# MINUTES

## Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting
## Monday, 20 July 2026

## Order of Business

**1 Opening Karakia ..... 3**
**2 Apologies ..... 3**
**3 Confirmation of minutes ..... 3**
3.1 Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 11 May 2026 ..... 3
**4 Declaration of conflicts of interest ..... 3**
**5 Business ..... 4**
5.1 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Appeal to retention of dogs threatening public safety – Muriwai POPATA-KAITOA ..... 4
5.2 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objection to Disqualification as a Dog Owner - Aroha Ririnui ..... 5
5.3 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Appeal to retention of dogs threatening public safety - Pearl Li Si ..... 7
5.4 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objection to Barking Abatement Notice - Shontelle Castledine ..... 8
**6 Public Excluded ..... 10**
6.1 – Deliberations – Muriwai Popata-Kaitoa – Application for release of dogs – Section 71 (4), Dog Control Act 1996 ..... 10
6.2 – Deliberations – Aroha Ririnui - Objection to disqualification as a dog owner ..... 10
6.3 – Deliberations – Pearl Li Si – Application to release of dogs – Section 71 (4) – Dog Control Act 1996 ..... 10
6.4 – Deliberations – Shontelle Castledine – Objection to Barking Abatement Notice ..... 11
**5 Business continued ..... 11**
5.1 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Appeal to retention of dogs threatening public safety – Muriwai POPATA-KAITOA ..... 11
5.2 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objection to Disqualification as a Dog Owner - Aroha Ririnui ..... 12
5.3 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Appeal to retention of dogs threatening public safety - Pearl Li Si ..... 12
5.4 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objection to Barking Abatement Notice - Shontelle Castledine ..... 12
**6 Closing Karakia ..... 13**

**MINUTES OF TAURANGA CITY COUNCIL**
**REGULATORY HEARINGS PANEL MEETING**
**HELD AT THE TAURANGA CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, L1, 90 DEVONPORT ROAD, TAURANGA**
**ON MONDAY, 20 JULY 2026 AT 9:30 AM**

| | |
|---|---|
| **MEMBERS PRESENT:** | Mr Alan Tate (Chair), Ms Mary Hill, Ms Amy Robinson, Mr Brent Lincoln, Mr Puhirake Ihaka. |
| **IN ATTENDANCE:** | Deidre Ewart (Head of Regulatory Support & Compliance Services), Oscar Glossop (Team Leader: Animal Services), Anahera Dinsdale (Governance Advisor), Caroline Irvin (Governance Advisor) |
| **EXTERNAL:** | Objectors as listed in the minutes below. |

## 1 OPENING KARAKIA

Mr Puhirake Ihaka opened the meeting with a karakia.

## 2 APOLOGIES

Nil

## 3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

### 3.1 Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 11 May 2026

**COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/26/0/1**

Moved: Mr Brent Lincoln
Seconded: Ms Mary Hill

That the Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 11 May 2026 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

**CARRIED**

## 4 DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil

# 5 BUSINESS

## 5.1 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Appeal to retention of dogs threatening public safety – Muriwai POPATA-KAITOA

**Staff** Oscar Glossop, Team Leader: Animal Services

### Key Points

- The Team Leader: Animal Services presented an application under section 71(4) of the Dog Control Act 1996 seeking release of Sasha (Rottweiler) and Bluey (Staffordshire Bull Terrier cross) pending prosecution.
- He outlined allegations arising from a serious attack on 14 November 2025 involving both dogs, stating that Sasha allegedly bit both the owner and a member of the public who intervened and Bluey allegedly attacked cattle and caused injury to stock.
- He advised a previous unreported attack involving Sasha and the owner's partner had been identified during the investigation.
- Six dogs had originally been seized, with four later returned, while Sasha and Bluey remained impounded.
- Three attack charges had been filed, and the prosecution remained before the courts and conviction could result in mandatory destruction orders.
- He expressed concern about public safety should the dogs be released and stated the pound remained the safest location for the dogs.

### In response to questions

- The Team Leader: Animal Services advised the attack prosecution was awaiting plea entry and could either conclude quickly or proceed to trial.
- He clarified the panel could release or retain the dogs but could not impose conditional release through this process.
- Observations had been made about the dog's behaviour while impounded and Bluey continued displaying aggressive behaviour in the pound, including repeated aggressive responses to people passing the enclosure.
- Due to safety considerations, no arrangement or opportunity would be afforded to the family if the dogs were ordered to be destructed.

