

**ATTACHMENT 1 - SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED**

During the consultation phase, council undertook a range of activities to raise awareness with the public and business community. These activities included:

- Media Release sent out on commencement of consultation
- Website Information Pages "Have Your Say" for proposed changes
- Public Notice advertisements in the Sunshine Coast Daily
- Spotlight radio advertising
- Some Councillor columns print media
- Targeted email notices to both the Chamber of Commerce organisations and the REIQ who distributed information to their members
- 821 letters sent to residents and owners living within 500m proximity to proposed dog off leash area at Aroona, as requested by Cr Cox

**Community consultation overview**

1. Consultation Period – 1 February 2019 to 3 March 2019
2. Submissions were invited from the public and business community
3. 64 submissions were received

**ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)**

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
<b>SUBORDINATE LOCAL LAW No 1 (Administration) 2016</b>				
1	I would like to have my say as a resident on the Sunshine Coast, I agree with all of Subordinate Local Law No. 1 (Administration) 2016 propose changes.		Agree	No change to proposed local law.
<b>Schedule 4 – Alteration or improvement to local government controlled areas and roads (Verge Gardens)</b>				
2	<p>I agree with the proposed change of Local Law 1 replace nature strip with road verge. "Verge" in the Macquarie Dictionary is defined as edge, rim or margin which to me means only a small part of what is at present called strip. As the home owner/rate payer at present maintains (in most case) this piece of land, they should have the freedom to use it, within reason for specific purposes, especially if it's an improvement in appearance and sensible practicality for them. I did this in 2016 after the sudden death of my husband to ease my workload. I applied for and received Council approval to replace the weed/grass on the undulating strip, the result of Council removal of a diseased tree/roots but not filling in afterwards, creating trip hazards. At considerable cost to me, synthetic turf of the best quality with a ten year guarantee, was laid on the verge by a professional who levelled and compacted the previously undulating land. Imagine my shock when I received a letter from a solicitor in your legal department withdrawing the approval, stating that the officer had made a mistake. After an extremely stressful time of four months, the help of the Sunshine Coast Legal Centre and on the advice of my GP (who sent a letter to the Council) who could see my health was being affected, I reluctantly signed a deed getting the cost to the exact dollar of the synthetic turf. No apology or compensation from a sterile council. Sub-standard turf was put down after the synthetic turf was rolled up and cut, contrary to my request that it be re-used. The area this summer was/is straw after the lack of rain. After discussing this with Mayor Mark Jamieson in a local coffee shop, I received a written apology in a local coffee shop, I received a written apology in 2018 with some lame arguments about synthetic turf which is becoming more popular in all areas, schools, parks and nature strips (verges). Council's inconsistency in this matter is questionable.</p> <p>When there are no footpaths, pedestrians use the road so plants, vegetables etc. should be allowed. Plant/fruit trees on verge. Some roads eg Monks Crescent, Buderim are narrow as verges are too wide. If cars park on the road, very little room for traffic and the safety of pedestrians is compromised. Therefore cars on verge for safety. Lawns that require mowing, whipper snipping etc. increase noise and air pollution unless like me people use a push mower. Reduce air/noise pollution. Most take pride in their homes/gardens. Those who don't, get preferential treatment - Council mow long grass of a certain height. Most conscientious residents do their own - no rewards for them.</p>	<p><b>Response Services</b> – The definition of <i>road verge</i> has been provided with the amendments. <i>Road verge</i> is defined as "the part of the road area between the edge (for example, the kerb) of the trafficable surface and the outer boundary of the road area (for example, an adjoining property frontage).</p> <p><b>CLP</b> – The introduction of the self-assessable criteria will allow local residents to introduce small plantings to the verge without the need to obtain an approval.</p> <p>Anything beyond the approved self-assessable list will require a resident to obtain an approval and be the holder of \$2 million public liability insurance.</p> <p>Council does not support using artificial turf on residential road verges for the following reasons. Service providers may need emergency access to the following utilities located underneath the road reserve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water</li> <li>• Sewer</li> <li>• Electrical</li> <li>• Gas</li> <li>• Telecommunications</li> </ul> <p>Service provided do not cover the cost to fix verge treatments such as artificial turf.</p>	Agree	No change to proposed local law.
3	Verge gardens are OK providing they do not inhibit the footpath thoroughfare. You could enforce vehicles from the verge also. Go down Greenoaks Ave sometime and you have to walk on the road to go around vehicles on the verge. Try to take a child's pram onto the road and have an accident and see who pays the damage.	<p><b>CLP &amp; Response Services</b> – The self-assessable planting list stipulates the need for a 1.8 metre clearance for pedestrian access.</p> <p>Parking on the verge is not supported and vehicles should be parking all four wheels on the road.</p>	Agree (Providing they do not inhibit the footpath thoroughfare)	No change to proposed local law.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
		Council undertakes parking patrols in high profile locations across the region. Where a resident has a particular concern regarding illegal parking, this should be raised as a service request to Customer Contact.		
4	Replace "nature strip" with "road verge" - I strongly disagree. Really? I'm confused. The current status reads 'an approval must be sought to alter a Council verge... Why was 'Council verge' used and not 'nature strip'? The term 'nature strip' has been used for a long time and is quite sufficient.	<b>CLP &amp; Response Services</b> – Noted. Matter of terminology only.	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>No change to proposed local law.</b>
Schedule 8 – Placement of Moveable Advertising Devices (Real Estate Signage)				
5	Subordinate Local Law No. 1 (Administration) 2016 - Schedule 8 placement of moveable advertising devices. We disagree with the proposed amendments. As a large complex of 68 lots, at any time we can have a large number of properties for sale. We currently have a situation where there are a number of large signs that have been erected at the front of the property, which we believe have a detrimental impact on the amenity of not only our complex but the area in general. Schedule 8 currently does not appear to specifically address the situation where multiple dwellings may be for sale. The former Maroochy Shire Local Law 8 addressed this (see attached excerpt) and we seek to extend the existing law by adding the following: "Where the owners or body corporate erects on the property, a device for the purpose of displaying multiple dwellings for sale, no signs other than directional signs on open days will be permitted to be placed on a public place." Current by-law 44 for "The Moorings on Golden Beach" reads as follows: Subject to the immediately preceding By-Law, the Body Corporate shall designate part of the common property to be used for the erection and maintenance of signs (including signs advertising the sale of a Lot In the building). Any such sign must be in the form as previously approved of in writing by the Body Corporate provided that no real estate agent's or any other sign displaying any real estate agents name or logo shall be erected on the common property or in any Lot. The Body corporate has provided facilities for the display of advertising of the sale of a lot albeit within the reception area for the complex. Real Estate agencies have used this facility since the building was established in 2000. Only recently did one agency erect a sign on the boundary and claim exemption as 'it was not on body corporate land'. This has prompted the erection of signs by other agencies claiming competitive business rights (see attached photographs). Because "The Moorings" contains 68 lots, churn is higher than usual residential properties to the extent that it is likely for some signs never to be removed and also for the number of signs to continue to grow. The plethora of such large signs gives the impression that there are negative issues and this impression is detrimental to the enjoyment of the property by owners and visitors as well as having a depressing impact on property values. The body corporate is willing to consider erecting what seems to be a standard style of display board so that it is more easily viewed by the passing trade so as to address real estate agency concerns that properties for sale are not sufficiently promoted. The placement of the signs on the boundary of our property also impedes the ability to keep the grass trimmed further adding to the degrading of the area. We are happy to meet with council to discuss and to find a mutually agreeable outcome.	<p><b>Response Services</b> – Contact will be arranged with the respondent to explain the current legislation.</p> <p><b>CLP &amp; Response Services</b> – The current local law requirements are as follows:</p> <p>The real estate (residential) sign on a private place must meet the below parameters to be self-assessable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• may have a maximum face area of 2.16 square metres exhibited per agent or agency per property;</li> <li>• where more than one agency is handling a property, the maximum face area that may be displayed is 2.16 square metres; and</li> <li>• 1 sign may be displayed on the property at all times until the property is sold/leased/auctioned or rented; and</li> <li>• shall be securely fixed to a wall/fence or place securely on the ground adjacent to the premises.</li> </ul> <p>Given the prescribed parameters to be self-assessable outline that the sign may only have a maximum face area of 2.16 square metres and only 1 sign can be displayed at the premises.</p> <p>Any additional signage is considered to require an approval under council's local law and would need to be considered in accordance with the additional criteria for the granting of an approval outlined in the Local Law, including, the device will not be likely to cause:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• harm to human health and safety; or</li> <li>• property damage; or</li> <li>• a nuisance; or</li> <li>• obstruction of pedestrian or vehicular traffic; or</li> <li>• environmental harm; or</li> <li>• environmental nuisance; or</li> <li>• a loss of amenity; or</li> <li>• an obstruction of a view or vista from any premises.</li> </ul> <p>Council must be satisfied that the signage will not likely cause any of the above mentioned matters prior to the awarding of any approval.</p> <p>The changes proposed in the current local law review make no reference to changing any of the above requirements.</p> <p>The proposed changes allow for the inclusion of an additional real estate sign (residential) with display parameters commencing 24 hours</p>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>No change to proposed local law.</b>

