Nillumbik Domestic Animal Management Plan (DAMP) Stage 1 Consultation Findings Report
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## 1. Executive summary

ChatterBox Projects was engaged by Nillumbik Shire Council in 2021 to plan and facilitate a range of community engagement activities to help inform the draft Domestic Animal Management Plan (DAMP) for the entire municipality. The purpose of the community engagement was to gather input to guide and assist Council with the development of the DAMP. People who live, work and visit the Nillumbik shire were identified as the target population to engage in this public consultation. Online, paper-based and in-person activities took place from 17 May to 25 June, 2021. Council's 'Participate Nillumbik' online engagement platform was used to support the consultation.

### 1.1 Overview of participation profile

The communications and engagement activities were effective in engaging around $\mathbf{8 6 8}$ participants. It is noted that some individuals may have participated in more than one engagement activity.

| Engagement activity | Indicative <br> number of <br> participants* |
| :--- | :--- |
| Survey (online and hard copy versions) | 523 |
| $8 \times$ place-based pop-up engagement: Aqueduct Trail, Research, Diamond Creek <br> Community Centre, Diamond Creek Dog Park, Eltham North Adventure Playground, <br> Eltham Town Square, Hurstbridge Town Centre, Lower Eltham Park and St Andrews | 345 |
| Market <br> $189 \times$ voting pod, $81 \times$ quick poll, $52 \times$ dotmocracy, 13 creative drawings and 10 <br> chatboard activities (and 76 surveys included above) |  |
| Indicative participants | 868 |

Demographic details were not submitted by or captured for all participants, so the participation profile has been generated based on the characteristics reported by the 523 survey respondands :

- Participants are a variety of ages: all age groupings were represented although there were single participants aged under 12 years and $85+$ years. Persons aged 35 to 49 years were particularly engaged ( 156 or $30.2 \%$ )
- Participants live or work in Nillumbik: $97.8 \%$ of participants reported living within the municipality and all areas were represented with the exception of Kinglake, Kinglake West and Strathewen. Participants from Eltham were particularly engaged (193 or 42.9\%)
- Participants have a variety of relationships to cats and dogs in Nillumbik: all relationship options were selected with the exception of Registered Domestic Animal Business, signalling participants have a variety of, and sometimes multiple, relationships to cats and dogs. The majority of participants are a dog and/or cat owner (395 or $76.0 \%$ ) and many use local parks, reserves or playgrounds ( 299 or $57.5 \%$ ). 101 (or $19.4 \%$ of) participants identified as a non-dog or cat owner
- 60 participants identified a connection with a range of cat or dog groups and organisations. Multiple participants reported a connection with: Diamond Valley dog obedience club (3); Dogs Victoria (7); Lower Eltham Park dog group (2); Melbourne Cavoodles (2); RSPCA (2) and Wiltja Dog Obedience Club Bundoora Park (2)


### 1.2 Key findings from the analysis of the community feedback

## Pet ownership in Nillumbik

- Most participants have one or more dogs and some participants have one or more cats: most participants, ( 365 or $89.2 \%$ ) have one or more dogs and 138 (or $33.7 \%$ ) have one or more cats. The majority of dog owners have one dog and the majority of cat owners have one cat
- Participants have owned pets for a range of timespans (less than $\mathbf{1 2} \mathbf{~ m o n t h s}$ to $\mathbf{1 0}$ years and over and the majority have been dog owners and/or cat owners for 10+ years
- Some participants welcomed a new pet to their household during the 2019/20 pandemic: the majority of participants ( 344 or $81.9 \%$ ) did not welcome a new pet during the 2019/20 pandemic. Some participants did welcome a new pet for a range of reasons including: existing pet died, old or unwell; coincidence, already considering, planning or searching; animal needed a home or rescue dog; and for companionship.

Pet owner views about registering, microchipping and desexing and experience with pound

- The majority of the 349 dog owners indicated their dogs were registered, microchipped and desexed
- Reasons for not registering include (11 participants): dog/s is not desexed; and don't see the value in it
- Reasons for not microchipping include (1 participant): don't know where or how to do it
- Reasons for not desexing include (25 participants): vet/breeder recommended waiting until they are older; and plan to breed them
- The majority of the $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ cat owners indicated their pets were registered, microchipped and desexed
- Reasons for not registering include (10 participants): don't see the value in it; and forgot
- Reasons for not microchipping include (5 participants): don't know where or how to do it
- Reasons for not desexing include (1 participant): haven't got around to it
- A small number of participants (5) have had their dog or cat taken to the pound in the past two years. The time taken for owners to be reunited with their pets varied from 5 minutes to 2 days

Pet ownership in the community

- The majority of participants agreed or strongly agreed that pets give comfort and support to many people and encourage social interaction: most participants (496 or 95.9\%) agreed that pets give great comfort and support to many people in the community and they are more likely to talk to other people if they are with a dog ( 379 or $73.3 \%$ ). Mixed views were reported for likelihood to become a dog/cat owner in the next two years or future
- The majority of participants (pet owners only) consistently agreed or strongly agreed that pets play an important and positive role in their life: pets are an important part of their family (161 or $98.2 \%$ ); give them great comfort and support ( 162 or $98.8 \%$ ); that they are likely to continue having a pet in their life ( 154 or $93.9 \%$ ); they exercise more because they have a dog/pet ( 124 or $76.1 \%$ ); and they are more likely to talk to more people because they have a dog ( 127 or $78.4 \%$ )
- The majority of participants reported desirable pet ownership behaviours (dogs) are always or often observed in their neighbourhood: in particular, participants observed dogs in public spaces who are friendly and well behaved (424 or $82.2 \%$ ), dog owners who have their dog on a leash when they are meant to ( 411 or $79.8 \%$ ), groups of dog owners socialising while their dogs play (368 or $71.7 \%$ ), Dogs responding to owners' commands (355 or $69.3 \%$ of participants), dog
owners picking up their dog's poo ( 350 or $68.0 \%$ ), and dogs returning to their owners when called (332 or 64.8\%)
- Many participants indicated dogs should be allowed on sporting fields, however mixed views were apparent: many of the 506 participants who answered this question indicated Yes ( 254 or $50.2 \%$ ), although many No ( 167 or $33 \%$ ) and Unsure ( 85 or $16.8 \%$ ) responses were also reported.
- The reasoning behind Yes responses included: sporting fields are public spaces that can be shared with dogs and their owners who need spaces to exercise and socialise; sporting fields are flat, fenced spaces that are good and safe for dogs off-leash, particularly when dog designated spaces and parks are limited; and most dog owners do pick up dog poo on sporting fields, or they can use them provided they do pick up dog poo
- The reasoning behind No responses included: dog owners do not pick up dog poo; it is unhygienic and creates health risks; and dogs dig the grounds and make holes in the surface
- The reasoning behind Unsure responses included: dog owners do not pick up dog poo; sports fields are a good space for dog access; and dog owners are not fully responsible, may not supervise or have effective control
- Many participants reported a few desirable and undesirable pet ownership behaviours involving cats in their neighbourhood: in particular, participants observed cats being kept inside houses during the day/night (200 or $40.4 \%$ ), cats outside at night ( 175 or $34.0 \%$ ). In contrast, cats fighting other cats has been never or rarely observed ( 380 or $75.4 \%$ ) and cats making loud noises has never or rarely been observed (365 or 72.0\%)


## Proposal for a 24-hour cat curfew

- The majority of survey and quick poll participants were supportive of the proposal for a 24hour cat curfew in Nillumbik, although mixed views were evident: just over half of participants indicated strong support ( 260 or $50.8 \%$ ) and a further 80 (or $15.6 \%$ ) indicated somewhat support (but they had some concerns). $60.0 \%$ of Quick poll participants indicated Support for the proposal.
- The reasoning behind Strongly support responses included: cats are hunters, predators and instinctively kill native wildlife, birds and animals; cats are a nuisance, they poo in and disturb my gardens and upset my pets/birds; and cats roam and their movements are unrestricted and unpredictable
- The reasoning behind Somewhat support responses included: not indoors exclusively, cats need some time outdoors for wellbeing and exercise; okay outside within own property, under supervision or on leash; and cats kill native wildlife, birds and animals
- The reasoning behind No opinion responses included: not a cat owner
- The reasoning behind Somewhat oppose responses included: not indoors exclusively, cats need some time outdoors for wellbeing and exercise; agree with current night curfew; and it is not reasonable or practical
- The reasoning behind Strongly oppose responses included: cats are used to being outside and need time for fresh air, exercise, play and overall health and wellbeing; it is inhumane, unreasonable, excessive and unnatural, cats have a right to go outside; and my cat plays or stays on our property, doesn't disturb wildlife and is not a nuisance
- The level of support for the proposal for a $\mathbf{2 4 - h o u r ~ c a t ~ c u r f e w ~ v a r i e d ~ a c r o s s ~ a r e a s ~ ( s u b u r b , ~}$ township and village): stronger levels of support were evident for: Bend of Islands, Christmas Hills, Cottles Bridge, Hurstbridge, North Warrandyte, Research, Smiths Gully and St Andrews. These insights are based on low response levels for many areas and should be regarded indicative and not conclusive.


