

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Cat and Dog Review](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: City of Belmont- Feedback on Dog & Cat Laws in WA
Date: Friday, 2 August 2019 10:50:46 AM
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for providing the opportunity to provide feedback on the current dog and cat related legislation.

The City's comments are as follows:-

Combined

- Life-time Registration should be reviewed. The flexibility of 1, 3 and 5 year periods could be considered. The main problem with "life-time registration" is that home details/status of animal (alive or dead) are not being updated.
- Consolidated Acts into one "Domestic Animals Act" or similar. There may be some benefit in having commonly phrased requirements/offences for both sets of animals.eg cats & dogs wandering

Cats

- Consider a limit on number of cats in the Act, same as the Dog Act, i.e no more than 2 without approval. This would take out inconsistent limits across LGs. After 6 years of the Cat Act we are now getting past the problem when local law requirements were overridden by the Act allowing those with multiple numbers of cats to register them.
- Consider including a section on cats WAL and/or causing a nuisance with the ability to impose penalties. This would take out inconsistencies across LGs. LGs are always at liberty to introduce more localised requirements. The preferable result would be to have requirements that cats must be kept on the owners property, in the same way as dogs, unless restrained on a leash (some people do walk cats) ie a "straying" offence. The community opinion on cats wandering into others property's and spraying on patio furniture, defecating in flower beds has hardened. In addition the clear impact they have on wildlife. The traditional act of "putting the cat out for the night" has passed.
- Consider cats to be sterilised at 3 months of age

Dogs

- Dog Attack Penalties - Consider an increase in modified penalties to recognise the significance of the issue and to deter repeat offenders.
- Dog Barking – The current Guidelines have some shortcomings. Consider the introduction of prescribed barking levels as well as subjective ways to quantify a nuisance. The current Guidelines have been based on numbers of barks over periods of time/times of day ie frequency. Unsure why or how the number of barks were quantified? They do not consider volume, sound frequency and the time periods are not consistent with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regs 1997 time periods. They also do not consider ongoing whining and yelping which can also be annoying. It is suggested that DWER Noise branch/EHO professions be consulted on a more user friendly set of criteria and their practical application.
- Greyhounds – Remove the requirement for greyhounds to be muzzled in public. Greyhounds are no more or less likely to chase and bite than other breeds or dogs.
- Unregistered Dogs – Consider the ability for local governments to be able to apply for a warrant to seize dogs which are not registered after a prescribed time, after being given a Notice to register. This would be a last resort but would allow LGs to bring the ongoing problem to a resolution.

- Registration details- the inaccurate (often deliberate) registering of a dog's breed, in particular calling a Pitbull X or even a Pitbull, an "Am-Staff". Not sure how this can be resolved.

Regards,




MANAGER SAFER COMMUNITIES



City of Belmont, 215 Wright Street, Cloverdale, WA 6105
Postal address: Locked Bag 379, Cloverdale WA 6985



Web – www.belmont.wa.gov.au

DISCLAIMER:

This e-mail is private and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please advise us by return e-mail immediately, and delete the e-mail and any attachments without using or disclosing the contents in any way. You should scan this e-mail and any attachments for viruses. This organisation accepts no liability for any direct or indirect damage or loss resulting from the use of any attachments to this e-mail.