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
		prior to , and concluding at the end of day of Open House.		
6	Real estate signage. I strongly disagree with increasing temporary Real estate signage. 1. Unsightly. 2. Detract from the beauty of the Coast. 3. Imply a commercial leaning as a priority over aesthetics. 4. Often not removed - those left on the nature strip may prove a hazard to walkers & cyclists and children. They often dislodge and fall on to the road. We needs LESS roadside advertising, not MORE.	<p><b>Response Services &amp; CLP</b> – The proposed changes do not allow for any additional signage on public land, but rather define the time in which directional signage may be displayed, including directional signs to be displayed 24 hours before the property being open for inspection and removed at the end of the day.</p> <p>The introduction of this requirement will provide council with the ability to have greater capacity to regulate signs that have been left outside these parameters.</p>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>No change to proposed local law.</b>
7	As regards real estate signage there needs to be a simple law to restrict the size and placement of signs.	<p><b>Response Services</b> – Contact will be arranged with the respondent to explain the current legislation.</p> <p><b>Response Services &amp; CLP</b> – The current local law requirements are as follows:</p> <p>The real estate (residential) sign on a private place must meet the below parameters to be self-assessable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• may have a maximum face area of 2.16 square metres exhibited per agent or agency per property;</li> <li>• where more than one agency is handling a property, the maximum face area that may be displayed is 2.16 square metres; and</li> <li>• 1 sign may be displayed on the property at all times until the property is sold/leased/auctioned or rented; and</li> <li>• shall be securely fixed to a wall/fence or place securely on the ground adjacent to the premises.</li> </ul> <p>Given the prescribed parameters to be self-assessable outline that the sign may only have a maximum face area of 2.16 square metres and only 1 sign can be displayed at the premises.</p> <p>Any additional signage is considered to require an approval under council’s local law and would need to be considered in accordance with the additional criteria for the granting of an approval outlined in the Local Law, including, the device will not be likely to cause:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• harm to human health and safety; or</li> <li>• property damage; or</li> <li>• a nuisance; or</li> <li>• obstruction of pedestrian or vehicular traffic; or</li> <li>• environmental harm; or</li> <li>• environmental nuisance; or</li> <li>• a loss of amenity; or</li> <li>• an obstruction of a view or vista from any premises.</li> </ul> <p>Council must be satisfied that the signage will not likely cause any of the above mentioned matters prior to the awarding of any approval.</p> <p>The changes proposed in the current local law review make no reference to changing any of the above requirements.</p>		<b>No change to proposed local law.</b>

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
		The proposed changes allow for the inclusion of an additional real estate sign (residential) with display parameters commencing 24 hours prior to , and concluding at the end of day of Open House.		
8	I refer to Subordinate Local Law No 1 (Administration) 2016 - Schedule 8, Placement of moveable advertising signs: In particular, Directional Real Estate Signs - I would like to ensure that a maximum sign size of 450mm x 450mm for directional signs is also specified. There should also be a penalty imposed for failure to comply as well as confiscation by Council for offending signs.	<p><b>Proposal to decrease current size limits on directional signs.</b></p> <p><b>Response Services &amp; CLP –</b> The current local law outlines the following in relation to the prescribed parameters for a Real Estate (Residential) sign on a public place (in other words, directional signs) are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• may have a maximum –                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ height of 1 metre; and</li> <li>○ width 0.6 metres; and</li> <li>○ depth 0.6 metres; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>• shall be securely fixed on the ground; and</li> <li>• may be displayed only on the day when a premise is open for inspection, being auctioned, leased or open for rental; and</li> <li>• the maximum number shall not exceed 5 at the time of Open house/Auction/Lessee of Rent.</li> </ul> <p>Any additional signage is considered to require an approval under council’s local law and would need to be considered in accordance with the additional criteria for the granting of an approval outlined in the Local Law, including, the device will not be likely to cause:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• harm to human health and safety; or</li> <li>• property damage; or</li> <li>• a nuisance; or</li> <li>• obstruction of pedestrian or vehicular traffic; or</li> <li>• environmental harm; or</li> <li>• environmental nuisance; or</li> <li>• a loss of amenity; or</li> <li>• an obstruction of a view or vista from any premises.</li> </ul> <p>Council must be satisfied that the signage will not likely cause any of the above mentioned matters prior to the awarding of any approval.</p> <p>The changes proposed in the current local law review make no reference to changing any of the above requirements.</p> <p>The proposed changes do not allow for any additional signage on public land, but rather define the time in which directional signage may be displayed, including directional signs to be displayed 24 hours before the property being open for inspection and removed at the end of the day.</p> <p>The introduction of this requirement will provide council with the ability to have greater capacity to regulate signs that have been left outside these parameters.</p>		<b>No change to proposed local law.</b>
9	A Real estate signage on the ground in the front of 2 story Unit that is more than 1m.50mm high is unsightly looking at the back of the signage from bedroom window and should not be attached to a private fence.	<p><b>Response Services &amp; CLP –</b> The current local law requirements are as follows:</p> <p>The real estate (residential) sign on a private place must meet the below parameters to be self-assessable:</p>		<b>No change to proposed local law.</b>