## Awareness and importance of Council's animal management services

- The majority of participants were aware of Council's animal management services and related regulations prior to participating in the consultation:
- Topics with highest overall level of awareness: Victorian law requires dogs/cats to be registered with their local council ( 483 or $95.6 \%$ ), Dog walkers are required to carry a poo bag (452 or $89.7 \%$ ), Dog owners must have 'effective control' of dogs in off-leash areas (450 or $89.8 \%$ ) and Difference between registering and microchipping a dog/cat (445 or $88.3 \%$ )
- Topics with lowest overall level of awareness: CSOs inspect all Domestic Animal Businesses throughout the municipality every year ( 335 or $66.7 \%$ said No), Council provides a cat trap hire service ( 310 or $61.5 \%$ said No) and the Save a Dog Scheme ( 277 or $55.5 \%$ said No)
- The majority of survey and Dotmocracy participants aged 18 years and over indicated most of Council's animal management services are very important or important:
- Services with highest overall level of importance: education about responsible pet ownership, provide/maintain off-leash areas, respond to reports of nuisance dogs/cats, collect/return stray dogs/cats to owners, and Protect/enforce dog-free nature reserves/environmentally sensitive areas
- Services with lowest overall level of importance: Annual Pet Expo and Checking dog/cat registration via patrols or door-knocks
- The majority of the 18 Dotmocracy participants aged under 18 years indicated most items were very important or important. Services with the highest overall level of importance were: Annual Pet Expo, Protect/enforce dog-free nature reserves/environmentally sensitive areas and Collect/return stray dogs/cats to their owners.

Satisfaction with animal-related services and improvement suggestions

- The majority of participants have not reported an animal-related issue to Council over the past two years
- Of the $\mathbf{9 6}$ participants who had reported an animal-related issue over the past two years:
- Dog-related issues (64 or 66.7\%) included: Nuisance barking dogs, night and daytime; Dogs off leash or not under effective control in public spaces; and Dog attacking my dog or wildlife
- Cat-related issues (24 or $25.0 \%$ ) included: Cats outside at night, after curfew; Stray or roaming cats; and Feral or wild cats
- Pet or other animal-related issues (8 or $8.3 \%$ ) included: Injured or sick animal (kangaroo, fox, horse); and Injured wildlife
- Participants reported mixed views when asked to rate their level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with Council's response to the animal-related issue:
- Outcome of the issue: 72 or $44.2 \%$ selected the neutral rating
- Time taken to respond to issue: 81 or $51.6 \%$ selected the neutral rating
- Communication and professionalism: 78 or $49.4 \%$ selected the neutral rating
- Explanations for dissatisfaction provided by 79 participants included: Council response was slow, unresponsive or appeared disinterested; In my view, the issue has not been resolved; and Unhappy with the Council diary or disclosure procedures


## 2. Project background and overview of consultation

### 2.1 Background

Council is reviewing and updating its Domestic Animal Management Plan (DAMP).
The DAMP aims to promote responsible pet ownership and the welfare of cats and dogs whilst protecting the community and environment from nuisance domestic animals.. The DAMP

- sets out how Council manages cats and dogs in Nillumbik;
- informs of rules for managing dogs and cats (including Local Laws);
- outlines how Council can help the community play their part as responsible pet owners; and
- directs how Council will invest its time and resources.

The DAMP is required to be reviewed every four years and is due to expire December 2021.
Community engagement is a critical element in developing the DAMP. Feedback received on the DAMP will also flow through to the local laws review which is being undertaken at a similar time. The local law includes a range of provisions that involve the keeping and control of animals.

With community input the updated DAMP will be developed July/ August with a further round of community consultation on the updated draft DAMP scheduled for September/ October 2021.

### 2.2 Engagement purpose and objectives

The engagement objectives were to:

- gather feedback from the community to help inform the development of a new Domestic Animal Management Plan;
- test a range of ideas including the introduction of a 24 hour cat curfew and restrictions to dogs on sporting reserves; and
- inform and educate the community about the Domestic Animal Management Plan.



### 2.3 Overview of consultation program

ChatterBox Projects planned and delivered a range of engagement activities from 17 May to 25 June, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Schedule of engagement activities

| Activity | Date and time |
| :--- | :--- |
| Survey (online via Nillumbik's consultation platform and <br> hard copy) | 17 May to 25 June |
| Place-based pop-up 1: Diamond Creek Dog Park | 13 June (Sunday, 10am -1 pm) |
| Place-based pop-up 2: Lower Eltham Park | 15 June (Tuesday, 2.30pm-5.30pm) |
| Place-based pop-up 3: Eltham Town Square | 16 June (Wednesday, 11am-2pm) |
| Place-based pop-up 4: Eltham North Adventure Playground | 16 June (Wednesday, 3pm-5.30pm) |
| Place-based pop-up 5: Hurstbridge Town Centre | 18 June (Friday, 11am-2pm) |
| Place-based pop-up 6: Diamond Creek Community Centre | 19 June (Saturday, 9am-12pm) |
| Place-based pop-up 7: Aqueduct Trail, Research | 21 June (Monday, 2.30pm-5.30pm) |
| Place-based pop-up 8: St Andrews Market | 27 June (Saturday, 9am-2pm) |

Eight place-based pop-ups were designed to intercept community members in busy public locations throughout the Nillumbik shire.. Combined, the pop-ups engaged around 400 people (via voting pod, quick poll, dotmocracy, creative drawings, chatboards and survey) and provided the opportunity for many community members to have conversations, ask questions, seek clarification on a range of issues and topics and take information and surveys home.


The feedback gathered via each engagement activity is shown in Table 3.
Table 3: Questions by engagement activity

|  | Survey <br> (523) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Voting } \\ \text { pod } \\ \text { (189) } \end{gathered}$ | Quick poll (81) | Dotmocracy <br> (52) | Creative drawings (13) | Chatboard (10) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demographics (see Section 3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age | マ | V |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{U} / 18 \text { or } \\ 18+ \end{gathered}$ | V |  |
| Residential suburb, town or village | マ |  |  |  | V |  |
| Relationship/s to cats and dogs in Nillumbik | V |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connection to cat or dog group/s or organisation/s | V |  |  |  |  |  |

Pet ownership in Nillumbik (see Section 4.1)

| How many cats and dogs live <br> in your household | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| How long have you owned <br> pets? | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Did you welcome a new pet <br> to your household during the <br> $2019 / 20$ pandemic? If yes, <br> why | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Pet owner views about registration, micro-chipping and desexing (see Section 4.2)

| Is your dog/cat registered, microchipped and desexed. If no, why? | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dog or cat taken to the pound in the past two years? If yes, how long to be reunited | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pet ownership in the comm |  | ction 4.3) |  |  |  |  |
| Level of agreement - 15 desirable and undesirable pet ownership behaviours (dogs) | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of agreement - 5 pet ownership experiences (pet owners only) | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Do you believe dogs should be allowed on sporting fields? Why? | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Survey (523) | Voting pod （189） | Quick poll （81） | Dotmocracy <br> （52） | Creative drawings <br> （13） | Chatboard （10） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Frequency－ 9 desirable and undesirable pet ownership behaviours（cats） | マ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal for a 24－hour cat curfew（see Section 4．4） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Support for a 24 －hour cat curfew in Nillumbik？ | マ |  | $\nabla$ |  |  |  |
| Awareness and importance of Council＇s animal management services（see Section 4．5） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Before today，were you aware that／of（prescribed list） | マ |  |  |  |  |  |
| How important do you think it is for Council to provide services to the community？ <br> （prescribed list） | マ |  |  | マ |  |  |
| Satisfaction with animal－related services and improvement suggestions（see Section 4．6） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you reported an animal－related issue to Council over the past two years？If yes，how satisfied were you with Council＇s response？ | マ |  |  |  |  |  |
| How can Council improve its animal management services？ （prescribed list） | マ |  |  |  |  | V |
| Other comments（see Section 4．7） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Draw a picture of your pet． What do you think they need to make them happy？ |  |  |  |  | マ |  |
| Any other feedback to inform the development of Council＇s DAMP？ | マ |  |  |  |  |  |

## 3. Description of participation profile

Community members who live, operate/work in an animal-related business as well as those who are members of a cat or dog group or organisation were identified as the target population to engage in this consultation. The broader community could also participate by completing the online survey.

The communications and engagement activities were effective in informing the community and around 868 participants were engaged in this consultation. A total of 516 participants reported a residential suburb and 440 (or $97.8 \%$ ) indicated suburbs, townships or villages within Nillumbik municipality.

Participant demographic data were captured to varying degrees across the engagement activities. Therefore, it is not possible to provide a complete participation profile or to determine the extent to which participants reflect a broad cross-section of the Nillumbik resident population and community.
Detailed demographic data were captured for the $\mathbf{5 2 3}$ survey participants, although some survey participants elected not to respond to some questions. No detailed demographic data are available or reported in relation to the following place-based pop-up engagement activities:

- 189 Voting poll participants
- 81 Quick poll participants
- 52 Dotmocracy participants
- 13 Creative drawing participants
- 10 Chatboard participants

The findings presented in Part 4 of this report may be regarded as accurately reflecting the views of the participants. As there is some evidence of consistently recurring themes in the responses gathered across engagement activities, this encourages confidence in the findings. It is noted that some individuals participated in more than one engagement activity.

## Key highlights

- Participants are a variety of ages: all age groupings were represented although there were single participants aged under 12 years and $85+$ years. Persons aged 35 to 49 years were particularly engaged ( 156 or $30.2 \%$ )
- Participants live or operate/work in an animal-related business throughout Nillumbik:
$97.8 \%$ of participants reported living within the municipality and all areas were represented with the exception of Kinglake, Kinglake West and Strathewen. Participants from Eltham were particularly engaged (193 or 42.9\%)
- Participants have a variety of relationships to cats and dogs in Nillumbik: all relationship options were selected with the exception of Registered Domestic Animal Business, signalling participants have a variety of, and sometimes multiple, relationships to cats and dogs. The majority of participants are a dog and/or cat owner ( 395 or $76.0 \%$ ) and many use local parks, reserves or playgrounds ( 299 or $57.5 \%$ ). 101 (or $19.4 \%$ of) participants identified as a non dog or cat owner
- 60 participants identified a connection with a range of cat or dog groups and organisations: multiple participants reported a connection with: Diamond Valley dog obedience club (3); Dogs Victoria (7); Lower Eltham Park dog group (2); Melbourne Cavoodles (2); RSPCA (2) and Wiltja Dog Obedience Club Bundoora Park (2)


### 3.1 Age of participants

Survey participants were asked to indicate their age grouping. All age groupings were represented although there were single participants for the under 12 years and 85+ years age groupings.
As shown in Graph 1, of the 516 participants who indicated their age, persons aged 35 to 49 years were particularly engaged ( 156 or $30.2 \%$ ).
Graph 1: Age groupings of survey participants



### 3.2 Residential suburb, township or village

Survey participants were asked to indicate the suburb, township or village where they live or operate/work in an animal-related business. All areas within the Nillumbik municipality were represented with the exception of Kinglake, Kinglake West and Strathewen.
As shown in Graph 2, of the 450 participants who indicated residential details, many reported living in Eltham ( 193 or $42.9 \%$ ). A total of 440 (or $97.8 \%$ ) of participants reported living within the Nillumbik municipality and 10 (or $2.2 \%$ ) reported living outside of Nillumbik.

