



AGENDA

Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting Wednesday, 1 April 2026

I hereby give notice that a Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting will be held on:

Date: Wednesday, 1 April 2026

Time: 11:30 am

**Location: Tauranga City Council Chambers
L1, 90 Devonport Road
Tauranga**

Please note that this meeting will be livestreamed and the recording will be publicly available on Tauranga City Council's website: www.tauranga.govt.nz.

**Marty Grenfell
Chief Executive**

Terms of reference – Regulatory Hearings Panel

Membership

Chair	Mary Dillon
Members	Puhirake Ihaka Terry Molloy Alan Tate
Quorum	At least two members
Meeting frequency	As required

Role

- To conduct hearings and make decisions of a quasi-judicial nature on regulatory matters through specific hearings and decision-making.

Scope

Regulatory matters

- To conduct hearings and make decisions of a quasi-judicial nature on behalf of the Council on any regulatory matter that the Council is legally:
 - empowered or obligated to hear and determine;
 - permitted to delegate to a subordinate decision-making body of Council under the Local Government Act 2002, or any other Act.
- To exercise this function in accordance with:
 - the applicable legislation;
 - the Council's corporate strategies, policies, plans and bylaws; and
 - the principles of administrative law and natural justice.
- Regulatory matters include (but are not limited to):
 - dog control matters;
 - matters arising from the exercise of Council's enforcement functions; and
 - regulatory matters that require a hearing under Council's policies (including, without limitation, Council's Gambling Venues Policy) and bylaws.

Matters excluded from scope

- The following are excluded from the scope of the Regulatory Hearings Panel:
 - matters relating to the sale and supply of alcohol;
 - matters under the Resource Management Act 1991; and
 - matters the Council is precluded from delegating to a subordinate decision-making body by the Local Government Act 2002, or any other Act.

Power to act

Regulatory matters

- All powers, duties and discretions necessary to conduct hearings and make decisions of a quasi-judicial nature on behalf of the Council on any regulatory matter that the Council is legally empowered or obligated to hear and determine, including (but not limited to):
 - All powers, duties and discretions necessary to hear and make decisions on behalf of the Council in respect of any matter that the Council is empowered or obligated to hear and determine under the Dog Control Act 1996, the Local Government Act 2002, the Local Government Act 1974 and any regulatory matters that require a hearing under Council's policies and bylaws.
- For the avoidance of doubt, the above delegation includes authority to hear and make decisions on appeals under Council's Gambling Venues Policy, including to decline an application to appeal.
- The power to establish and amend hearings protocols relating to the general conduct of hearings and hearings related matters in accordance with the applicable legislation and the principles of administrative law and natural justice.
- The power to co-opt expert advice on an as required basis.

Matters excluded from power to act

- For the avoidance of doubt, the Regulatory Hearings Panel does not have the power to hear:
 - matters relating to the sale and supply of alcohol;
 - matters under the Resource Management Act 1991; or
 - matters that the Council is precluded from delegating to a subordinate decision-making body by the Local Government Act 2002, or any other Act.

Power to recommend

- The Regulatory Hearings Panel is unlikely to need to make recommendations to the Council as it has the power to conduct hearings and make decisions of a quasi-judicial nature on behalf of Council as per its powers to act. However, the Panel may make recommendations to the Council if, in the circumstances of a matter, it considers it appropriate to do so.

Note:

The Regulatory Hearings Panel is established as a subordinate decision-making body of Council and delegated the powers specified in its Terms of Reference under clauses 30 and 32 of Schedule 7 Local Government Act 2002 respectively. It is not a committee or subcommittee of Council.

Regulatory Hearings Panel

Summary of hearings procedure



Who is involved in a hearing?

- Regulatory Hearings Panel – these are independent persons who make the decision
- Tauranga City Council staff – staff who write the report and attend the hearing
- Applicant/objector or their representative – those who will present their evidence
- Witnesses/experts – called by staff or applicant/objector



What happens before the hearing?

- The applicant/objector will be given at least seven days' notice of the date, time and place of the hearing.
- An agenda with the staff report and any documents will be sent to the panel members and the applicant/objector before the hearing.
- The applicant/objector can organise evidence and call witnesses in support of their application/objection.
- If the applicant/objector can't be present at the hearing they can organise a representative to attend on their behalf.