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• may have a maximum face area of 2.16 square metres exhibited per agent or agency per property;</li> <li>• where more than one agency is handling a property, the maximum face area that may be displayed is 2.16 square metres; and</li> <li>• 1 sign may be displayed on the property at all times until the property is sold/leased/auctioned or rented; and</li> <li>• shall be securely fixed to a wall/fence or place securely on the ground adjacent to the premises.</li> </ul> <p>Given the prescribed parameters to be self-assessable outline that the sign may only have a maximum face area of 2.16 square metres and only 1 sign can be displayed at the premises.</p> <p>There are no proposed changes to these parameters following the making of the local law in 2011.</p>		
10	Placement of real estate signs. There should only be 1 for sale sign and then when there is an open home only 1 sign at home saying the time. This would then remove the visual pollution of numerous signs and flags which are not promoting the sale of a property but the brand of an agent and agency	<p><b>Response Services</b> – Contact will be arranged with the respondent to explain the current legislation.</p> <p><b>Response Services &amp; CLP</b> – The current local law requirements are as follows:</p> <p>The real estate (residential) sign on a private place must meet the below parameters to be self-assessable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• may have a maximum face area of 2.16 square metres exhibited per agent or agency per property;</li> <li>• where more than one agency is handling a property, the maximum face area that may be displayed is 2.16 square metres; and</li> <li>• 1 sign may be displayed on the property at all times until the property is sold/leased/auctioned or rented; and</li> <li>• shall be securely fixed to a wall/fence or place securely on the ground adjacent to the premises.</li> </ul> <p>Given the prescribed parameters to be self-assessable outline that the sign may only have a maximum face area of 2.16 square metres and only 1 sign can be displayed at the premises.</p> <p>The changes proposed in the current local law review make no reference to changing any of the above requirements.</p> <p>The proposed changes allow for the inclusion of an additional real estate sign (residential) with display parameters commencing 24 hours prior to , and concluding at the end of day of Open House.</p> <p>The current local law outlines the following in relation to the prescribed parameters for a Real Estate (Residential) sign on a public place (in other words, directional signs) are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• may have a maximum –                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ height of 1 metre; and</li> <li>○ width 0.6 metres; and</li> <li>○ depth 0.6 metres; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>• shall be securely fixed on the ground; and</li> </ul>		<b>No change to proposed local law.</b>