Graph 2: Residential suburb, township or village of survey participants


A total of 10 participants selected 'Other' and provided the following responses (where more than one participant provided a similar response, the number is indicated in brackets):

- Lower Plenty (2)
- Mernda (1)
- Montmorency (4)
- Moonee Ponds (1)
- Templestowe Lower (1)
- Watsonia (1)


### 3.3 Relationship/s to cats and dogs in Nillumbik

Survey participants were asked to indicate their relationship to cats and dogs in Nillumbik and to select all response options that applied. All relationships were selected with the exception of Registered Domestic Animal Business, which signals participants have a variety of, and sometimes multiple, relationships to cats and dogs.
As shown in Graph 3, of the 520 participants who answered this question, the majority are a dog and/or cat owner ( 395 or $76.0 \%$ ) and use local parks, reserves or playgrounds ( 299 or $57.5 \%$ ). Further, 101 (or $19.4 \%$ of) participants identified as a non dog or cat owner.


Graph 3: Relationship/s to cats and dogs in Nillumbik reported by survey participants


### 3.4 Cat and dog groups or organisations represented

Survey participants were invited to indicate the name of any dog or cat groups or organisations that they are part of and 60 participants provided the following responses (where more than one participant provided a similar response, the number is indicated in brackets):

- ACF
- Animal Justice Party
- Australian Borderforce Detector Dog Program - Volunteer Foster Carer
- Australian Wildlife conservancy
- Bernese Mountain Dog club of Victoria
- Diamond Valley dog obedience club (3)
- Dogs Victoria (7)
- Dogs4LEP (Facebook Group)
- Eltham greyhound group
- English cocker spaniel playgroup and rescue
- German Shepherd Dog Club of Victoria (Northern Branch)
- German Shepherd Rescue Victoria
- German Wirehaired Pointers Australia
- Greenpeace
- Greyhound Adoption Program
- Greyhound Association (Doncaster)
- Greyhound Safety Net
- Greyhounds
- Guide Dogs Victoria
- Gus and Gertie
- He@rd It Rescue
- Healesville Dog Obedience club
- Homeless Hounds and Cats
- Ingrids Haven. Vic Dog Rescue
- Irish Wolfhound Club
- Keeshond Association Victoria
- Kintala Dog Club
- Labrador Retriever Club of Vic.
- Lower Eltham Park dog group (2)
- Madpaws
- Max ALP
- Melbourne Cavoodles (2)
- Nillumbik Environment Action Group
- Parks Victoria Volunteer
- Pug pals Melbourne
- Reishi Siamese
- RSPCA (2)
- RSPCA employee, foster carer for various rescues
- Save a dog
- Schnauzer club of Victoria
- Second Chance Animal Rescue
- Siberian Husky Lovers
- (2)
- Starting Over Dog Rescue
- The K9 Company Eltham
- The Kintala Dog Training Club Incorporated
- Vision Australia Seeing Eye Dogs
- Warringal Dog Obedience Club
- Wiltja Dog Obedience Club Bundoora Park


Dogs of Nillumbik-photos taken at pop-up engagement events

## 4. Findings from the analysis of the community feedback

This section reports the findings from the analysis of the community feedback gathered via survey (online and hard copy versions) and place-based pop-up engagement activities.

### 4.1 Pet ownership in Nillumbik

## Key highlights

- Most participants have one or more dogs and some participants have one or more cats: most participants, ( 365 or $89.2 \%$ ) have one or more dogs and 138 (or $33.7 \%$ ) have one or more cats. The majority of dog owners have one dog and the majority of cat owners have one cat
- Participants have owned pets for a range of timespans (less than 12 months to 10 years and over and the majority have been dog owners and/or cat owners for $10+$ years
- Some participants welcomed a new pet to their household during the 2019/20 pandemic: the majority of participants ( 344 or $81.9 \%$ ) did not welcome a new pet during the 2019/20 pandemic. Some participants did welcome a new pet for a range of reasons including: existing pet died, old or unwell; coincidence, already considering, planning or searching; animal needed a home or rescue dog; and for companionship

Survey participants were asked "How many pets (dog/s and cat/s) live in your household?" As shown in Graph 4, of the 409 participants who answered this question, 365 (or $89.2 \%$ ) have one or more dogs and 138 (or $33.7 \%$ ) have one or more cats. The majority of dog owners have one dog and the majority of cat owners have one cat.

Graph 4: Number of dogs and cats living in households


Voting pod participants were asked "How many pets (dog/s and cat/s) live in your household?" As shown in Graph 5, of the 203 participants who answered this question, 38 did not have a dog or cat living in their household. Of the pet owners, 96 have one or more dogs and 69 have one or more cats. The majority of dog owners have one dog and the majority of cat owners have one cat.

Graph 5: Number of dogs and cats living in households (Voting pod)


Survey participants were asked "How long have you owned pets?" As shown in Graph 6, 405 participants answered this question and have owned pets for a range of timespans. The majority of dog owners ( 243 of 372 or $65.3 \%$ ) have owned a dog for 10+ years. The majority of cat owners (97 of 148 or $65.5 \%$ ) have owned a cat for $10+$ years.

Graph 6: Length of time survey participants have owned pets


Survey participants were asked "Did you welcome a new pet to your household during the 2019/20 pandemic?" As shown in Graph 7, of the 420 participants who answered this question, the majority indicated No (344 or $81.9 \%$ ).

Graph 7: Survey participants welcoming a new pet to household during 2019/20 pandemic


Survey participants who answered Yes to the previous question were invited to "Please tell us why?" Of the 76 survey participants who indicated Yes, 70 provided an explanation which referenced one or more topics, see Table 4.

Table 4: Reasons for welcoming a new pet to the household during the 2019/20 pandemic

| Themes in reasons for welcoming a new pet | No. of responses <br> mentioning theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Existing pet died, old or unwell | 18 |
| Coincidence, already considering, planning or searching | 15 |
| Animal needed a home or rescue dog | 10 |
| Companionship for me or my household | 10 |
| Working from home or home more | 5 |
| More time for training or puppy | 4 |
| Companionship for existing pet | 2 |
| Other | 8 |
| TOTAL | 72 |

Eight participants provided the following responses which did not neatly fit within the themes in Table 4.

- Fish for fishpond to control mosquitoes and for aquarium (how come there are no other categories on this survey than for dogs and cats?!?!)
- Just love it
- My family member got a new dog
- Newly married family relationships
- Time and place
- We brought her home in December 2019, before the pandemic hit Australia. We are training her as a therapy dog.
- We loved to a bigger house that allowed for a doggo
- Why not, what an absurd question


### 4.2 Pet owner views about registering, microchipping and desexing and experience with pound

## Key highlights

- The majority of the participants ( 349 dog owners and 129 cat owners) indicated their pets were registered, microchipped and desexed
- Dogs
- Reasons for not registering include (11 participants): dog/s is not desexed; and don't see the value in it
- Reasons for not microchipping include (1 participant): don't know where or how to do it
- Reasons for not desexing include ( 25 participants): vet/breeder recommended waiting until they are older; and plan to breed them
- Cats
- Reasons for not registering include (10 participants): don't see the value in it; and forgot
- Reasons for not microchipping include ( 5 participants): don't know where or how to do it
- Reasons for not desexing include (1 participant): haven't got around to it
- A small number of participants have had their dog or cat taken to the pound in the past two years. The time taken for owners to be reunited with their pets varied from 5 minutes to 2 days

Dog registration, microchipping and desexing
Survey participants were asked to provide some information about their pet/s in relation to registering, microchipping and desexing. As shown in Graph 8, of the 343 to 349 participants who answered this question in relation to their dog/s, the majority indicated Yes.

Graph 8: Survey participants and responsible pet ownership actions - dog/s


Survey participants who indicated their dog was not registered were invited to select an explanation from a prescribed list or to provide a personalised response. As shown in Graph 9, participants selected a variety of explanations.

Graph 9: Reasons why dogs have not been registered


The three survey participants who indicated Other provided the following explanations:

- 6 months old.
- Moved address
- Only new, will be registering them ASAP

The survey participant who indicated their dog was not microchipped was invited to select an explanation from a prescribed listing or to provide a personalised response. As shown in Graph 10, the participant indicated they don't know where or how to do it.

## Graph 10: Reason why dog has not been microchipped



Survey participants who indicated their dog was not desexed were invited to select an explanation from a prescribed list or to provide a personalised response. As shown in Graph 11, many participants indicated the vet or breeder recommended waiting until the dog is older.