**Objector** Ms Hinerangi Waipouri (via Teams) representing Miss Muriwai Popata-Kaitoa

### Key Points

- Ms Waipouri described the applicant's challenging personal circumstances, and how she supported Miss Popata-Kaitoa through those circumstances.
- She described Miss Popata-Kaitoa's version of events outlining that Miss Popata-Kaitoa was transporting the dogs to her mother in Porirua, but her car broke down in Pāpāmoa where the event took place.
- She stated that Sasha was very protective of Miss Popata-Kaitoa.

- She raised concern around the effect the situation had on Miss Popata-Kaitoa's mental health.
- It was the intent to transfer the dogs to Miss Popata-Kaitoa's mother for care and not directly to her. There were support structures proposed to ensure safe transport back to Porirua, responsible ownership and public safety.

**In response to questions**

- Ms Waipouri advised that the intended property where the dogs would be released was fully fenced and she was working with Miss Popata-Kaitoa's mother and Kainga Ora to ensure it met requirements.
- She noted that responsibility of the dogs would be shared among family, advocates, rescue organisations and the dogs' proposed new owner.

**Staff** Oscar Glossop, Team Leader: Animal Services

**Staff in response to objector**

- The Team Leader: Animal Services reiterated the risks posed by the dogs, the evidence of aggression, and recommended to retain the dogs in the pound pending the outcome of the prosecution.

**COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/26/0/2**

Moved: Mr Alan Tate
Seconded: Mr Puhirake Ihaka

That the Regulatory Hearings Panel:

(a) Suppresses any personal details and information relating to the applicant due to safety concerns.

**CARRIED**

## 5.2 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objection to Disqualification as a Dog Owner - Aroha Ririnui

**Staff** Oscar Glossop, Team Leader: Animal Services

**Key Points**

- The Team Leader: Animal Services presented an objection to a three-year dog owner disqualification.
- He reported multiple roaming incidents involving dogs Kai and Jack and advised Kai had been impounded five times which resulted in five infringement notices issued.
- He stated repeated engagement and enforcement had not achieved sustained compliance and recommended the three-year disqualification remain in place.

**In response to questions**

The Team Leader: Animal Services:

- Clarified complaints mainly related to roaming and public concern rather than reported attacks.
- Advised Animal Services had interacted with the owner repeatedly during enforcement actions.
- Advised the dogs had travelled significant distances and all infringements had been filed with the court.
- Stated that containment challenges existed on the dog owner's property.

**Objector** Ms Aroha Ririnui

**Key Points**

- Ms Ririnui described herself as a kaitiaki living on ancestral land.
- She acknowledged prior failures to adequately control the dogs and apologised to the community.
- She explained she had significantly reduced work commitments to focus on training and supervision of her dogs.
- She detailed intensive boundary training, leash control, cages, runs and containment measures and advised there had been no further roaming incidents since implementing these changes.
- She expressed that the dogs formed an important part of her family and environmental work.

**In response to questions**

- Ms Ririnui confirmed the dogs had already been neutered and advised she had acquired and rescued the dogs in July 2024.

**Staff** Oscar Glossop, Team Leader: Animal Services

**Staff in response to objector**

- The Team Leader: Animal Services acknowledged training efforts but submitted the number of incidents demonstrated an entrenched pattern and maintained that responsible ownership had not yet been demonstrated sufficiently.
- He recommended the disqualification remain in place.

**Attachments**

1 5.2 - Aroha Ririnui - Aku mokai Kai Gak

At 11.37am the meeting adjourned.

At 12.01pm the meeting resumed in open.

### 5.3 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Appeal to retention of dogs threatening public safety - Pearl Li Si

**Staff** Oscar Glossop, Team Leader: Animal Services

**Key Points**

- The Team Leader: Animal Services presented an application seeking the release of dogs Rambo and Oreo, pending prosecution.
- He described a serious attack on a horse on Pāpāmoa Beach and stated both dogs pursued and bit the horse causing significant injuries to the horse.
- He noted Rambo had a previous menacing classification arising from an Auckland incident.
- He advised that prosecution was underway for this incident and was scheduled before the District Court.
- He recommended both dogs remain impounded.