What happens at the hearing?

- The hearings will be conducted without a lot of formality and will make sure that all parties and witnesses receive a fair hearing.
- Staff will present Council's case (including evidence and any witnesses) in support of its decision that is the subject of the application/objection.
- The applicant/objector presents their case (including any evidence and any witnesses).
- Council staff have a right of reply but can't submit any new evidence or call any further witnesses.
- The chairperson and panel members may ask questions from any party or witness.
- Other persons may ask the chairperson to put a question to any party or witness on their behalf but that is at the discretion of the chairperson as to whether the question is put.

- No cross examination is permitted.
- The chairperson's rulings on any matter is final.
- The hearing is generally open to the public unless there is good reason to have the hearing with the public excluded.

What happens after the hearing?

- The panel will usually deliberate in private immediately after the hearing and make their decision.
- The panel may, but is not required to, deliver its decision in the open section of a meeting. A notice of decision will be given (or sent) in writing to the applicant/objector as soon as practicable after the panel has made its decision.
- The chairperson will then close the hearing.
- If the chairperson has allowed further information to be provided before the hearing is closed, then the hearing will be adjourned, and the panel will reserve its decision until it has considered the further information.
- Where the applicant/objector has a right to appeal the panel's decision, that will be advised in writing.
- No discussions or communication of any kind will happen outside of the hearing between the panel, the parties or witnesses until a decision is issued, including during any site visits, adjournment or break.
- Minutes of the meeting will be kept as evidence of the hearing.

Order of Business

1	Opening karakia	7
2	Apologies	7
3	Declaration of conflicts of interest	7
4	Confirmation of minutes	8
4.1	Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 23 March 2026	8
5	Business	16
5.1	Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objector Jesse HARTLEY	16
6	Public excluded session	24
6.1	Public Excluded Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 23 March 2026	24
7	Closing karakia	24

- 1 OPENING KARAKIA**
- 2 APOLOGIES**
- 3 DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 23 March 2026

File Number: A20013934

Author: Anahera Dinsdale, Governance Advisor

Authoriser: Sarah Holmes, Team Leader: Governance & CCO Support Services

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 23 March 2026 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 23 March 2026



DRAFT MINUTES

**Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting
Monday, 23 March 2026**

Order of Business

1	Opening Karakia	3
2	Apologies	3
3	Declaration of conflicts of interest	3
4	Confirmation of minutes.....	3
4.1	Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 18 August 2025.....	3
4.2	Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 2 December 2025	4
5	Business.....	4
5.1	Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Applicant Mandeep Kaur	4
5.2	Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objector Jesse HARTLEY	5
6	Public excluded session at 10:15am	5
6.1	Public Excluded Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 18 August 2025.....	5
6.2	Public Excluded Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 2 December 2025.....	5
5	Business continued.....	6
5.1	Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Applicant Mandeep Kaur	6
7	Closing Karakia.....	6

**MINUTES OF TAURANGA CITY COUNCIL
REGULATORY HEARINGS PANEL MEETING
HELD AT THE TAURANGA CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, L1, 90 DEVONPORT ROAD,
TAURANGA
ON MONDAY, 23 MARCH 2026 AT 9:00 AM**

- MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mrs Mary Dillon (Chair), Mr Puhirake Ihaka, Mr Terry Molloy, Mr Alan Tate
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Deidre Ewart (Head of Regulatory Support & Compliance Services), Nigel McGlone (Manager: Compliance Services), Oscar Glossop (Team Leader: Animal Services), Anahera Dinsdale (Governance Advisor), Caroline Irvin (Governance Advisor)
- EXTERNAL:** Mrs Mandeep Kaur and Ms Rosemary.

The meeting opened at 9:20am due to late arrival of a Panel member.

1 OPENING KARAKIA

Ms Anahera Dinsdale opened the meeting with a karakia.

2 APOLOGIES

APOLOGY

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/26/1/1

Moved: Mrs Mary Dillon
Seconded: Mr Alan Tate

That the apology for lateness received from Mr Puhirake Ihaka be accepted.

CARRIED

At 9.24am, Mr Puhirake Ihaka entered the meeting.