Graph 11: Reasons why dogs have not been desexed


The six survey participants who indicated Other provided the following explanations:

- A couple of my animals are and a couple of them are used for registered breeding
- It is cruel. And affects animal health.
- Mixed breed desexed by rescue group, other two entire - one may be used by breeder to maintain line, other will not be used for breeding however dogs do not have any behavioural issues related to being entire so will not be desexed.
- More and more medical studies showing it is detrimental to dogs particularly large breed dogs.
- Too young
- Vision Australia Seeing Eye Dogs breeder dog (female)
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## Cat registration, microchipping and desexing

Survey participants were asked to provide some information about their pet $/ \mathrm{s}$ in relation to registering, microchipping and desexing. As shown in Graph 12, of the 128 to 129 participants who answered this question in relation to their cat/s, the majority indicated Yes.
Graph 12: Survey participants and responsible pet ownership actions - cat/s


Survey participants who indicated their cat was not registered were invited to select an explanation from a prescribed list or to provide a personalised response. As shown in Graph 13, participants selected a variety of explanations.
Graph 13: Reasons why cats have not been registered


The two survey participants who indicated Other provided the following explanations:

- Cats just roam the neighbourhood, why should I pay when the majority don't
- Indoor only and ancient

Survey participants who indicated their cat was not microchipped were invited to select an explanation from a prescribed list or to provide a personalised response. As shown in Graph 14, participants selected a variety of explanations.

Graph 14: Reasons why cats have not been microchipped


The survey participant who indicated Other provided the following explanation:

- Strictly managed indoor cat.

The survey participant who indicated their cat was not desexed was invited to select an explanation from a prescribed listing or to provide a personalised response. As shown in Graph 15, the participant indicated they haven't got around to it.
Graph 15: Reasons why cats have not been desexed


## Experience with pound-dogs and cats

Survey participants were asked "Have you had your dog or cat taken to the pound in the past two years?" As shown in Graph 16, of the 382 participants who answered this question, the majority indicated No (377 or 98.7\%).

Graph 16: Participants having a dog or cat taken to the pound in the past two years


The five survey participants who selected Yes were invited to indicate how long it took to be reunited with their pet and provided the following responses:

- 5 minutes
- 1 hour
- 2 hours
- 12 hours
- 2 days
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## Key highlights

- The majority of participants agreed or strongly agreed that pets give comfort and support to many people and encourage social interaction: most participants (496 or $95.9 \%$ ) agreed that pets give great comfort and support to many people in the community and they are more likely to talk to other people if they are with a dog ( 379 or $73.3 \%$ ). Mixed views were reported for likelihood to become a dog/cat owner in the next two years or future
- The majority of participants (pet owners only) consistently agreed or strongly agreed that pets play an important and positive role in their life: pets are an important part of their family ( 161 or $98.2 \%$ ); give them great comfort and support ( 162 or $98.8 \%$ ); that they are likely to continue having a pet in their life ( 154 or $93.9 \%$ ); they exercise more because they have a dog/pet ( 124 or $76.1 \%$ ); and they are more likely to talk to more people because they have a dog ( 127 or $78.4 \%$ )
- The majority of participants reported desirable pet ownership behaviours (dogs) are always or often observed in their neighbourhood: in particular, participants observed dogs in public spaces who are friendly and well behaved ( 424 or $82.2 \%$ ), dog owners who have their dog on a leash when they are meant to ( 411 or $79.8 \%$ ), groups of dog owners socialising while their dogs play ( 368 or $71.7 \%$ ), dogs responding to owners' commands ( 355 or $69.3 \%$ of participants), dog owners picking up their dog's poo ( 350 or $68.0 \%$ ), and dogs returning to their owners when called (332 or 64.8\%)
- Many participants indicated dogs should be allowed on sporting fields, however mixed views were apparent: many of the 506 participants indicated Yes ( 254 or $50.2 \%$ ), although many No and Unsure responses were also reported.
- The reasoning behind Yes responses included: sporting fields are public spaces that can be shared with dogs and their owners who need spaces to exercise and socialise; sporting fields are flat, fenced spaces that are good and safe for dogs off-leash, particularly when dog designated spaces and parks are limited; and most dog owners do pick up dog poo on sporting fields, or they can use them provided they do pick up dog poo
- The reasoning behind No responses included: dog owners do not pick up dog poo; it is unhygienic and creates health risks; and dogs dig the grounds and make holes in the surface
- The reasoning behind Unsure responses included: dog owners do not pick up dog poo; sports fields are a good space for dog access; and dog owners are not fully responsible, may not supervise or have effective control
- Many participants reported a few desirable and undesirable pet ownership behaviours involving cats observed in their neighbourhood: in particular, participants observed cats being kept inside houses during the day/night ( 200 or $40.4 \%$ ), cats outside at night ( 175 or $34.0 \%$ ). In contrast, cats fighting other cats has been never or rarely observed ( 380 or $75.4 \%$ ) and cats making loud noises has never or rarely been observed ( 365 or $72.0 \%$ )

Survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree with four statements relating to pet ownership. As shown in Graph 17, the majority of the 517 participants (496 or 95.9\%) agreed that pets give great comfort and support to many people in the community and they are more likely to talk to other people if they are with a dog ( 379 or $73.3 \%$ ). Mixed views were reported for likelihood to become a dog/cat owner in the next two years or future.

Graph 17: Level of agreement with pet ownership statements


Survey participants who identified as pet owners were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with five statements relating to the pet ownership experience. As shown in Graph 18, the majority of the 164 participants consistently agreed with all five statements, particularly, my/our $\mathrm{pet} / \mathrm{s}$ are an important part of my/our family ( 161 or $98.2 \%$ ), my/our pet gives me/us great comfort and support ( 162 or $98.8 \%$ ) and I am likely to continue to have a pet in my life ( 154 or $93.9 \%$ ).

Graph 18: Level of agreement with pet ownership experiences (pet owners only)


## Responsible pet ownership - dogs

Survey participants were asked "In the last year, have you noticed any of the following things about dogs when out and about in your neighbourhood?", presented with a list of 15 desirable and undesirable pet ownership behaviours and invited to indicate how frequently these behaviours occurred. Between 506 and 517 participants provided a response for each statement.

As shown in Graph 19, the majority of participants indicated desirable behaviours are always or often observed: Dogs in public spaces who are friendly and well behaved (424 or $82.2 \%$ of participants), Dog owners who have their dog on a leash when they are meant to (411 or $79.8 \%$ of participants), Groups of dog owners socialising while their dogs play (368 or $71.7 \%$ of participants), Dogs responding to owners' commands (355 or 69.3\% of participants), Dog owners picking up their dog's poo (350 or 68.0\% of participants), and Dogs returning to their owners when called (332 or 64.8\% of participants)

Graph 19: Observed frequency of responsible dog ownership (desirable behaviours)


As shown in Graph 20, many participants indicated undesirable dog behaviours are always or often observed to varying degrees. Dog poo being left on the ground has been always or often observed by 292 (or $56.6 \%$ of) participants and Dogs being off-leash when they shouldn't be has been always or often observed by 204 (or $39.8 \%$ of) participants. In contrast, Grass/plants being trampled or dug up has been never or rarely observed by 389 (or $76.4 \%$ of) participants and Dogs chasing/attacking wildlife has never or rarely observed by 372 (or $72.9 \%$ of) participants.

Graph 20: Observed frequency of responsible dog ownership (undesirable behaviours)


Survey participants were asked "Do you believe dogs should be allowed on sporting fields?" As shown in Graph 21 , many of the 506 participants indicated Yes ( 254 or $50.2 \%$ ), although many No and Unsure responses were apparent.

Graph 21: Views about dogs being allowed on sporting fields


To gain a deeper understanding of the views relating to dogs being allowed on sporting fields, survey participants were also asked to explain the reasoning behind the answers shown in Graph 18. The 228 survey participants who indicated Yes provided the explanations presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Reasons behind Yes responses to dogs being allowed on sporting fields

| Theme in Yes, dogs should be allowed on sporting field responses | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Sporting fields are public spaces that can be shared with dogs and their owners <br> who need spaces to exercise and socialise | 134 |
| Sporting fields are flat, fenced spaces that are good and safe for dogs off- <br> leash, particularly when dog designated spaces and parks are limited | 94 |
| Most dog owners do pick up dog poo on sporting fields, or they can use them <br> provided they do pick up dog poo | 49 |
| Most dog owners act responsibly on sporting fields, or they can use them <br> provided they do act responsibly | 27 |
| Sporting fields permit dogs to exercise and socialise without worry and hazards <br> of a dog park (aggressive dog behaviours and fights, snakes, uneven or sloped <br> ground, over-crowding and muddy) | 21 |
|  <br> games | 15 |
| They are family friendly and dog friendly spaces | 9 |
| Other | 11 |

The 153 survey participants who indicated No provided the explanations presented in Table 6.
Table 6: Reasons behind No responses to dogs being allowed on sporting fields

| Theme in No, dogs should be allowed on sporting field responses | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Dog owners do not pick up dog poo | 101 |
| It is unhygienic and creates health risks | 29 |
| Dogs dig the grounds and make holes in the surface | 27 |
| Dog owners are not fully responsible, may not supervise or have effective control | 18 |
| Sporting fields are for sport, there are dog parks and other more suitable areas | 18 |
| Dogs may intimidate or scare children/people by running, jumping and rushing | 18 |
| Dogs may interrupt training sessions or games and create a safety hazard | 16 |
| There is a need for more dog parks and areas | 6 |
| Clubs pay for the use of sporting fields and dogs may be problematic for turf <br> management | 4 |

The 67 survey participants who indicated Unsure provided the explanations presented in Table 7.
Table 7: Reasons behind Unsure responses to dogs being allowed on sporting fields

| Theme in Unsure, dogs should be allowed on sporting field responses | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Dog owners do not pick up dog poo | 31 |
| Sports fields are a good space for dog access | 15 |
| Don't mind or know impact or don't have dog or do sport | 11 |
| Dog owners are not fully responsible, may not supervise or have effective control | 10 |
| Should be ground or club or time specific | 7 |
| Prefer to have separate areas for dog and sports, interference and health <br> concerns | 5 |
| Dogs dig the grounds and make holes in the surface | 5 |
| Depends on availability of dog areas, there is a need more dog parks | 4 |

## Responsible pet ownership - cats

Survey participants were asked "In the last year, have you noticed any of the following things about cats when out and about in your neighbourhood?", presented with a list of nine desirable and undesirable pet ownership behaviours and invited to indicate how frequently these behaviours occurred. Between 495 and 514 participants provided a response for each statement.

