keri Te Kawa
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Mahi

Sent from my Galaxy

----- Original message -----

From: Animal Services Team <Animals@huttcity.govt.nz>
Date: 7/04/25 2:43 pm (GMT+12:00)
To: Virginia Van Dooren <Virginia.VanDooren@huttcity.govt.nz>
Cc: Jane Schuitema <Jane.schuitema@huttcity.govt.nz>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Mahi

Hi Virginia,

We received this appeal re Mahi from Joshua Ward.

Kind regards,

Kaelyn

Animal Services Team
Animal Services

, Animal Services, 21 Meachen Street, Lower Hutt 5040
P: 04 570 6666 **M:** **W:** www.huttcity.govt.nz



From: Josh Ward [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 7 April 2025 2:41 pm
To: Animal Services Team <Animals@huttcity.govt.nz>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Mahi

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Kia ora,

I am writing to object to classification of my dog Mahi under s33A of the Dog Control Act 1996, on the following grounds:

Mahi is not a menacing dog, and no evidence has been provided from council to support the claim My neighbours, who have complained about Mahi, taunt him and abuse him, even throwing water at him, and threatening to kill him. Any complaints from them are unsupported and made in bad faith.

Mahi did get off the property due to the negligence of a visitor, but since this incident I have strengthened fencing to prevent future escapes

Further to his character and good nature, Mahi attended the hikoi with me in Wellington, and accepted plenty of pats without issue. Over 40,000 people were present and he was fine, and no muzzle was required

He has never bitten or hurt anyone, and is extremely well loved.

I can provide letters of support

I collected him from Animal services on 24/03/2025. He was seized from my property, and gone for 13 days. Upon collection I was given the "Notice of classification as a menacing dog" which I object to.

I request full disclosure of all relevant materials, including but not limited to;

Evidence to support classification which is being relied upon

Animal services records for Mahi, including seizure and impound

Any other relevant materials

Complaints received about Mahi

Any other relevant materials

I would like to request the right to reply to any of the materials provided, prior to the matter being reconsidered and decided.

Nga Mihi,

Joshua

On Tue, 25 Mar 2025, 17:45 Josh Ward [REDACTED] wrote:

Object Appeal

Blank

Keri Te Kawa

From: Animal Services Team
Sent: Wednesday, 26 March 2025 1:31 pm
To: Virginia Van Dooren; Keri Te Kawa
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Form 4A

Hi, we received this email from Josh Ward about Mahi.

Kind regards,

Kaelyn

Animal Services Team

Animal Services

, Animal Services, 21 Meachen Street, Lower Hutt 5040

P: 04 570 6666 M: W: www.huttcity.govt.nz



From: Josh Ward [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 25 March 2025 5:45 pm
To: Animal Services Team <Animals@huttcity.govt.nz>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Form 4A

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Object Appeal

Blank

Keri Te Kawa

From: Keri Te Kawa
Sent: Wednesday, 2 April 2025 11:20 am
To: Virginia Van Dooren
Subject: Joshua Ward- Mahi

Hey Virginia,

Just a quick update, I spoke to Joshua last night by phone and requested he provide more info and clarification as to why he is objecting to the classification.

I will hopefully receive this soon and I have informed him we have accepted the objection within the time frame but just send us and expand the reason for the objection then we can set up the hearing.

Ngā Mihi

Keri

Keri Te Kawa

From: Keri Te Kawa
Sent: Thursday, 10 April 2025 12:14 pm
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: MAHI - Menacing Dog Objection

Kia ora Joshua,

This is just to confirm the Hutt City Council has received your objection to your dog named 'Mahi' being classified as a menacing dog.

Once a date for the hearing is confirmed we will be in contact to make sure that is suitable to you.

The documents containing the information you requested will be sent out to you before the hearing date.

Confirmation of this date may be 2-3 weeks away.

If you have any queries in relation to this matter please feel free to contact me.

Ngā Mihi

Keri

Keri Te Kawa

From: Keri Te Kawa
Sent: Tuesday, 6 May 2025 3:59 pm
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Virginia Van Dooren
Subject: Menacing Dog Objection - Mahi

Kia ora Joshua,

The date for your objection hearing has been set for the 13 June 2025 9.30am to 12.30pm. Can you please confirm that this date is all good for you and I will send out the more detailed information.

Ngā Mihi

Keri

Keri Te Kawa

From: Jane Schuitema
Sent: Monday, 7 April 2025 1:12 pm
To: Virginia Van Dooren
Cc: Keri Te Kawa
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Menacing Dog Issue - RE: Joshua Ward & Mahi

From: Nicholas Clark [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, 5 April 2025 1:49 pm
To: ContactHCC <contact@huttcity.govt.nz>; Animal Services Team <Animals@huttcity.govt.nz>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Menacing Dog Issue - RE: Joshua Ward & Mahi

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Kia Ora Hutt City,

I want to express my opinion about a dog called Mahi owned by Joshua Ward.

Address is [REDACTED] Stokes Valley
Registration number: [REDACTED]
Colour: Brindle and White
Animal ID: [REDACTED]
Microchip Number: [REDACTED]
Breed: Staffordshire Bull Terrier Crossbreed

I have known Joshua and Mahi for a long time and Mahi has never posed any threatening or dangerous behaviour towards myself or anyone at the address. Mahi is a friendly dog who is keen to meet new people and responds to commands of his owner. He is safe, well looked after, happy and well exercised.

I personally do not think Mahi should be classified as a menacing dog. In my opinion he does not pose a threat to any person, stock, poultry, domestic animal or protected wildlife.

I am available to contact for further discussion if you would like.

Nga mihi
Nicholas

--

Nicholas Clark
[REDACTED]