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>may be displayed only on the day when a premise is open for inspection, being auctioned, leased or open for rental; and</li> <li>the maximum number shall not exceed 5 at the time of Open house/Auction/Lessee of Rent.</li> </ul> <p>The changes proposed in the current local law review make no reference to changing any of the above requirements.</p> <p>The proposed changes do not allow for any additional signage on public land, but rather define the time in which directional signage may be displayed, including directional signs to be displayed 24 hours before the property being open for inspection and removed at the end of the day.</p> <p>The introduction of this requirement will provide council with the ability to have greater capacity to regulate signs that have been left outside these parameters.</p> <p>Any additional signage is considered to require an approval under council's local law and would need to be considered in accordance with the additional criteria for the granting of an approval outlined in the Local Law, including, the device will not be likely to cause:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>harm to human health and safety; or</li> <li>property damage; or</li> <li>a nuisance; or</li> <li>obstruction of pedestrian or vehicular traffic; or</li> <li>environmental harm; or</li> <li>environmental nuisance; or</li> <li>a loss of amenity; or</li> <li>an obstruction of a view or vista from any premises.</li> </ul> <p>Council must be satisfied that the signage will not likely cause any of the above mentioned matters prior to the awarding of any approval.</p>		
<b>Schedule 18 – Carrying out works on a road or interfering with a road or its operation (Grids)</b>				
No Submissions received				No change to proposed local law.
<b>SUBORDINATE LOCAL LAW No 2 (Animal Management) 2011</b>				
<b>Schedule 6 – Dog Off Leash Areas</b>				
11	It is a positive move by Council to have off leash areas for dogs. I agree with the proposed amendments as read.		Agree (General, no park specified)	No change to proposed local law.
12	Agree with expanding dog off leash areas		Agree (General, no park specified)	No change to proposed local law.
<b>AROONA</b>				
13	I heartily endorse a 'DOLA' in Aroona Park, allowing off-leash area. Thank you.		Agree (Aroona)	No change to proposed local law.
14	We agree to park being off-leash 4pm-8am Monday to Friday. This park is a meeting place for people to socialise with other people ie dog owners and have social interaction. Many elderly people live in this area within walking distance to this park and for many it's a contact with outside world. Many friendships have been formed and with today's society it's very important		Agree (Aroona)	No change to proposed local law.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	to have this interaction for owners and dogs. Many dog owners work and these times suit them because its close and otherwise the dogs miss out but being so available before and after work, works in everyone’s favour.			
15	The Aroona Park Dog off leash proposal. I fully support the proposal off leash area. It improves the neighbourhood and the contact between all residents.		Agree (Aroona)	No change to proposed local law.
16	The Aroona Dog Off leash proposal. I completely support the proposed off-leash area on the grounds that it improves neighbour relations between friendly dogs. It promotes interaction of people, young and old with a common interest. Aroona in particular has a very high dog ownership rate and a second off leash area is required to support the sheer numbers of dogs walked in our area.  Ensure that education of renegade dog owners who do not clean up after their dogs or have not socialised their dogs, are aware of appropriate dog responsibilities.		Agree (Aroona)	No change to proposed local law.
17	I am for the proposed dog off leash area at the eastern end of Aroona Park. The social benefits for dog owners and their dogs are considerable. People of all ages gather to talk and enjoy the park. Particularly older dog owners. *Because this sort of off leash area is unfenced, owners are very responsible and attentive to their dogs and that their dogs interaction with other dogs. I have observed this and compared the interactions to those at/in fenced areas.		Agree (Aroona)	No change to proposed local law.
18	I strongly recommend that the dog off leash area at Aroona Park be put through. I live in forest court Aroona and currently can only walk the perimeter of the park along with other dog owners. We all utilise the poo bags provided and are respectful of each other and the space. Families only use the half of the park near the play equipment so it makes perfect sense to share the space in the proposed shared hours of before 8am and after 4pm.		Agree (Aroona)	No change to proposed local law.
19	Establishment of DOLA from 4pm to 8am Monday - Friday @Aroona Park. AGREE. It has always been my observation that this park is not used by many people with the exception of the playground area during the day. It is well maintained at tax payers costs for the benefit of few at it stands now. Many dog owners and their pets frequent this park - probably more so than other users. Therefore as a majority of users are pet owners I believe that Aroona Park should be amended to off leash as proposed. There is no need for additional funding - water taps and poo bins are adequate.  I recommend the off leash area be increased, much of the park is under utilised during the week and between the hours of 4pm and 8am. I also recommend weekends be included as after 4pm the park rarely is populated with park goers other than dog walkers.		Agree (Aroona)	No change to proposed local law.
20	A newly established dog off leash area at Aroona Park between 4pm and 8am Mon-Fri. Sll 2.6.41. I agree and endorse the proposal.		Agree (Aroona)	No change to proposed local law.
21	DOLA @ Aroona Park 4pm - 8am Mon - Fri. Very happy to have this happen - AGREE!! This park used to be off leash at least to say there were no signs up till a few years ago. My dog benefits to run and get his heart rate up. I can't run with him so off leash gives him the exercise he needs. I take him to the beach but prefer to alternate with Aroona Park as it's walking distance. Otherwise it's Coochin Park this is brilliant you dont feel like you're in a cage as is with the small DOLA @ Ridgehaven. Everywhere is getting busier more people more dogs when the tides in there is limited room on the beach so having our local park as an alternate option is perfect to give us all room to move and to not have to use the car less emissions in another bonus.  Don't overdo things just have a simple to understand sign and an extra poo rubbish bin to the east end. No fences don't make it a cage it'll ruin the park. No new constructs except a sign maybe keep it simple yeah.		Agree (Aroona)	No change to proposed local law.
22	Agree with the establishment of a dog off leash area from 4pm - 8am Monday to Friday at Aroona Park.		Agree (Aroona)	No change to proposed local law.
23	Support the dog off leash proposal. Establishment of a new dog off leash area in Aroona Park 4pm-8am Mon-Fri.		Agree (Aroona)	No change to proposed local law.
24	Dog off leash area - Aroona Park. I agree with the proposal.		Agree (Aroona)	No change to proposed local law.
25	RE: Proposed amendment to make Aroona Park dogs off leash area 4pm-8am Monday to Friday: DISAGREE Whilst upon initial consultation I was supportive of this amendment, my own dog has subsequently been attacked whilst walking her on-leash by a dog who was out of it's yard	Submission has been referred to the appropriate operational areas within Council.	Disagree (Aroona)	No change to proposed local law.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	<p>without a leash. This attack has make both my dog and myself nervous around other dogs without a leash and my dog has become more reactive when approached by dogs off a leash. It has taken considerable work, cost, and stress to help my dog feel secure again. In order to minimise the risk and exposure to other dogs, we now walk her at night. It is important that we are able to continue to walk our dog safely and securely around the local area without fear of uncontained dogs. I feel secure in the knowledge that dogs are required to be on leash at all times when walking her around Aroona Park and I fear further attacks and all the subsequent issues this brings in the recovery process for dog owners if dogs are allowed off leash without a fenced area. I would be supportive of an off-leash area if it was contained but not how it is currently proposed.</p> <p>If a dog off-leash area is required for this park, my recommendation is that a fenced area is provided for this purpose.</p>			
26	<p>I disagree with the proposed amendment to establish a dog off leash area in Aroona Park. Aroona Park is a unique beautiful expansive space which I am sure was initially intended to provide a visually delightful area for the use of humans not dogs. Who will ensure that the dog faeces are disposed of correctly? Will council be providing foot and shoe washing facilities for the humans?</p> <p>Dogs are by nature unpredictable – ask any vet or animal trainer. They are known to attack other dogs and humans when on and off leash. The council will not be providing supervision of the owners or the animals in Aroona Park. Your Officers will not be vetting the owners to check if they are responsible dog owners nor will they be checking to see if the dogs have been trained to be obedient. Are council officers intending to check the immunisation status of the dogs? Any area of the park designated as a DOLA, But unenclosed, cannot be guaranteed to be safe for children to transit through or play in. My 4 year old grandson has been chased by dogs while running around the park. This fact applies to adults utilising the park also, in particular when they are having a gathering involving food consumption. I have experienced off leash dogs attempting to join my picnics and worse than that, sniffing at the babies and toddlers accompanying me. If the DOLA is to be enclosed, the designated area will be off limits for the majority of park users. This is discriminating against people in favour of dogs, dogs do not care about the aesthetics of a location – they just want to be able to run free, council needs to find an area not currently used by humans if they must yield to the demands of dog owners.</p> <p>Recommendations: allocate areas of land for DOLAS that are not currently used by humans for human recreation, do not take park land away from people and allocate it for the use of dogs, create DOLAs that are enclosed for the safety of both the dogs in the DOLA when accompanied by a small child, maybe it is time to erect warning signs where there are un enclosed DOLAs – owners relinquish control when a dog is off the leash in a public place.</p> <p>Yes I have been a dog owner and my dogs roamed free within my fenced property. I did not take them into public places where they could inhibit the enjoyment of other people.</p>	Submission has been referred to the appropriate operational areas within Council.	<b>Disagree</b> (Aroona)	<b>No change to proposed local law.</b>
27	<p>I would prefer to leave the park as it is. I feel the fenced area will spoil the aesthetic appearance of our lovely Aroona Park. There is a fenced dog area not far away at the Ridgehaven Park.</p>	<p>Submission has been referred to the appropriate operational areas within Council.</p> <p>This area is not being fenced.</p>	<b>Disagree</b> (Aroona)	<b>No change to proposed local law.</b>
28	<p>I strongly oppose this amendment and disagree with it.</p> <p>My son and I are frequent users of Aroona Park between Monday to Friday from 4pm – 6pm, as are other children. My son finishes school at 3pm, we are home at 3.30, and ready to use the park close to 4pm.</p> <p>The proposed 4-8pm dog off leash timeslot coincides with the frequent use of this park by children. If the dog off leash time starts at 4pm, we would not be able to use the park during the week. Perhaps 5.30 – 6pm would be a better dog off leash start time? This would allow children to use this park after school too.</p> <p>Our house has a very small yard, measuring approx. 10m x 2m. This area is insufficient for active outdoor play. My son refers to Aroona Park as “his backyard”. The government and health organisations recommend a minimum number of hours of active outdoor play for children. By creating a dog off leash area, the council limits the active outdoor play opportunities available for children living in Aroona. I have spoken to a number of other local parents who share this concern. It is difficult for many parents to get kids outside and away from screens. Enacting a law to remove children’s after school play areas for use by dogs exacerbates this problem and removes play opportunities now and in the future. Some of the benefits of outdoor play for children include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reduced risk of obesity</li> <li>• increased cardiovascular fitness</li> </ul>	Submission has been referred to the appropriate operational areas within Council.	<b>Disagree</b> (Aroona)	<b>No change to proposed local law.</b>



ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• healthy growth of bones, muscles, ligaments and tendons</li> <li>• improved coordination and balance</li> <li>• reduced risk of myopia (short sightedness)</li> <li>• a greater ability to physically relax and, therefore, avoid the complications of chronic muscular tension (such as headache or back ache)</li> <li>• improved sleep</li> <li>• mental health benefits, such as greater confidence</li> <li>• improved social skills</li> <li>• improved personal skills, including cooperation and leadership.</li> </ul> <p>Instead of converting this area to a dog park, it would be great to see the council encourage greater use of this park by children after school. Perhaps the council could upgrade the existing playground/swings so that it provided some challenges for older children. Another option would be to implement some co-ordinated active play activities for local children such as the series run by the Brisbane City Council a few years ago with free organised games and activities for kids in local parks after school. It would be great to see the SCC helping to build local informal play communities for children – it is critical for the social development of kids and the community.</p> <p>My son is 7, and has minimal interest in the young children’s playground, at the other end of Aroona Park. His main interest is in the areas covered by the proposed dog off leash area. My son uses this area of the park alone and with his friends to kick the soccer ball, football, use the cricket bat, have water balloon fights with his friends, play chasey, fly kites, throw balls and nerf frisbees, climb trees, build cubby houses, use the basketball area, and play “line tiggly” on the basketball court. I can provide photos of nearly all of these activities occurring at this park taken over the last few years. A few images are included below. There are other dog off-leash areas available nearby, particularly the park on Kalana Road/ Beerburrum street. If Aroona Park becomes a dog off leash area, there will no longer be any other similar large open grassed space for my son and other children to play in at this park or at nearby parks. The small areas of bush that he builds cubby houses in will also be difficult for him to use between 4-8pm, as the nearby dogs off leash will pose a danger. We have had a couple of negative encounters with poorly supervised off leash dogs at Aroona park in the past.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the proposed local law amendment to establish a dog off leash area between 4-8pm Monday to Friday in Aroona Park. I would like to be further consulted on this law amendment and request that I am informed and able to attend any council meetings that discuss this amendment so that I can present my views and propose other options.</p>			
29	<p>I disagree with the proposed amendment to establish a dog off leash area at Aroona Park. Why do all parks in this area need to be off leash, people especially children enjoy parks without the fear of being charged at or aggressively barked at by dogs on the loose when they are having a enjoyable walk, play or family time. I believe the park is not monitored or policed closely enough now with dog owners blatantly disregarding the rules presently in place, the proposed amendment will make it open slather over the whole park with dog owners having no respect or regard for other users.</p> <p>There is a park some 500m away from Aroona Park, on Beerburrum St. (Ridgehaven Park) which is off-leash for numerous hours during the day plus I am sure at great expense to rate payers has two enclosed (fenced) off areas for large and small dogs for all day off leash which I believe should be encouraged to be used and signage put up on Aroona Park saying this.</p>	Submission has been referred to the appropriate operational areas within Council.	<b>Disagree</b> (Aroona)	<b>No change to proposed local law.</b>
30	<p>Dog off leash area - Aroona Park. I only agree with the dog off leash park if part of the park is fenced. ie. like Kawana Park where dogs can run free off leash. I've had to clean up dog poo off my backyard and I don't believe an 87yo woman should have to clean up dog poo. A secure fenced area is the best idea. Dogs can mingle and owners can rest - 2 hours for each dog. At the present time I think dogs are let free early mornings and can use anyone's yard for a toilet.</p>	Submission has been referred to the appropriate operational areas within Council.	<b>Disagree</b> (Aroona) <b>unless it is fenced</b>	<b>No change to proposed local law.</b>
<b>PALMWOODS</b>				
31	<p>I agree with all the changes with animal management and as a resident in Palmwoods I am very excited to see federation park be dog off leash at all times.</p>		<b>Agree</b> (Palmwoods)	<b>No change to proposed local law.</b>
32	<p>Subordinate Local Law No.2 Animal Management 2011. Amend Schedule 6 - Change of off leash rules Federation Park, Palmwoods - proposal to change to off leash at all times.</p> <p>I disagree with the proposal to change Federation Park to off leash for dogs at all times for the following reasons: a) many families with children use this park for ball games etc. and there is the potential for an unsafe</p>	Submission has been referred to the appropriate operational areas within Council.	<b>Disagree</b> (Palmwoods)	<b>No change to proposed local law.</b>