As shown in Graph 22, many participants indicated a few desirable and undesirable cat behaviours are always or often observed. Cats being kept inside houses during the day/night has been always or often observed by 200 (or $40.4 \%$ of) participants and cats outside at night has been always or often observed by 175 (or $34.0 \%$ of) participants. In contrast, cats fighting other cats has been never or rarely observed by 380 (or $75.4 \%$ of) participants and cats making loud noises has never or rarely been observed by 365 (or $72.0 \%$ of) participants.
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Graph 22: Observed frequency of responsible cat ownership (all behaviours)
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### 4.4 Proposal for a 24-hour cat curfew in Nillumbik

## Key highlights

- The majority of survey and quick poll participants were supportive of the proposal for a 24hour cat curfew in Nillumbik, although mixed views were evident: just over half of participants indicated Strongly support ( 260 or $50.8 \%$ ) and a further 80 (or $15.6 \%$ ) indicated Somewhat support but have some concerns. $60.0 \%$ of Quick poll participants indicated Support
- The reasoning behind Strongly support responses included: cats are hunters, predators and instinctively kill native wildlife, birds and animals; cats are a nuisance, they poo in and disturb my gardens and upset my pets/birds; and cats roam and their movements are unrestricted and unpredictable
- The reasoning behind Somewhat support responses included: not indoors exclusively, cats need some time outdoors for wellbeing and exercise; okay outside within own property, under supervision or on leash; and cats kill native wildlife, birds and animals
- The reasoning behind No opinion responses included: not a cat owner
- The reasoning behind Somewhat oppose responses included: not indoors exclusively, cats need some time outdoors for wellbeing and exercise; agree with current night curfew; and it is not reasonable or practical
- The reasoning behind Strongly oppose responses included: cats are used to being outside and need time for fresh air, exercise, play and overall health and wellbeing; it is inhumane, unreasonable, excessive and unnatural, cats have a right to go outside; and my cat plays or stays on our property, doesn't disturb wildlife and is not a nuisance
- The level of support for the proposal for a $\mathbf{2 4 - h o u r ~ c a t ~ c u r f e w ~ v a r i e d ~ a c r o s s ~ a r e a s ~ ( s u b u r b , ~}$ township and village): stronger levels of support were evident for: Bend of Islands, Christmas Hills, Cottles Bridge, Hurstbridge, North Warrandyte, Research, Smiths Gully and St Andrews. These insights are based on low response levels for many areas and should be regarded indicative and not conclusive

Survey participants were asked "How supportive are you of a 24 -hour cat curfew in Nillumbik?" As shown in Graph 23, just over half of the 512 participants indicated Strongly support ( 260 or $50.8 \%$ ). However, mixed views were reported.

Graph 23: Level of support for a 24-hour cat curfew in Nillumbik


Quick poll participants at pop-up events were asked "Do you support a 24 -hour cat curfew in Nillumbik?" As shown in Graph 24 of the 100 participants who answered this question, 66 (or 66.0\%) indicated Yes.

Graph 24: Support for a 24 -hour cat curfew in Nillumbik (Quick poll)


To gain a deeper understanding of the views relating to the proposed 24 -hour cat curfew, survey participants were also asked to explain the reasoning behind the answers shown in Graph 23. 219 of the 260 survey participants who indicated Strongly support provided the explanations presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Reasons behind Strongly support responses to proposed 24-hour cat curfew

| Theme in Strongly support proposed 24-hour cat curfew responses | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Cats are hunters, predators and instinctively kill native wildlife, birds and animals | 186 |
| Cats are a nuisance, they poo in and disturb my gardens and upset my <br> pets/birds | 42 |
| Cats roam and their movements are unrestricted and unpredictable | 38 |
| It is better for cat welfare and safety | 27 |
| Cat presence harms biodiversity and the environment | 14 |
| Owners need to be responsible and comply, the cat curfew needs to be enforced <br> and 24-hour cat curfew is clear | 14 |
| Owner to provide outdoor space on property for cats or use leashes, dogs aren't <br> allowed to roam freely | 14 |
| Cats adapt to indoor only | 4 |
| Other comments | 5 |

68 of the 80 survey participants who indicated Somewhat support provided the explanations presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Reasons behind Somewhat support responses to proposed 24-hour cat curfew

| Theme in Somewhat support proposed 24-hour cat curfew responses | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Not indoors exclusively, cats need some time outdoors for wellbeing and exercise | 33 |
| Okay outside within own property, under supervision or on leash | 20 |
| Cats kill native wildlife, birds and animals | 16 |
| Yes to night time cat curfew | 9 |
| It is not reasonable or practical | 7 |
| Owners need to be responsible and comply and cats are not always co- <br> operative | 6 |
| It is better for cat safety | 4 |
| Implementation will need information, time to phase in and enforcement | 4 |
| Other comments | 9 |

10 of the 38 survey participants who indicated No opinion provided the explanations presented in Table 10.

Table 10: Reasons behind No opinion responses to proposed 24-hour cat curfew

| Theme in No opinion support proposed 24-hour cat curfew responses | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Not a cat owner | 6 |
| Other comments | 4 |

50 of the 60 survey participants who indicated Somewhat oppose provided the explanations presented in Table 11.

Table 11: Reasons behind Somewhat oppose responses to proposed 24-hour cat curfew

| Theme in Somewhat oppose proposed 24-hour cat curfew responses | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Not indoors exclusively, cats need some time outdoors for wellbeing and exercise | 32 |
| Agree with current night curfew | 12 |
| It is not reasonable or practical | 8 |
| Cats kill native wildlife, birds and animals | 5 |


| Theme in Somewhat oppose proposed 24-hour cat curfew responses | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Reduces roaming into other properties and on roads | 3 |
| Owners need to be responsible and comply, cats are not always co-operative | 3 |
| Other comments | 3 |

68 of the 74 survey participants who indicated Strongly oppose provided the explanations presented in Table 12.

Table 12: Reasons behind Strongly oppose responses to proposed 24-hour cat curfew

| Theme in Strongly oppose proposed 24-hour cat curfew responses | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Cats are used to being outside and need time for fresh air, exercise, play and <br> overall health and wellbeing | 39 |
| It is inhumane, unreasonable, excessive and unnatural, cats have a right to go <br> outside | 29 |
| My cat plays or stays on our property, doesn't disturb wildlife and is not a <br> nuisance | 14 |
| Agree with current night curfew, it is sufficient | 12 |
| Our cat provides vermin control, catch mice and rats and need time outside | 5 |
| Cat owners are responsible | 4 |
| Many people cannot provide an adequate private cat enclosure | 3 |
| Other comments | 2 |

Cross-tabulation analysis was conducted to explore the level of support for the proposed 24-hour cat curfew at the area level (suburb, township and village). As shown in Table 12, the level of support varied across areas. Participants indicated stronger levels of support for: Bend of Islands, Christmas Hills, Cottles Bridge, Hurstbridge, North Warrandyte, Research, Smiths Gully and St Andrews. These insights are based on low response levels for many areas and should be regarded indicative and not conclusive.

Table 12: Level of support for a 24-hour cat curfew in Nillumbik, by area level

| Suburb | Strongly support | Somewha <br> † support but have some concerns | No opinion | Somewha † oppose and have concerns | Strongly oppose | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arthurs Creek | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |
| Bend of Islands | 9 | 1 |  |  |  | 10 |
| Christmas Hills | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Cottles Bridge | 3 | 1 |  |  |  | 4 |
| Diamond Creek | 23 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 43 |
| Doreen | 2 |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |
| Eltham | 78 | 33 | 19 | 27 | 33 | 190 |
| Eltham North | 20 | 4 |  | 5 | 7 | 36 |
| Greensborough | 10 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 20 |
| Hurstbridge | 21 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 30 |
| Kangaroo Ground |  | 4 |  | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| Kinglake |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Kinglake West |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| North Warrandyte | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 |  | 11 |
| Nutfield | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Panton Hill | 3 |  |  | 1 | 3 | 7 |
| Plenty | 5 |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 |
| Research | 13 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 19 |
| Smiths Gully | 4 |  |  | 1 |  | 5 |
| St Andrews | 10 | 3 |  | 2 |  | 15 |
| Strathewen |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Watsons Creek | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Wattle Glen | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Yan Yean |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Yarrambat | 1 |  |  |  | 3 | 4 |
| TOTAL | 216 | 64 | 31 | 51 | 68 | 430 |

4.5 Awareness and importance of Council's animal management services

## Key highlights

- The majority of participants were aware of Council's animal management services and related regulations prior to participating in the consultation:
- Topics with highest overall level of awareness: Victorian law requires dogs/cats to be registered with their local council (483 or 95.6\%), Dog walkers are required to carry a poo bag ( 452 or $89.7 \%$ ), Dog owners must have 'effective control' of dogs in off-leash areas ( 450 or $89.8 \%$ ) and Difference between registering and microchipping a dog/cat (445 or 88.3\%)
- Topics with lowest overall level of awareness: CSOs inspect all Domestic Animal Businesses throughout the municipality every year ( 335 or $66.7 \%$ said No), Council provides a cat trap hire service ( 310 or $61.5 \%$ said No) and the Save a Dog Scheme ( 277 or $55.5 \%$ said No)
- The majority of survey and Dotmocracy participants aged 18 years and over indicated most of Council's animal management services are very important or important:
- Services with highest overall level of importance: education about responsible pet ownership, provide/maintain off-leash areas, respond to reports of nuisance dogs/cats, collect/return stray dogs/cats to owners and Protect/enforce dog-free nature reserves/environmentally sensitive areas
- Services with lowest overall level of importance: Annual Pet Expo and Checking dog/cat registration via patrols or door-knocks
- The majority of the 18 Dotmocracy participants aged under 18 years indicated most items were very important or important. Services with the highest overall level of importance were: Annual Pet Expo, Protect/enforce dog-free nature reserves/environmentally sensitive areas and Collect/return stray dogs/cats to their owners.