3 DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 18 August 2025

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/26/1/2

Moved: Mr Alan Tate
Seconded: Mr Terry Molloy

That the Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 18 August 2025 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

CARRIED

4.2 Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 2 December 2025

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/26/1/3

Moved: Mr Alan Tate

Seconded: Mr Terry Molloy

That the Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 2 December 2025 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

CARRIED

5 BUSINESS

5.1 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Applicant Mandeep Kaur

Staff Oscar Glossop, Team Leader: Animal Services

External Mrs Mandeep Kaur

Key Points

- Diesel, a 2.5-year-old German shepherd owned by Mrs Kaur, was involved in two attacks: March 9, 2024 (bit victim's forearm) and November 15, 2025 (bit victim's hamstring, requiring medical treatment).
- Animal Services intended to prosecute Mrs Kaur under section 57, and Diesel was seized and impounded.
- Staff described Diesel's aggressive behavior in custody and referenced previous warnings and fencing requirements.
- Staff encouraged that the panel assess public safety risk under section 71(5) before any release pending prosecution.

In response to questions

- The Team Leader: Animal Services was of the opinion that a German Shepherd could jump over the current fence height at Ms Kaur's residence.

Mrs Mandeep Kaur

Key Points

Ms Kaur:

- Explained Diesel's background, training, and routine, emphasising Diesel's friendliness at home and in the orchard.
- Described fencing improvements after the first incident and recent installation of a 1.8m fence and installation of electric gates (not yet operational).
- Stated Diesel was not aggressive, but energetic and disliked confinement. Diesel had not harmed orchard animals or workers.
- Assured the panel that new fencing and gates would prevent future escapes and committed to proper locking.

- Acknowledged both incidents involved Diesel escaping due to gates left open and committed to preventing recurrence.

In response to questions

- The Panel reminded Mrs Kaur of her full responsibility for Diesel's behaviour as the dog's owner and noted the gates were not yet operational, which would be an issue for returning Diesel.

Mrs Rosemary (neighbour) – speaking in support of Mrs Kaur

Key Points

Ms Rosemary:

- Described Diesel as under control and not aggressive during interactions, including when Diesel greeted her.
- Confirmed the victim continued to park outside the property after the incident and had not shown fear.
- Clarified Diesel's routine and lack of aggression toward strangers or workers.

5.2 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objector Jesse Hartley

Staff Oscar Glossop, Team Leader: Animal Services

External Mr Jesse Hartley

- Mr Hartley emailed his apologies. Staff would work to reschedule his hearing for April 2026.
- Mr Hartley would be notified that if he did not attend the meeting, the matters would nevertheless be addressed and a decision would be made based off the staff report.

6 PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION AT 10:15AM

Resolution to exclude the public

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/26/1/4

Moved: Mr Puhirake Ihaka

Seconded: Mr Terry Molloy

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 - Public Excluded Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 18 August 2025	s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons	s48(1)(a) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7
6.2 - Public Excluded Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 2 December 2025	s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons	s48(1)(a) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7
5.1 – Deliberations – Applicant Mandeep KAUR	To enable the Panel to deliberate in private on the objections heard.	s48(1)(d) 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.
5.2 – Deliberations – Objection to disqualification as a dog owner Jesse HARTLEY	To enable the Panel to deliberate in private on the objections heard.	s48(1)(d) 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

The meeting resumed in open at 10:38am

5 BUSINESS CONTINUED**5.1 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Applicant Mandeep Kaur****COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/26/1/5**

Moved: Mr Terry Molloy

Seconded: Mrs Mary Dillon

That the Regulatory Hearings Panel:

- (a) Receives the report "Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Applicant Mandeep Kaur" under s 71(4), Mandeep Kaur; and.
- (b) After considering whether it is satisfied that the release of the dog would not threaten public safety under section 71(5) of the Dog Control Act 1996, resolves to uphold the retention of the dog pending prosecution.

CARRIED

7 CLOSING KARAKIA

Mr Puhirake Ihaka closed the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting closed at 10:40am.

The minutes of this meeting were confirmed as a true and correct record at the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 1 April 2026.