**In response to questions**

The Team Leader: Animal Services:

- Advised no injury to the rider had been reported.
- Identified a reputational risk to the Council should the dogs be released and reoffend.
- Clarified prosecution remained at first appearance stage and advised that the Panel could not impose enforceable release conditions.

**Objector** Counsel Ms Bev Edwards representing Ms Pearl Li Si

**Key Points**

- Ms Edwards argued the panel was not determining guilt but assessing future risk.
- She stated the dogs could be safely contained at home through a highly secure arrangement and described locks, gated access, secure fencing and a separate sleepout used for containment.
- She argued the beach incident was a unique and unprecedented event involving horses and advised both dogs had previously exercised on the beach for approximately two years without issue.
- She detailed the owner’s actions towards behavioural controls for the dogs and proposed ongoing management measures.

**In response to questions**

Miss Edwards:

- Advised that the owner misunderstood the muzzle requirements and stated that the event

escalated too quickly for leads to be applied to the dogs.

- Explained Rambo was implicated on an earlier matter involving an elderly cat and confirmed Oreo had no known adverse history.
- Explained the owner had reliance on recall collars and had prior successful beach visits with the collars.

**Staff** Oscar Glossop, Team Leader: Animal Services

**Staff in response to objector**

- The Team Leader: Animal Services reiterated witness evidence indicated the owner had failed to control the dogs and noted that one dog had not been muzzled despite classification requirements.
- Confirmed the dogs were healthy and receiving care in the pound.
- He recommended both dogs remain retained pending prosecution.

**Attachments**

1 FINAL REG PANEL Submissions Pearl Li 13.07.2026

### 5.4 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objection to Barking Abatement Notice - Shontelle Castledine

**Staff** Oscar Glossop, Team Leader: Animal Services

**Key Points**

- The Team Leader: Animal Services presented the objection to barking abatement noting the repeated complaints about persistent barking from Ms Castledine's dogs.
- He summarised the steps taken by Animal Services, and the rationale for issuing the abatement notice requiring anti-bark collars.
- He recommended the Barking abatement notice be confirmed by the Panel.

**In response to questions**

- Confirmed that there were different types of legal anti-barking collars and the effectiveness of these.

**Objector** Ms Shontelle Castledine

**Key Points**

- Ms Castledine stated that her dogs barked in response to other dogs, cats, people looking at the dogs, and activity near the fence line rather than barking without cause.
- She stated that neighbouring dogs frequently barked and that a small neighbouring dog regularly escaped its property and approached her fence, which she believed triggered barking from her dogs.
- She advised that her dog Karma, a German Shepherd, had been stolen between October and January and was not at her property during that period. She stated that any complaints during that time should be assessed in that context as she believed her dog Karma would have been readjusting to being at home after such events.
- She referred to an April complaint regarding aggressive behaviour at the fence line and said she had been told that the dogs could not harm anyone over the fence and that no issue had been identified.
- She confirmed that she had purchased anti-barking collars, maintained records of complaints, and taken steps to reduce roadside visibility and barking triggers.
- She questioned whether adequate inspection of her property had occurred, stating that the yard itself had not been inspected.
- She believed her dogs were being unfairly targeted.

**In response to questions**

- Ms Castledine confirmed that the collars had been used and said the instructions had been confusing. She noted that she had not noticed the dogs barking more or less than usual while using them.
- She expressed concerns about the dogs becoming tangled in the collars while playing and referred to a previous near-death incident for her dogs involving the anti-barking collars.
- Ms Castledine agreed that tethering did present risks and stated that she monitored the dogs through cameras when away from home.

**Discussion points raised**

- Ms Castledine noted that her property had been listed for sale for a month.
- She acknowledged that the barking abatement notice was only for her current address, but she was unsure how long it would take to sell her property.
- Stated that a threat to kill her dogs had been made after less than one minute of barking and expressed concern that the threats had not been taken seriously and neither Council nor police had undertaken door-to-door enquiries regarding the threats.
- She explained that she had personally spoken politely with neighbours and had attempted to minimise barking issues.

**Staff** Oscar Glossop, Team Leader: Animal Services

**Staff in response to objector**

- Summarised that evidence showed the dogs were barking and that barking appeared to be the source of the issues raised.
- Confirmed that anti-barking collars had been purchased and were being used in accordance with the abatement notice conditions.