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	<p>situation if dogs are allowed to run free at all times, if times are restricted families can make a decision to use the park when there will be no dogs off leash or when dogs are running free there. b) I have used the dog off leash area in Federation Park and have had to exit this area as dogs, who were not under control by their owners, were causing a problem for my dog by jumping on her and not leaving her alone. I am able to walk around the park safely at present as all dogs should be on a leash so by making the whole park off leash at all times my choice of where to use the park with my dog will be removed. c) There is already a problem of dog excrement not being removed by dog owners and causing a health hazard for other park users particularly children whilst running and playing on the grass, this problem could worsen if dogs are running off leash and owners do not see them defecating and then more will be left in the park. I am a responsible dog owner but unfortunately a lot of people do not carry out their responsibilities as dog owners to ensure the safety of others.</p>			
33	<p>Federation Park Palmwoods Dog off leash at all times. I strongly disagree with this proposal. There is an area owners can allow their dogs to run around and play off leash. There are also other areas such as Buderim that are bigger if they want a bigger area. I have been bailed up a few times at Federation by dogs off leashes and the owners didn't stop their dogs growling, barking and jumping on me. Just because the owners have confidence their pet won't bite, doesn't mean I do. And I should be able to walk freely around the park without having a dog jump on me. If I did that to another human I would be up for assault. Yet some irresponsible pet owners think it's cute their animals jump up on people. I have been knocked back and had muddy paw prints left on my clothes. I find that unacceptable. In the past I have always walked my dog on leash and if I wanted off leash I would go to the appropriate places. I have had to get between my children and boisterous dogs. My children have been terrified on occasions. Once at Federation I had a large dog bail me up with a newborn in my arms. I had to turn my back to the dog and hunch over my baby to protect it. The owners eventually came over and told me the dog wouldn't hurt a fly. Physical is not the only hurt a dog like this can cause. Fear itself creates harm. I don't believe allowing dog's freely off leash at all times at any park is appropriate. Council should never place human safety secondary to a dog roaming free. Owners do have an option available for off leash areas. Allow humans to walk, run, ride, play unhindered by the fear of a dog approaching off leash.</p> <p>I recommend owners take their dogs to a larger off leash park if they are wanting a bigger area for their dog. There is sufficient room for dogs to play in the fenced off leash area.</p>	Submission has been referred to the appropriate operational areas within Council.	<b>Disagree</b> (Palmwoods)	<b>No change to proposed local law.</b>
SUBORDINATE LOCAL LAW No 3 (Community Health and Environmental Management) 2011				
Schedule 3 – Prohibited Fires				
34	<p>I agree with the proposed amendment, in relation to Prohibited Fires. However, it is fine to have laws but in my experience in relation to fires the laws are useless if Local Laws Officers cannot or will not apply the law and relevant penalties.</p> <p>I have written at length on this subject to Council. However, as usual I never receive a written reply. I have attached two items of 2018 correspondence which explain in detail the circumstances of illegal and damaging fires at the base of the Bluff at Alexandra Headland. In those I have made a few suggestions to try to encourage Council to actually apply the Local Law in relation to illegal fires, not just put signs up announcing the law.</p> <p>Thank you in anticipation of your consideration. PS When I suggested building a fire place at the Bluff Beach 167 the verbal answer was, all fires are illegal anywhere on the beach/foreshore.</p>	Healthy Places - Noted	Agree	No change to proposed local law.
35	<p>Subordinate Local Law No. 3 (Community Health and Environmental Management) 2011, I strongly support the amendments to the local laws. I live in a Rural residential area and current local law is confusing, unclear and Map 1 is not available. It is a lot more sensible to align regulations with the SCC planning scheme. I moved into the area 18 months ago and when I inquired to council about the regulations on burning of garden waste I was informed that I was able to and given the guidelines.</p> <p>Please proceed with amendment as outlined.</p>	Healthy Places - Agree	Agree	No change to proposed local law.
36	<p>Subordinate Local Law No. 3 (Community Health and Environmental Management) 2011. We support the amendments. So many people burning rubbish and green waste under the guise of "fire pits" in res A areas.</p> <p>Ban all green waste and rubbish fires in all res A areas. At the moment the existing by-laws are vague and virtually unenforceable. The affects on asthmatic people, elderly residents and young children is detrimental. Only option at present to minimise the problem is to close homes up and turn on</p>	Response Services – Contact will be arranged with the respondent to explain the current legislation.	Agree	No change to proposed local law.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	air conditioners, if they're available. Many elderly people just close up to keep the smoke and smell away and don't have cooling features, which must be dangerous for them in hot weather. There is absolutely no need for such fires in this day and age.			
37	<p>This submission relates to: Subordinate Local Law No. 3 (Community Health and Environmental Management) 2011 and the proposal to Amend Schedule 3 (Prohibited Fires). Remove reference to the urban area in schedule 3 and replace with fires prohibited in any part of the local government area excluding the rural and rural residential area. I agree with the intent of the proposal but would like to see it augmented as it is not strong enough to stop fires for pleasure in fire pits etc. in closely spaced houses. Our neighbour runs his vacant premises as short term accommodation (averaging 3 sets of hirers per fortnight) and has a fire pit located less than 10 meters from our house. The hirers of the house with the fire pit light the fire, summer and winter, for pleasure and the smoke enters our house every time a fire is lit. It enters through the skylights as well as through any open door or window. The cooking of marshmallows is used to say the fire pit is used for cooking purposes and therefore not covered by the local law</p> <p>I ask Council to approach State Government to get the relevant legislation changed so that Local law can cover any outside wood fire on a property, regardless of its purpose, if it is within 15 meters of a neighbouring residence. In this day and age there is no need for people to cook food on a wood fire in their back yard. Barbeques fuelled by gas, electricity or heat-beads are easily available. If a fire is required for heating in an urban area it should be lit in a designated fireplace within the building. If a fire is lit outside, when a house is available, I contend that the fire is not being lit for heating purposes because the people who lit the fire would be warmer if they were inside the house. I ask that council make the proposed amendment but immediately take whatever action is necessary to prevent the lighting of any open fires, whether in a fire pit or not, within 15 meters of a neighbouring residence.</p>	<p><b>Healthy Places</b> - This is outside of the proposed changes of the amendment. To endorse this approach would be problematic given the current wording for cooking purposes etc.</p>	<p><b>Agree in principle</b>                      But against fire pits in urban areas</p>	<p><b>This submission does not relate to current amendments. Comments will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.</b></p>
38	<p>I disagree with the proposed amendment and submit that it should also prohibit fires in the rural residential areas. I recommend that either: (a) fires be prohibited in rural residential areas, or (b) this residential area (Carnarvon Drive and adjoining streets) be rezoned as an urban area. This is a densely settled area and we are affected by smoke from backyard fires on an almost daily basis. The Sunshine Coast promotes its healthy lifestyle and environment and we cannot understand why this constant backyard burning is allowed. As local residents are unable to keep their smoke within their boundaries, that smoke affects someone, somewhere. Not talking incinerators or drums as in 50s, these are bonfires. We should not have to close our home up because of thoughtless folk burning- usually nights &amp; early morning. Why is burning allowed when surrounded by homes? It's very uncomfortable.</p>	<p><b>Healthy Places</b> – Disagree. There needs to be a balance given the larger community expectations and the benefits of being able to burn in these areas to reduce risks. Moving to the zoning definitions makes the laws easier to understand for self-compliance. If the fire is not being managed correctly a direction notice can be issued.</p>	<p><b>Disagree</b></p>	<p><b>No change to proposed local law.</b></p>
39	<p>Subordinate Local law No. 3 Disagree</p> <p>As local residents are unable to keep their smoke within their boundaries, that smoke affects someone, somewhere. Not talking incinerators or drums as in 50's, these are bonfires. We should not have to close our home up because of thoughtless folk burning- usually nights &amp; early morning. Why is burning allowed when surrounded by homes? It's very uncomfortable.</p>		<p><b>Disagree</b></p>	<p><b>No change to proposed local law.</b></p>
40	<p>Replace with fires prohibited in any part of the local government area excluding the rural and rural residential area – I strongly disagree with the proposed amendment when I was growing up we regularly had a fire and applied common sense. We didn't have a fire if the neighbours had washing on the line, during a high fire danger or windy conditions. Given the high ratio of old houses on the Sunshine Coast, I consider the proposal premature at this stage. Alas, I suspect in the future fires will be prohibited in all areas including rural and rural residential. I consider access to fire a basic human right along with growing vegetables and keeping chooks!</p>	<p><b>Response Services</b> – Contact will be arranged with the respondent to explain the current legislation.</p> <p>The proposed changes still allow for fires to be lit on rural and rural residential properties in circumstances where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) the fire is directly associated with the bona fide use of any appliance or equipment for cooking or heating purposes; and</li> <li>(b) all reasonable and practical measures have been taken by the person in control of the fire to minimise smoke creation.</li> </ul>		<p><b>No change to proposed local law.</b></p>
41	<p>With local law no. 3, I do think that we should be able to have small fire pits on our property in suburbia as long as it is not used during fire bans.</p> <p>Amend Schedule 3 (Prohibited Fires) Remove reference to the urban area in schedule 3 and replace with fires prohibited in any part of the local</p>	<p><b>Response Services</b> – Contact will be arranged with the respondent to explain the current legislation.</p>		<p><b>The proposed amendment does not remove the ability to have fires in a rural or urban</b></p>