5 BUSINESS

5.1 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objector Jesse HARTLEY

File Number: A20012611

Author: Oscar Glossop, Team Leader: Animal Services

Authoriser: Sarah Omundsen, General Manager: Regulatory and Community Services

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. To hear an objection from Jesse Hartley, opposing his disqualification as a dog owner under Section 25(1)(a) of the *Dog Control Act 1996*.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Regulatory Hearings Panel:

- (a) Receives the report "Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objector Jesse HARTLEY".
- (b) It is recommended that the panel uphold the disqualification of Jesse Hartley as a dog owner for 5 years. However, the panel has three options:
 - (i) Uphold the disqualification; or
 - (ii) Bring forward the date of termination; or
 - (iii) Terminate immediately the disqualification

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Mr Jesse Hartley was disqualified from dog ownership under Section 25(1)(a) of the *Dog Control Act 1996* after meeting the statutory threshold of three or more infringement offences within 24 months.
3. Mr Hartley's compliance history is extensive and indicates persistent non-compliance:
 - (a) 13 infringements since 2021,
 - (b) All of which have been filed with the Court, and
 - (c) A new infringement was issued even after meeting the disqualification threshold, demonstrating ongoing failure to meet legal obligations.
4. The infringements involve repeated failure to keep a dog under control, multiple instances of failure to comply with a menacing dog classification, and a pattern of failure to register a dog.
5. Given the seriousness, frequency, and continued nature of these offences, officers consider there is insufficient evidence of improved behaviour or responsible dog ownership. It is therefore recommended that the Panel uphold the disqualification.

BACKGROUND

6. Mr Hartley is the owner of one menacing dog within the Tauranga City Council jurisdiction.
7. Since 2021, he has received 13 infringements, including repeated notices relating to dog control, prohibited-area breaches, registration failures, and non-compliance with a menacing dog classification.

8. The relevant infringements that triggered the current disqualification, along with earlier infringements demonstrating an ongoing pattern of behaviour, are:
9. Recent Infringements (within the 24-month statutory period)
 - 22/02/2026** - INF 29099 – Section 20: Failure to keep dog under control (Clause 6.3)

Tuff Cooky found roaming, picked up at 6 Penrhyn Place by First Security.
Complainant stated that they thought Tuff Cooky was drugged, beaten, and left to roam.
 - 17/10/2025** – INF 28919 - Failure to comply with classification of dog as menacing
Tuff Cooky was unmuzzled in public on Penrhyn Place
 - 17/10/2025** – INF 28918 - Section 20: Failure to keep dog under control (Clause 6.3)
Tuff Cooky was roaming on Penrhyn Place
 - 07/10/2025** – INF 28917 - Failure to register dog
Tuff Cooky was unregistered
 - 03/11/2024** – INF 28329 - Section 20: Failure to keep dog under control (Clause 6.3)
Video footage was received showing Tuff Cooky running down Penrhyn Place roaming.
 - 03/11/2024** – INF 28330 - Failure to comply with classification of dog as menacing
Video footage was received showing Tuff Cooky running down Penrhyn Place unmuzzled in a public place.
 - 14/08/2024** – INF 27822 - Section 20(7): Dog in prohibited area (Clause 7.1)
CCTV footage captured Jesse HARTLEY and Tuff Cooky on coming from Mauao and into the Pilot Bay trailer parking area. This is a dog prohibited area.
 - 14/08/2024** – INF 27821 - Failure to comply with classification of dog as menacing
CCTV footage captured Tuff Cooky at the Pilot Bay Trailer park unmuzzled and not desexed at the time.
 - 14/08/2024** – INF 27822 - Failure to register dog
CCTV footage captured Tuff Cooky in the Pilot Bay trailer parking area unregistered at the time.
10. In total, 13 infringements have been issued to Mr Hartley since 2021, all of which have been filed with the Court.
11. On 1st May 2025 this panel heard a previous objection from Mr Hartley to his disqualification as a dog owner and as a result rescinded the disqualification.
12. Since this panel rescinded Mr Hartley's disqualification as a dog owner he has received a further four infringements.
13. On 23rd February 2026, Mr Hartley was served a notice disqualifying him from dog ownership for 5 years under Section 25(1)(a), Dog Control Act 1996.
14. On 28th February 2026, Mr Hartley lodged an objection to his disqualification under Section 26 of the Act.