Awareness of Council's animal management services and related regulations Survey participants were asked "Before today, were you aware that/of ..." and presented with a list of 16 items and invited to indicate yes, no or not applicable. Between 499 and 505 participants provided a response for each statement. As shown in Graph 25, the majority of participants indicated Yes to most items.

Highest overall level of awareness were reported for Victorian law requires dogs/cats to be registered with their local council (483 or $95.6 \%$ ), Dog walkers are required to carry a poo bag (452 or 89.7\%), Dog owners must have 'effective control' of dogs in off-leash areas ( 450 or $89.8 \%$ ) and Difference between registering and microchipping a dog/cat (445 or 88.3\%). Lowest overall level of awareness were reported for CSOs inspect all Domestic Animal Businesses throughout the municipality every year ( 335 or $66.7 \%$ said No), Council provides a cat trap hire service ( 310 or $61.5 \%$ said No) and the Save a Dog Scheme ( 277 or $55.5 \%$ said No).

Graph 25: Awareness of Council's animal management services and related regulations



## Importance of Council's animal management services

Survey participants were asked "How important do you think it is for Council to provide the following services to the community?" and presented with a list of 11 items and invited to indicate the level of importance. Between 498 and 506 participants provided a response for each statement. As shown in Graph 26 , the majority of participants indicated most items were very important or important.

Highest overall level of importance were reported for Education about responsible pet ownership ( 475 or $94.1 \%$ ), Provide/maintain off-leash areas ( 464 or $91.1 \%$ ), Respond to reports of nuisance dogs/cats ( 457 or $90.3 \%$ ), and Collect/return stray dogs/cats to owners ( 455 or 90.5\%). Lowest overall level of importance were reported for Annual Pet Expo (125 or $25.1 \%$ said not important) and Checking dog/cat registration via patrols or door-knocks (127 or $25.4 \%$ said not important).

Graph 26: Importance of Council's animal management services


Dotmocracy participants at the place-based pop-up engagement activities were asked "How important do you think it is for Council to provide the following services to the community?" As shown in Graph 27, the majority of the 18 Dotmocracy participants aged under 18 years indicated most items were very important or important. The highest overall level of importance was reported for Annual Pet Expo, Protect/enforce dog-free nature reserves/environmentally sensitive areas, and Collect/return stray dogs/cats to their owners.

Graph 27: Importance of Council's animal management services (Dotmocracy, under 18 years)


As shown in Graph 28, the majority of the 34 Dotmocracy participants aged 18 years and over indicated most items were very important or important. The highest overall level of importance was reported for Provide/maintain off-leash areas, Education about responsible pet ownership, and Protect/enforce dog-free nature reserves/environmentally sensitive areas.

Graph 28: Importance of Council's animal management services (Dotmocracy, 18 years and over)


### 4.6 Satisfaction with animal-related services and improvement suggestions

## Key highlights

- The majority of participants have not reported an animal-related issue to Council over the past two years
- Of the $\mathbf{9 6}$ participants who had reported an animal-related issue over the past two years:
- Dog-related issues (64 or 66.7\%) included: Nuisance barking dogs, night and daytime; Dogs off leash or not under effective control in public spaces; and Dog attacking my dog or wildlife
- Cat-related issues ( 24 or $25.0 \%$ ) included: Cats outside at night, after curfew; Stray or roaming cats; and Feral or wild cats
- Pet or other animal-related issues (8 or 8.3\%) included: Injured or sick animal (kangaroo, fox, horse); and Injured wildlife
- Participants reported mixed views when asked to rate their satisfaction/dissatisfaction with Council's response to the animal-related issue:
- Outcome of the issue: 72 or $44.2 \%$ selected the neutral rating
- Time taken to respond to issue: 81 or $51.6 \%$ selected the neutral rating
- Communication and professionalism: 78 or $49.4 \%$ selected the neutral rating
- Explanations for dissatisfaction provided by 79 participants included: Council response was slow, unresponsive or appeared disinterested; In my view, the issue has not been resolved; and Unhappy with the Council diary or disclosure procedures
- Participants selected all listed suggestions to improve Council's animal management services. The three most frequently selected suggestions were: Photos of lost and found pets on Council's website/social media (354 or $72.1 \%$ ), Better signage about relevant dog restrictions in public spaces (291 or 59.3\%), and More off-leash areas (263 or 53.6\%).


## Satisfaction with animal-related issues reported to Council

Survey participants were asked "Have you reported an animal-related issue to Council over the past two years?" As shown in Graph 29, 96 of the 495 participants indicated Yes.

Graph 29: Whether an animal-related issue has been reported to Council over the past two years


To gain a deeper understanding of the views relating to animal-related issues, survey participants who indicated Yes were asked to describe the issue. As shown in Graph 30 and Table 13, the majority of the animal-related issues reported by the 96 participants related to Dogs ( 64 or $66.7 \%$ ).
Graph 30: Type of animal-related issues reported to Council over the past two years


Table 13: Dog-related issues reported to Council over the past two years

| Themes in animal-relaited issue responses relating to Dogs | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Nuisance barking dogs, night and daytime | 22 |
| Dogs off leash or not under effective control in public spaces | 12 |
| Dog attacking my dog or wildlife | 11 |
| Stray or escaped dogs at large | 10 |
| Dogs harassing, rushing or acting aggressively towards a person | 10 |
| Uncollected dog poo | 4 |
| Missing or lost dog | 3 |
| Unfamiliar dog/s on my property | 3 |
| Dog abuse or neglect | 2 |
| Other complaint or request: dog park maintenance, refill dog bags in dispenser, <br> 3 dog permit and no dogs at St Andrews market | 4 |

24 of the 96 survey participants referred to cat-related issues as shown in Table 14.
Table 14: Cat-related issues reported to Council over the past two years

| Themes in animal-related issue responses relating to Cats | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Cats outside at night, after curfew | 7 |
| Stray or roaming cats | 6 |
| Feral or wild cats | 5 |
| Unwelcome cats on my property | 4 |
| Cat attacking wildlife or birds | 3 |
| Cat causing a nuisance | 3 |
| Other complaint or request: cat cage request and missing/lost cat | 2 |

Eight of the 96 survey participants referred to pets or other animal-related issues as shown in Table 15.

Table 15: Pet or other animal-related issues reported to Council over the past two years

| Themes in animal-related issue responses relating to Pets or other animals | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Injured or sick animal (kangaroo, fox, horse) | 4 |
| Injured wildlife | 2 |
| Stray goat or sheep on my property | 2 |
| Other: lost horse, pest animals (rabbit, foxes) | 2 |

Survey participants were asked "How satisfied were you with Council's response to your issue?", presented with a list of three animal-related issue items and invited to indicate the level of satisfaction. Between 158 and 163 participants provided a response for each statement.

As shown in Graph 31, the mixed views were reported, with many participants selecting neutral: Outcome of the issue ( 72 or $44.2 \%$ ); Time taken to respond to issue: ( 81 or $51.6 \%$ ); and Communication and professionalism (78 or 49.4\%).

Graph 31: Satisfaction with Council's response to an animal-related issue


To gain a deeper understanding of the views relating to animal-related issues, survey participants who indicated Unsatisfied or Very unsatisfied were invited to explain why. 79 participants referred to a range of reasons and explanations, as shown in Table 16.

Table 16: Reasons why participants were dissatisfied with Council's response to an animalrelated issue

| Themes in dissatisfaction with Council's response to an animal-relaied issue <br> responses | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Council response was slow, unresponsive or appeared disinterested | 26 |
| In my view, the issue has not been resolved | 16 |
| Unhappy with the Council diary or disclosure procedures | 14 |
| No follow up advice from Council, not aware of outcome | 12 |
| Owners need to be made accountable, appears to be no fine or enforcement | 11 |
| Unsatisfactory response or advice provided upon contacting Council | 8 |
| Need to increase resourcing for $24 / 7$ pound, weekend presence and more <br> patrols | 4 |
| Other: Rangers were excellent, impressed with Rangers, couldn't catch second cat | 3 |

## Suggestions to improve Council's animal management services

Survey participants were asked "How can Council improve its animal management services ... (select all that apply)" presented with a list of 10 suggestions. As shown in Graph 32, all listed improvement suggestions were selected albeit to varying degrees by the 491 participants.

The three most frequently selected improvement suggestions were: Photos of lost and found pets on Council's website/social media (354 or $72.1 \%$ ), Better signage about relevant dog restrictions in public spaces (291 or 59.3\%), and More off-leash areas (263 or 53.6\%).