- Stated that the dogs were not currently registered for the new registration year.

At 1.52pm the meeting adjourned.

At 2pm the meeting resumed.

## 6 PUBLIC EXCLUDED

### COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/26/0/3

Moved: Mr Alan Tate
Seconded: Ms Mary Hill

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject matter of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

| General subject of each matter to be considered | Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter | Ground(s) under section 48 for the passing of this resolution |
|---|---|---|
| **6.1 – Deliberations – Muriwai Popata-Kaitoa – Application for release of dogs – Section 71 (4), Dog Control Act 1996** | To enable the Panel to deliberate in private on the objections heard. | s48(1)(d)<br>That the exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the Council to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation in any proceedings before a Council where the Council is required, by any enactment, to make a recommendation in respect of the matter that is the subject of those proceedings. |
| **6.2 – Deliberations – Aroha Ririnui - Objection to disqualification as a dog owner** | To enable the Panel to deliberate in private on the objections heard. | s48(1)(d)<br>That the exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the Council to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation in any proceedings before a Council where the Council is required, by any enactment, to make a recommendation in respect of the matter that is the subject of those proceedings. |
| **6.3 – Deliberations – Pearl Li Si** | To enable the Panel to deliberate in private on the objections heard. | s48(1)(d)<br>That the exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **– Application to release of dogs – Section 71 (4) – Dog Control Act 1996** | | of the meeting is necessary to enable the Council to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation in any proceedings before a Council where the Council is required, by any enactment, to make a recommendation in respect of the matter that is the subject of those proceedings. |
| **6.4 – Deliberations – Shontelle Castledine – Objection to Barking Abatement Notice** | To enable the Panel to deliberate in private on the objections heard. | s48(1)(d)<br>That the exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the Council to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation in any proceedings before a Council where the Council is required, by any enactment, to make a recommendation in respect of the matter that is the subject of those proceedings. |

**CARRIED**

At 2:17pm the meeting resumed in open.

## 5 BUSINESS CONTINUED

### 5.1 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Appeal to retention of dogs threatening public safety – Muriwai POPATA-KAITOA

**COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/26/0/4**

Moved: Mr Alan Tate
Seconded: Mr Puhirake Ihaka

That the Regulatory Hearings Panel:

(a) Receives the report "Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Appeal to retention of dogs threatening public safety – Muriwai POPATA-KAITOA".

(b) After considering whether it is satisfied that the release of the dogs would not threaten public safety under section 71(5) of the Dog Control Act 1996, resolves to:

(i) **Uphold** the retention of both dogs pending prosecution.

**CARRIED**

### 5.2 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objection to Disqualification as a Dog Owner - Aroha Ririnui

**COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/26/0/5**

Moved: Mr Alan Tate
Seconded: Ms Mary Hill

That the Regulatory Hearings Panel:

(a) Receives the report "Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objection to Disqualification as a Dog Owner - Aroha Ririnui".

(b) Resolves to:

(i) **Uphold** the disqualification - for one year affective from 28 December 2025.

**CARRIED**

### 5.3 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Appeal to retention of dogs threatening public safety - Pearl Li Si

**COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/26/0/6**

Moved: Mr Brent Lincoln
Seconded: Mr Puhirake Ihaka

That the Regulatory Hearings Panel:

(a) Receives the report "Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Appeal to retention of dogs threatening public safety - Pearl Li Si".

(b) Resolves to:

(i) **Uphold** the retention of both dogs' pending prosecution.

**CARRIED**

### 5.4 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objection to Barking Abatement Notice - Shontelle Castledine

**COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/26/0/7**

Moved: Ms Mary Hill
Seconded: Ms Amy Robinson

That the Regulatory Hearings Panel:

(a) Receives the report "Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objection to Barking Abatement Notice - Shontelle Castledine".

(b) **Confirms** the Barking Abatement Notice issued on 27 May 2026.

**CARRIED**

## 6 CLOSING KARAKIA

Mr Puhirake Ihaka closed the meeting with a karakia.

**The meeting closed at 2:34pm.**

**The minutes of this meeting were confirmed as a true and correct record at the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 3 August 2026.**