STATUTORY CONTEXT

15. Under the *Dog Control Act 1996*:
 - (a) Section 25(1)(a) requires Territorial Authorities to disqualify an owner who commits three or more infringement offences within 24 months.
 - (b) Section 26(3) requires the Panel to consider:
 - (i) The circumstances and nature of the offences

- (ii) The competency of the owner
- (iii) Steps taken to prevent further offences
- (iv) The matters advanced in support of the objection
- (v) Any other relevant matters

16. The Panel may:

- (i) Uphold the disqualification; or
- (ii) Bring forward the date of termination; or
- (iii) Terminate immediately the disqualification

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

17. This contributes to the promotion or achievement of the following strategic community outcome(s):

	Contributes
We are an inclusive city	<input type="checkbox"/>
We value, protect and enhance the environment	<input type="checkbox"/>
We are a well-planned city that is easy to move around	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
We are a city that supports business and education	<input type="checkbox"/>
We are a vibrant city that embraces events	<input type="checkbox"/>

18. Effective enforcement of the Dog Control Act supports safer public spaces, responsible dog ownership, and reduced animal-related incidents, contributing to a safer and more liveable city.

OPTIONS ANALYSIS

19. Option 1: Uphold the Disqualification (Recommended)

- Statutory requirements met.
- Significant and repeated non-compliance across many years.
- Repeated breaches of menacing-dog conditions increase risk.
- New infringement issued *after* disqualification threshold reached.
- No evidence of improved dog management or mitigation steps.

20. Option 2: Bring Forward the Date of Termination

- Requires demonstrated improvement or proactive behavioural change.
- No such evidence has been presented.

21. Option 3: Immediately Terminate the Disqualification

Inappropriate given the:

- Volume of offending (13 infringements).
- Seriousness and repeat nature of the offences.
- Continued offending even after reaching disqualification threshold.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

22. No additional financial implications beyond normal enforcement operations.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / RISKS

23. The Panel must ensure compliance with Section 25 and Section 26 requirements. A failure to properly consider statutory criteria may result in appeal under **Section 27**.

TE AO MĀORI APPROACH

24. This matter is a regulatory enforcement process and does not directly impact Council's Te Ao Māori principles. Effects relate to general community wellbeing and safety.

CONSULTATION / ENGAGEMENT

25. This matter concerns individual compliance and does not require wider consultation.

SIGNIFICANCE

26. The Local Government Act 2002 requires an assessment of the significance of matters, issues, proposals and decisions in this report against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. Council acknowledges that in some instances a matter, issue, proposal or decision may have a high degree of importance to individuals, groups, or agencies affected by the report.
27. In making this assessment, consideration has been given to the likely impact, and likely consequences for:
- (a) the current and future social, economic, environmental, or cultural well-being of the district or region
 - (b) any persons who are likely to be particularly affected by, or interested in, the .
 - (c) the capacity of the local authority to perform its role, and the financial and other costs of doing so.
28. In accordance with the considerations above, criteria and thresholds in the policy, it is considered that the decision is of low significance.

ENGAGEMENT

29. Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of low significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

Click here to view the [TCC Significance and Engagement Policy](#)

NEXT STEPS

30. Council will provide Mr Hartley with a written decision, including reasons for the determination.

ATTACHMENTS

1. **Disqualification Notice - A19886139** [↓](#) 
2. **Objection - A19886131** [↓](#) 

DISQUALIFICATION FROM DOG OWNERSHIP



23 February 2026

JESSE HARTLEY



Delivery Confirmation:

Recipient name:

Signature:

Date:

Time:

Served by:

Signature:

Notice of disqualification from dog ownership (Section 25, Dog Control Act 1996)

This is to inform you that you have been disqualified under section 25 (1) (a) of the Dog Control Act 1996 from owning any dog.

This follows three or more infringement offences (not relating to a single incident or occasion) having been committed by you, within a continuous period of 24 months.

This disqualification will apply from 17 October 2025 and will expire on 16 October 2028.

A summary of the effect of the disqualification and your right to object is provided below.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Oscar Glossop".

Oscar Glossop
Animal Services: Team Leader
07 577 7000
info@tauranga.govt.nz

EFFECT OF DISQUALIFICATION***Section 28, Dog Control Act 1996***

You are required to dispose of every dog owned by you within 14 days of the date of this notice.

However, you may not dispose of a dog:

- to a person who resides at the same address as you.
- in a way that constitutes of an offence against the Dog Control Act 1996 or any other Act.