Graph 32: Ways to improve Council's animal management services


## Suggestions to improve Council's animal management services

To gain a deeper understanding of opportunities to improve Council's animal management services, participants could indicate "Other" and provide a personalised response. As shown in Table 17, a variety of personalised comments were provided by the 82 participants:

- 49 (or $59.8 \%$ ) comments were dog-related
- 20 (or $24.4 \%$ ) comments were cat-related
- 18 (or $22.0 \%$ ) comments related to other topics

Table 17: Other suggestions to improve Council's animal management services

| Themes in other suggestions to improve Council's animal management <br> services | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Dog-related suggestions | 18 |
| Increase dog facilities such as poo bag dispensers, bins, pooh disposal units | 12 |
| Encourage, monitor and enforce responsible ownership, particularly dogs off- <br> leash | 10 |
| Increase access to safe and secure dedicated dog parks and improve dog <br> spaces |  |


| Themes in other suggestions to improve Council's animal management services | No. of responses mentioning theme |
| :---: | :---: |
| Provide more information, education, clear signage and encourage training | 5 |
| Other (single responses): Limit of one dog or one cat per household; registration discount for owners who have completed dog training; stop Council letters seeking a complaint about a neighbour's nuisance dog; easier process to quieten nuisance barking dogs; simplify policy for policing nuisance dogs, ruins neighbour relationships; respect dog owners and their pets; strengthen dog restrictions in Bend of Islands; and financial support for dog obedience clubs | 8 |
| Cat-related suggestions |  |
| Provide information and education about the cat rules | 7 |
| Enforce cat curfew and rules | 6 |
| Subsidised cat enclosures | 3 |
| Support for 24-hour curfew | 2 |
| Other (single responses): Strengthen cat restrictions in Bend of Islands; and subsidised cat desexing for targeted areas, prepare for Pound Shelter Reform, more compassion less compliance, evidence based strategy | 2 |
| Other topics |  |
| List of useful animal-related contacts such as vets, wildlife carers, dog walking groups | 9 |
| Education and encourage participation in training | 3 |
| Simplify animal management policy or process | 2 |
| Other (single responses): increase penalties for offenders and repeat offenders; cheaper pet items such as beds and toys; encourage non-predatory alternative pets; and no additional requirements | 4 |

Chatboard participants were asked "How can Council improve its animal management services?" and invited to provide a personalised response. Participants provided the following suggestions:

- More education about what to do with anxious pets when returning to work
- Heaps more enclosed off lead dedicated dog parks that are well cared for (not muddy, landscaped)
- More education about dog behaviour
- Water taps at Lower Eltham Park for dogs
- Dog poo bag dispenser
- Rule or etiquette signs at all dog parks
- How is registration money spent?


### 4.7 General feedback to inform the development of Council's DAMP

## Key highlights

- Many participants provided general feedback to help inform the development of Council's DAMP:
- 164 (or $63.6 \%$ of) participants referenced Dogs, responses included: Increase access to safe and secure dog parks and improve dog spaces (lights, shelter); Encourage, monitor and enforce responsible ownership, particularly dogs off-leash in designated on-leash and sensitive areas and Provide more information, education, clear signage and encourage training
- 38 (or $14.7 \%$ of) participants referenced Cats, responses included: Provide information and education about the cat rules and enforcement; and Support for proposed 24-hour cat curfew
- 12 (or $4.7 \%$ of) participants referenced Wildlife and other animals, responses included: Protecting native wildlife and managing animals and impact broadly (horses, deer, birds and livestock)
- 49 (or $19.0 \%$ of) participants referenced Other topics, responses included: Registration fees should be reduced or discounted fees and send a new tag annually; and Provide more animal-related information and education
- Some participants referred to more than one topic

Survey participants were asked "Do you have any other feedback you would like to provide that will help inform the development of Council's Domestic Animal Management Plan?" and invited to provide a personalised response. As shown in Graph 33 and Table $x x$, the majority of general feedback provided by 258 participants referred to Dogs (164 or 63.6\%). Some participants referred to more than one topic.

Graph 33: Topics referenced in general feedback


164 of the 258 survey participants referenced Dog-related topics as shown in Table 20.

Table 20: General feedback to inform the development of Council's DAMP - Dogs

| Themes in general feedback to inform the development of Council's DAMP - <br> Dogs | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Increase access to safe, secure designated dog parks and improve dog spaces <br> (lights, shelter) | 48 |
| Encourage, monitor and enforce responsible ownership, particularly dogs off- <br> leash in designated on-leash and sensitive areas | 47 |
| Provide more information, education, clear signage and encourage training | 43 |
| Increase dog facilities such as pooh bag dispensers, bins, pooh disposal units and <br> water fountains | 37 |
| Encourage and enforce the picking up and correct disposal of dog pooh | 28 |
| Address barking, nuisance, aggressive and feral dogs | 19 |
| Positive feedback about Council's animal management services | 3 |
| Other (single references): one rule does not fit all, Nillumbik has a variety of <br> property, people and animals; prioritise people over dogs for access to <br> recreation space; pet ownership is important; avoid penalising pet owners, as <br> suburbs become suburban, restrictions are needed; recently had to put down our <br> dog; need more facts and evidence to be disclosed for the public to be well- <br> informed | 8 |

68 of the 258 survey participants referenced Cat-related topics as shown in Table 21.
Table 21: General feedback to inform the development of Council's DAMP - Cats

| Themes in general feedback to inform the development of Council's DAMP - <br> Cats | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Provide information and education about the cat rules and enforcement | 22 |
| Support for proposed 24-hour cat curfew | 21 |
| Oppose proposed 24-hour cat curfew as it is cruel, current night-time curfew is <br> sufficient | 13 |
| Reduce or trap feral cats, decrease the overall cat population | 9 |
| Provide support or advice about cat enclosures | 4 |
| Other (single references): cat registration fees should be reduced or more <br> transparency of the benefits of registration; curfew/containment does not <br> address the population of cats out at night; don't want our neighbour's cat using <br> our garden as a toilet; a cat aged $10+$ years should not be required to be <br> registered; no more than two pets should be allowed; cat trap service is great; <br> need more facts and evidence to be disclosed for the public to be well-informed; <br> need more evidence to support 24 -hour cat curfew; unable to build a cat run; <br> cats catch and kill wildlife | 9 |

12 of the 258 survey participants referenced Wildlife and other animal-related topics. Due to the limited volume of this feedback, it is summarised below:

- Aware that neglect of livestock such as horses is a regular occurrence
- Concerned about horses trampling small plants, exacerbating erosion and pooing in public picnic spots.
- More desexing vouchers and widen the eligibility. Develop best practice policy for euthanasia at pounds. Be transparent about how many animals are being affected, animal management data and costs. Expand the Damp to include companion animals. Form a community working group with councillors, the AM team and stakeholders.
- Native animals as pets should be promoted (blue tongue lizards, sugar gliders, dingoes) to break the barrier that people have with understanding native wildlife and the cycle of reproducing exotic invasive animals as pets
- Feral deer at night may aggravate dogs
- Nillumbik has varied property and people. Some animals are pets, others work on the property.
- Residents need to be aware that their domestic cat could be contributing to the toll on birdlife and wildlife and the extinctions that have already occurred due to feral cats. It is also important that people be aware of how many domestic animals are permitted and where, including sheep and horses in bushland
- Owners should pick up after all and any animals, horses included
- Deer management is also important for safety of pets, our dogs were terrified
- Native wildlife needs to be better protected and managed than the prioritising of exotic animals, cats and dogs.
- Consider international examples where new laws enshrine animal sounds in the country as national heritage (including roosters, frog ponds, goats, etc.)
- The sporting oval damage in particularly at Lower Eltham Park is caused by the birds not the dogs.

49 of the 258 survey participants referenced Other topics as shown in Table 22.
Table 22: Feedback provided by participants to inform the development of Council's DAMP Other

| Themes in general feedback to inform the development of Council's DAMP - <br> Other | No. of <br> responses <br> mentioning <br> theme |
| :--- | :---: |
| Registration fees should be reduced or discounted fees and send a new tag <br> annually | 12 |
| Provide more animal-related information and education | 8 |
| Address non-compliance, provide consequences and allocate penalties | 5 |
| Some vets recommend delaying desexing which results is a higher registration <br> fee, consider extending timeframes, offer more desexing vouchers and widen <br> criteria | 5 |
| Pets are important to human wellbeing, do not make it difficult for people to <br> have a pet | 3 |
| Increase Council animal management resources and take action |  |
| No changes or additional services are necessary | 3 |
| Positive feedback about animal management services or consultation process | 3 |
| Other (single references): Councillors to care about the community; leave animal <br> welfare to the experts; urban biased survey; when complaints are lodged, follow <br> up the animal's welfare too; why do door knocking?; care about people baiting; <br> follow the RSPCA guidelines; cyclists can be confrontational with dog owners; no <br> more than two pets should be allowed; no ongoing pet permits in the Bend of <br> Islands | 11 |

## 5. Children's participation

Children were given the opprtunity to particpate by drawing a portrait of their pet or a pet they would like to have as part of their family. This activity could only be undertaken at pop-up locations where it was suitable to set up kids chairs and tables. 13 drawings were received from children during the engagement activities.



## 6. Appendix <br> DAMP hard copy survey

## Have your say on pets in Nillumbik Domestic Animal Management Plan Community Survey

Nillumbik Shire Council would like to hear from the community about your views on animal management.

We will use your feedback to help prepare a new four-year Domestic Animal Management Plan (DAMP) 2022-2026.

The DAMP aims to promote responsible pet ownership and the welfare of cats and dogs in the community, whilst protecting the community and environment from nuisance cats and dogs. It will:

- set out how we manage cats and dogs in Nillumbik;
- inform our rules for managing dogs and cats (including Local Laws);
- outline how we can help the community to play their part as responsible pet owners; and
- direct how Council will invest its time and resources.

This survey will take approximately 8 minutes to complete and can also be completed online at: www.participate.nillumbik.vic.gov.au/damp. All responses are anonymous.

You can also scan the QR code below to complete this survey online.


## Surveys close on Sunday 13 June 2021.

For further information or questions, visit the website above or contact our Community Safety Team on 94333111.

## Project timeline:

May - June
Consultation on animal management
June
Consultation findings collated.
August
Consultation on the Draft Domestic Animal Management
Plan
September
Submissions heard at the Planning and Consultation
Committee meeting
October
Council Meeting to endorse the Domestic Animal
Management Plan

## A little about you

1. What is your relationship to cats and dogs in Nillumbik? (select all that apply)

- Dog and/or cat owner
- Non dog or cat owner
$\square$ I do not want any contact with cats
$\square$ I do not want any contact with dogs
$\square$ Use local parks, reserves or playgrounds
- Sports club member/player/volunteer
[ Veterinarian/Vet Nurse
ㅁ Member of animal advocacy/rescue group
- Member of a dog club

I Member of a wildlife/environmental group
$\square$ Registered dog or cat breeder

- Business operator - animal behaviourist/trainer/walker
[ Registered Domestic Animal Business

2. Please tell us the name of any cat or dog groups or organisations that you are a part of:
3. In which suburb, township or village do you live (or operate/work in your animalrelated business)?

- Arthurs Creek
$\square$ Bend of Islands
- Christmas Hills
$\square$ Cottles Bridge
- Diamond Creek
- Doreen
- Eltham
$\square$ Eltham North
- Greensborough
- Hurstbridge
- Kangaroo Ground
$\square$ Kinglake
- Kinglake West
- North Warrandyte
$\square$ Nutfield
[ Panton Hill
- Research
- Smiths Gully

4. What is your age?

| $\square$ Under 12yrs | $\square$ 25-34yrs | $\square$ 60-69yrs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ 12-17yrs | $\square$ 35-49yrs | $\square$ 70-84yrs |
| $\square \quad 18-24 y r s$ | $\square$ | $\square 0-59$ yrs |

## Your pet ownership

If you do not own a pet and live in Nillumbik, please skip to question 10.
5. How many pets live in your household?

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | $5+$ | Other (please state) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Dog/s | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |
| Cat/s | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |

6. How long have you owned pets?

|  | Under 12 <br> months | $1-2$ years | $2-5$ years | $5-10$ years | $10+$ years |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dog/s | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Cat/s | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |

7. Did you welcome a new pet to your household during the 2019/20 pandemic?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please tell us why?
8. Please tell us about your pet/s:

| Is your pet/s registered? | ```Dog/s: \\ \(\square\) Yes``` <br> ```No ``` <br> Cat/s: Yes No | If not, please tell us why: <br> I It's too expensive <br> - I forgot <br> $\square$ Didn't know I had to <br> - Didn't know how to <br> - I couldn't find my dog/s desexed certificate <br> - My dog/s is not desexed <br> - I don't see the value in it <br> $\square$ Other (please state): |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Is your pet/s microchipped? | Dog/s: $\square$ Yes $\square$ No Cat/s: $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | If not, please tell us why: <br> - It's too expensive <br> [ Don't know where or how to do it <br> $\square$ I don't agree with microchipping animals <br> - I don't think my pets will get lost <br> I It's too hard/difficult <br> - Other (please state): |
| Is your pet/s desexed? | Dog/s: <br> $\square$ Yes <br> $\square$ No <br> Cat/s: <br> $\square$ Yes <br> ㅁ No | If not, please tell us why: <br> - It's too expensive <br> - Plan to breed them <br> $\square$ Haven't got around to it <br> I I think it will change their temperament <br> - Vet/breeder recommended I wait until they are older <br> - Don't want to put the animal through it <br> - I don't see the benefit of it <br> - My pet/s has a health condition that would make it dangerous <br> - Other (please state): |

9. Have you had your dog or cat taken to the pound in the past two years?

- Yes, if so how long did it take to be reunited with your pet? $\qquad$
- No


## Pets in your neighbourhood

10. To what extent do you agree with the following statements:

|  | Strongly <br> agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly <br> disagree | N/A |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All respondents:     <br> Pets give great comfort and <br> support to many people in the <br> community $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ <br> lam more likely to talk to <br> other people if they are with a <br> dog $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ <br> I am likely to become a <br> dog/cat owner in the next 2 <br> years $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ <br> am likely to become a <br> dog/cat owner in the future $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Pet owners only: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| My/our pet/s are an important <br> part of my/our family | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |
| My/our pet gives me/us great <br> comfort and support | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |
| I am likely to continue to have <br> a pet in my life | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |
| I exercise more because I <br> have a dog or pet | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |
| My family exercises more <br> because we have a dog or <br> pet | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |
| I talk to more people because <br> I have a dog | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |

## 11. In the last year, have you noticed any of the following things about dogs when out and about in your neighbourhood?

|  | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dog poo left on the ground | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Dogs off-leash when they shouldn't be | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Dogs with owners far away/ absent | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Dogs annoying/ intimidating you | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Dogs annoying/ intimidating other <br> people | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Dogs annoying/ intimidating other dogs | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Dogs chasing/ attacking wildlife | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Grass/plants trampled or dug up | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Dogs in playgrounds | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |


|  | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dogs barking for a long time | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Dog owners picking up their dog's poo | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Dog owners who have their dog on a <br> leash when they are meant to | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Dogs returning to their owners when <br> called | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Dogs in public spaces who are friendly <br> and well behaved | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Dogs responding to owners' commands | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Groups of dog owners socialising while <br> their dogs play | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |

Sports grounds can be popular spaces for dog owners to exercise and socialise their dogs, however without effective supervision and responsible dog owners, there can be negative impacts to the ground such as uncollected dog poo and holes in the surface which can provide hazards to players.
12. Do you believe dogs should be allowed on sporting fields?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Please tell is why:
13. In the last year, have you noticed any of the following things about cats when out and about in your neighbourhood?

|  | Always | Often | Sometimes | Rarely | Never |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cats outside at night | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Cats preying on wildlife | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Cats that appear unowned | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Cats fighting other cats | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Cats making loud noises | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Cats causing nuisance to your <br> property | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Disturbed garden beds due to <br> cat activity | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Cats living in sensitive <br> environmental areas or <br> reserves | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Cats kept inside houses during <br> the day/night | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |

Currently Nillumbik Council has a cat curfew from 7.30pm to 6am requiring all cats to be indoors during this time. The curfew is designed for the wellbeing of cats (for example, reduced incidents of fighting/ reduced breeding with stray cats) and to protect local wildlife (reduced hunting of native animals). Many Council's have implemented a 24 -hour cat curfew.
14. How supportive are you of a $\mathbf{2 4}$-hour cat curfew in Nillumbik?

- Strongly support this proposal
- Somewhat support this proposal but have some concerns
- I don't have an opinion
$\square$ Somewhat oppose the proposal and have concerns
$\square$ Strongly oppose the proposal
Please tell us why:
$\square$


## Council's animal management services

15. Before today, were you aware that/of:

|  | Yes | No | N/A |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Victorian State law that dogs and cats must be registered with the local <br> Council | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| The difference between registering and microchipping a cat/dog | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Pets need to be microchipped before they can be registered with Council | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| The services provided by pet registration | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| There is a cat curfew in Nillumbik | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Council provides a cat trap hire service | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Community Safety Officers inspect all Domestic Animal Businesses <br> throughout the Municipality every year? (eg, kennels, training facilities, <br> pet stores) | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| How to find dog off and on-leash areas | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Dog owners must have 'effective control' of their dog when in an off-leash <br> area | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| What 'effective control' means | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Dogs are not allowed to be off-leash within 20m of a playground, sporting <br> game or picnic area | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Dog walkers are required to carry a poo bag | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| What to do if you lose or find a lost pet | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| How to make a complaint about a pet or owner | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| The Cat Protection Society | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| The Save a Dog Scheme | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |

16. How important do you think it is for Council to provide the following services for the community?

|  | Very <br> important | Important | Neutral | Not very <br> important | Not important <br> at all |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Respond to reports of <br> nuisance dogs/cats | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Education about <br> responsible pet ownership | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Collect/ return stray <br> dogs/cats to their owners | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Provide/ maintain off-leash <br> areas | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Protect/ enforce dog-free <br> nature reserves/ <br> environmentally sensitive <br> areas | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Discounted dog/cat <br> desexing for pensioners | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Discounted dog/cat <br> microchipping for <br> pensioners | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Patrols of public spaces to <br> ensure compliance with <br> rules | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Checking dog/cat <br> registration via patrols or <br> door-knocks | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Annual Pet Expo | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Cat traps for resident use | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |

## 17. How can Council improve its animal management services? (Tick all that apply)

$\square$ Photos of lost and found pets on Council's website/ social media
$\square$ More information about caring for pets
$\square$ More information about choosing the right pet
ㅁ More patrols in public places
$\square$ More off-leash areas
$\square$ More dog-free protected areas
$\square$ Better signage about relevant dog restrictions in public spaces
$\square$ List of useful animal-related contacts (eg, vets, wildlife carers, dog-walking groups)
$\square$ More friendly/ approachable Community Safety staff
$\square$ Advice on how to build cat enclosures
ㅁ More timely response to my requests
ㅁ Other (please state): $\qquad$
18. Have you reported an animal-related issue to Council over the past two years?
$\square$ Yes, if so what for? $\qquad$

- No

19. How satisfied were you with Council's response to your issue?

|  | Very <br> satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Unsatisfied | Very <br> unsatisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Outcome of the issue | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Time taken to respond to your <br> issue | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| Communication and <br> professionalism | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |

If you were unsatisfied, please tell us why:
$\square$
20. Do you have any other feedback you would like to provide that will help inform the development of Council's Domestic Animal Management Plan?
$\square$

## Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

## Privacy Collection Notice:

Nillumbik Shire Council is collecting your personal information for the purpose of facilitating effective community engagement in relation to the Domestic Animal Management Plan.

The full content of a personal submission including any name/s is a public record and may be made available for public inspection and included in Council business papers. Contact information will be redacted. Names will not be redacted unless anonymity is expressly requested and confidentiality granted to a submission.

The full content of a submission made on behalf of an organisation in relation to Council's Domestic Animal Management Plan, including the name of the organisation is a public record and may be made available for public inspection and included in Council business papers.

Not providing the mandatory information will mean that your submission cannot be accepted.
You have the right to access and correct your personal information. Enquiries for access should be made to the Privacy Officer 9433 3271, privacy@nillumbik.vic.gov.au or PO Box 476, Greensborough Vic 3088.