You must not become the owner, even on a temporary basis, of any dog while you are disqualified. You may have possession of a dog only for the purpose of:

- preventing it from causing injury, damage, or distress.
- returning, within 72 hours, a lost dog to a territorial authority for the purpose of restoring the dog to its owner.

You will commit an offence and be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding \$3000 if you:

- fail to dispose of every dog owned by you within 14 days of this notice.
- at any time while disqualification, become the owner of any dog.
- dispose of a dog owned by you:
 - to a person who resides at the same address as you.
 - in a manner that constitutes an offence against the Dog Control Act 1996 or any other Act.

If you are convicted of the first or second of these offenses, your period of disqualification may be further extended. You will also commit an offence and be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding \$3000 if you dispose or give custody or possession of a dog to a person knowing that person to be disqualified from ownership under section 25 of the Dog Control Act 1996.

Full details of the effect of disqualification are provided in the Dog Control Act 1996.

RIGHT OF OBJECTION TO DISQUALIFICATION***Section 26, Dog Control Act 1996***

You may object to the disqualification by lodging a written objection with Tauranga City Council setting out the grounds on which you object. You are entitled to be heard in support of your objection and will be notified of the time and place when your objection will be heard.

No objection can be lodged within 12 months of the hearing of any previous objection to the disqualification. If an objection is lodged within 14 days after the date of this notice, the requirement to dispose of every dog owned by you will be suspended until Tauranga City Council has determined the objection.

There is a further right of appeal to a District Court if you are dissatisfied with the decision of Tauranga City Council on your objection.

Note: In the event of a Council hearing, the council report and minutes of the hearing will be posted on the Council's website. Any objection heard by the Regulatory Hearings Panel is a publicly notified meeting, and members of the public, including the media, may attend. While your name and your dog's name may be published, your contact details will not be reported.

From: Jesse Hartley [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 February 2026 12:14
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@tauranga.govt.nz](mailto:[REDACTED]@tauranga.govt.nz)>
Subject: Appeal of disqualification

CAUTION: External Email.

To: Operations Manager – Dog Control

I write regarding the current disqualification status of my dog and his recent impoundment.

All impound and associated fees have been paid in full. I am formally disputing the continued disqualification and the circumstances that have led to repeated complaints and enforcement action.

There are serious concerns regarding external interference contributing to the alleged roaming. My property is double-gated. I am actively investigating how my shed door and gate were opened, enabling my dog to leave the section. I have reason to believe third-party involvement may be a contributing factor.

I have personally observed a neighbouring resident throwing food scraps outside, despite being aware my dog is on a controlled diet. I have also observed behaviour from another complainant that appears inconsistent, including holding my dog on a lead until animal control officers arrived at an early hour.

There are additional concerns involving the neighbouring dog (“Teddy,” a black poodle), jointly associated with two complainants. That dog has been left to bark continuously during the owner’s absence and has reportedly developed kennel cough. I also confirm there was an incident where that dog bit me, which was not addressed by its owners. I have not pursued this matter to date, but it remains relevant to the broader pattern of conduct.

For clarity, my dog is not aggressive. His temperament is consistently friendly and social. Any allegations implying otherwise are strongly disputed.

Accordingly, I formally request:

1. A complete copy of all file notes, complaint records, officer observations, internal communications, and any supporting evidence relating to my dog.
2. Confirmation of the legal basis relied upon for the current disqualification decision.
3. Disclosure of any statements made by third parties that contributed to enforcement action.
4. Confirmation of the process available to formally appeal or review the disqualification.

Please provide the full file record to me in writing. I also request that a duplicate copy be forwarded to:



This letter serves as formal notice that I intend to pursue all available legal remedies should procedural fairness or evidentiary standards not be met.

I expect acknowledgment of this correspondence and a timeline for disclosure within statutory requirements.

Yours faithfully,

Jesse Hartley

6 PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION

Resolution to exclude the public

RECOMMENDATIONS

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 - Public Excluded Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 23 March 2026	s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons	s48(1)(a) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7
5.1 – Deliberations – Objection to Disqualification as a dog owner – Jesse Hartley	To enable the Panel to deliberate in private on the objections heard.	s48(1)(d) 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.

7 CLOSING KARAKIA