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	government area excluding the rural and rural residential area. We should be allowed to have fire pits in suburbia & only when there is no fire bans in place.	The proposed changes still allow for fires to be lit on rural and rural residential properties in circumstances where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) the fire is directly associated with the bona fide use of any appliance or equipment for cooking or heating purposes; and</li> <li>(c) all reasonable and practical measures have been taken by the person in control of the fire to minimise smoke creation.</li> </ul>		<b>backyard for the purposes of heating or cooking.</b> <b>No change to proposed local law.</b>
42	Clarification is required on the definition of a fire. Is this to cover fire-pits, Chimineas and fires (e log burners) in houses as well? Or is it only open fires (bonfires) that are covered by the ban? Closed Fires should be allowed for the burning of garden rubbish to minimise leaf litter in the area and prevent build-up of combustible materials. Levy to be placed on all rate payers to allow free tipping of garden waste at council re-cycling centres, to reduce need for burning garden rubbish. Council to operate a mobile chipping service to allow people to use garden waste as mulch. This could be a big money spinner! A neighbourhood could come together to reduce the level of material lying around their properties and benefit from the water saving properties of the mulch produced.	<b>Healthy Places</b> – Contact will be arranged with the respondent to explain the current legislation.  The proposed changes still allow for fires to be lit on rural and rural residential properties in circumstances where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) the fire is directly associated with the bona fide use of any appliance or equipment for cooking or heating purposes; and</li> <li>(b) all reasonable and practical measures have been taken by the person in control of the fire to minimise smoke creation.</li> </ul> As an example appliances or equipment would include a chimenea.  This proposal is outside of the scope of the amendment. Disagree that burning of vegetation be allowed in residential areas. Smaller amounts of vegetation incurred with access to council green bin, private contractors and close proximity to council landfills where green waste can be taken. Council recycles in bulk on site at the landfill and you can get a trailer load for free each day or pay \$7 a load for premium mulch which is being taken up by many residents.		<b>No change to proposed local law.</b>
43	Fires are out and should be fined when advised by land owners.	Contact will be made with respondent to clarify submission.	<b>Disagree</b>	Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.  <b>No change to proposed local laws.</b>
<b>Schedule 4 – Definitions (amend ‘Urban Area’ to ‘Rural and Rural Residential’ to align to Sunshine Coast Planning Scheme</b>				
<b>No Submissions received</b>				

SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED NOT RELATED TO CURRENT PROPOSED AMENDMENTS			
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Recommendation
44	Please consider an area of beach at Golden Beach as an off leash area. Somewhere between Nelson Street and Lamerough Parade (Around the Power Boat Club). If unrestricted access is frowned upon, perhaps hours, say from 4.00pm to 8.00am be allowed. This will contribute positively to dog friendly holidays for tourists and the Golden beach caravan park, which is dog friendly. I recently stayed at a new caravan park (the PIER) in Hervey Bay which until recently was not pet friendly. They now accept pets and for the 8 days I was there the pet area consistently had at least 150% more vans than the non pet allocated area of the park. The area of beach in front of it at Urangan has off leash beach times from 4.00pm to 8.00am. Seems sensible to me. Your local constituents would be overjoyed with such a positive move by Council.	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.  <b>No change to proposed local laws.</b>
45	DOLA across region. You can put as many parks in as you like but you have to get the owners to take them there. Most go to work and leave dogs to bark on and off all day and sometimes into the night. There are always dogs on Moffat Beach all year round because the owner wants to go to the beach so it doesn't matter to the owner there are certain times the dog should not be on the beach nor does it matter about the leash. We have so many dogs here at Aroona that get left to bark. Our neighbour has his son's dog over and they leave it outside to bark, don't take it anywhere so it just barks. As if we don't have enough already. We were walking on the beach at Wurtulla and there was a dog tethered to one of the red and yellow flags. We said it shouldn't be there but they said it was OK because the lifeguard patted the dog and left it there.  Try to educate the owner - can't blame the dog! No one seems to take any notice of the law maybe an increase in fines and regular patrols including streets and beaches. No dogs in restaurants, cafes etc.	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.  <b>No change to proposed local laws.</b>
46	I am seeking an amendment to Subordinate Local Law No 2 (Animal Management) to include a dog off-leash along Golden Beach to allow access for dogs to swim and walk along the beach between Onslow St and Oxley Street. At present most people who have dogs that like to walk along the beach have to go to Moffat Beach or Currimundi. This creates additional traffic on the roads through Caloundra that don't need to be there. Particularly in summer, dogs get quite warm when walking them on the paths and the opportunity for them to have a swim to cool down would be wonderful without needing to drive to the other side of town. Personally, I also have a dog with bad arthritis who can't walk long distances but does like to sit in the water and it would be great to be able to do this in my own neighbourhood. I had understood that the reason was so shorebirds weren't disrupted, but after living at Golden Beach for 20 years, I have found the shorebirds predominantly roost on the sand islands in the middle of the passage rather than on the Golden Beach shore.  As a minimum allow dog off leash between Oxley and Onslow before 8am and after 4.00pm and on weekends. Alternatively, allow a trial or a permit system if you want to gauge the numbers.	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.  <b>No change to proposed local laws.</b>
47	SUBORDINATE LOCAL LAW NO. 2 (ANIMAL MANAGEMENT) 2011. - DISAGREE. Council is focusing on establishing dog off leash parks in outlying areas, which is a welcomed move I am sure. However, I really do feel that there should be a voice for those that are discontent with the current situation. We used to live in Buderim, and the local dog park was an amazing place to socialise our animals. But when we moved to Bli Bli, we soon realised that there is no facility that is fenced off anywhere near by. We drive back to Buderim now on a regular basis just for the dog park. We have heard the same gripe from many people when they are chatting between each other at Buderim dog park. Just like them, our dogs are not socialised when run at Mudjimba beach - North Shore. That is a walk and not a socialising experience, as beautiful as it is. Some dogs really do enjoy spending quality time with other dogs. The beach comes with many issues. The jet skis are a problem as great as they are. Our one dog chases them now relentlessly after one of them played with her and splashed water at her. It is so dangerous that we have stressed many times when she tries to go deep in the surf to get to them, and the jet skis don't see her in the white water. The jet skis have sometimes made the river side black with oil, or it makes the water smell like fuel. We can smell it on them when we dry them at home. Also, one of our dogs once ran into the bush and we lost her for hours, plus the beach has caused issues with their legs. We cannot use Muller Park either, because it is not fenced. Most people I talk to at the doggie park have the same issue with their dogs in off leash areas that are not fenced. Only dogs that are solely focused on a ball or are very highly trained are safe in those areas. If one of our dogs saw a turkey across the road, they would definitely run into traffic to go inspect it. We did once try go through the training sessions but to be honest we felt it was cruel and we just want to enjoy our animals and watch their goofiness, not spend hours reprimanding them. So Buderim is our only option. Could council not maybe consider fencing some areas before focusing on the outlying areas, please :-)? Bli Bli and surrounds has grown considerably, with big complexes and loads of extra rates, which must also mean an increase in pets in the area. We don't even have a Woollies and have to travel for miles to find an affordable place for a weekly shop. Surely the area can do with some extra planning, and at the very least a fenced in doggie park.  Recommend A fenced doggie park in Bli Bli.	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.  <b>No change to proposed local laws.</b>
48	Subordinate Local Law No. 2 (Animal Management) 2011. Wish to add Off Leash Dog Park in Mapleton  Council to implement the provision of a fenced, off leash dog park within Mapleton Lily-ponds Park as foreshadowed in Councils Concept Masterplan of 2003	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.  <b>No change to proposed local laws.</b>
49	Subordinate Local Law No 2 (Animal Management 2011) Disagree.  Golden Beach. I have spoken to many people who walk their dogs at Golden Beach. We would like 2 areas where dogs are allowed off leash along the beach before 8 and after 4 as is the case at other beaches in Caloundra. We would like the council to be fair with the dog laws and let people that	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.

SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED NOT RELATED TO CURRENT PROPOSED AMENDMENTS			
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Recommendation
	walk their dogs at Golden Beach to have the same as other beaches in Caloundra. Amend the existing dogs on leash at all times on the beach in area beach access 304 to beach access 302 law to: Allow dogs off leash on the beach before 8am and after 4pm (as is the case at Shelly Beach access 276 to 281, Dicky Beach access 269 to 276, Point Cartwright Reserve) for the following areas along Golden Beach. Beach Access 302 south to Beach Access 309 And also Beach Access 321 south to Beach Access 322 There is nowhere along Golden Beach where dogs are allowed off leash on the beach. Previously dogs have been allowed along Golden Beach off leash on the beach before 8am and after 4pm. Dogs are currently only allowed on the beach from access 304 to 302, but must be on a lead unless in the water. A lot of this area is not accessible as it is rocks and oysters.		<b>No change to proposed local laws.</b>
50	Subordinate local law number 2: Dog off leash areas Disagree.  We need MORE Dogs off leash areas - reclaim the spit area of Mooloolaba as we used to be able to take dogs down here. Dogs are a proven health benefit for a number of disorders including anxiety and depression. We need more areas for people to get out with their companions and exercise. I also believe we need more bush trail areas where people can run with their dogs.	The proposal include the addition of 5 new dog off leash areas. SCC has 27 dog off leash parks across the region together with 13.5 km's of beach also dedicated to dogs off leash.  <b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.  <b>No change to proposed local laws.</b>
51	Dogs and off leash zones  I believe there should be more off leash dog zones available to Sunshine Coast residents. It is unacceptable that current off leash zones be reduced, moreover greater access to beaches and pathways needs to be a focus for Council.	Current proposal is recommending further dog off leash areas. The only amendment to reduce an area is at Hideaway Park, Mountain Creek because a playground has been constructed.  The proposal include the addition of 5 new dog off leash areas. SCC has 27 dog off leash parks across the region together with 13.5 km's of beach also dedicated to dogs off leash.  <b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.  <b>No change to proposed local laws.</b>
52	An off leash dog park is very necessary in Mapleton as a large percentage of the community own a dog. It improves community spirit, enables older persons to socialise and is great for dogs being able to run without fear of being injured.  Recommend A dog park is located within the boundaries of the lily pond park.	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.  <b>No change to proposed local laws.</b>
53	Subordinate Local Law No. 2 (Animal Management) 2011. I agree with the Amendment but would like to ask the Council to consider adding the Mapleton-Lily ponds as an extra Off Leash area for dogs.  There are a large number of dogs in Mapleton and there is nowhere for them to run freely other than going off the Range. The Mapleton-Lily ponds is large enough to have a designated off-leash area and still allow others to enjoy the park/playground.	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.  <b>No change to proposed local laws.</b>
54	Subordinate Local Law No. 2 (Animal Management) 2011. Wish to add Off Leash Dog Park in Mapleton.  Can the Council PLEASE implement the provision of a fenced, off leash dog park in Mapleton? The Mapleton Lily-ponds Park is already used as a dog walking area. This has been on the table in Councils Concept Master plan since 2003! We have the space. It just needs to be built.	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.  <b>No change to proposed local laws.</b>
55	I do not disagree with the proposed changes to amendment section 6 regarding existing DOLA but suggest that Council has overlooked a DOLA for the Mapleton area.  I propose that a fenced dog off leash area be approved and constructed in the Mapleton area as soon as possible, in keeping with Council's Concept Landscape Master plan of 2003. There are many dog lovers and owners in the Mapleton area and surrounds whose lifestyle would be enhanced by the construction of a DOLA as soon as possible.	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.  <b>No change to proposed local laws.</b>
56	Subordinate Local Law No. 2 (Animal Management) 2011. Wish to add Off Leash Dog Park in Mapleton  As a registered Dog owner in Mapleton, and MADCA's Dog Park advocate, I respectfully urge Council to implement the provision of a fenced, off leash dog park within Mapleton Lily-ponds Park as foreshadowed in Councils Concept Master-plan of 2003	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.  <b>No change to proposed local laws.</b>
57	Grounds to have an off leash dog park in Mapleton.  We need a fence dog park for our dogs to run off leash safely.	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.  <b>No change to proposed local laws.</b>

SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED NOT RELATED TO CURRENT PROPOSED AMENDMENTS			
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Recommendation
58	<p>In relation to the Animal Management changes I strongly recommend that Council increase the areas under review to include areas around Coolum, Yaroomba and Marcoola. As Council would be aware there has been a significant increase in residents in this area and in particular Peregrian Springs and consequently an increase on dogs as well as an increase in Airbnb rentals that permit animals. This has led to an imbalanced increase in dog traffic at leash free zones and an increase in negative incidents and dog attacks. The incidents would appear to have been caused in the main by irresponsible dog owners who believe leash free means "Run Wild" areas and no supervision required and poor education and/or signage. Also there appears to be an unbalanced increase in the number of specific breeds that have potential for harm. These problems could be addressed through education, improved signage and separation areas (i.e. smaller breeds separated from larger). I personally have faced many situations of concern 2 of which I have reported to Council. One a savage attack on a little Sydney Silky and one of a threat of physical violence when requesting an owner not permit his dog to jump on me or my dogs. I recently lost a treasured silver bracelet when a large dog repeatedly jumped on me at the entrance to Yaroomba Beach (not even leash free) but accompanied by his owners. The actions of irresponsible owners, their lack of education and the absence (outside of fines) of any strategic monitoring and regulation by Council has the potential to lead to Legal Action and raising the question of a duty of care of the Council to manage these issues. It is not uncommon to hear small dog owners admitting they no longer take their dogs to the beach as it is dangerous! Jacinta Lipson Yaroomba Beach Resident</p> <p>Recommend 1. Consultation with Dog owners who have been directly impacted by the increasing dog numbers and/or attacks. 2. Improved Signage - i.e. more prominent and more detailed - to include owner responsibilities and other limitations. 3. Implementation of dog separation areas e.g. leash free areas just for small dogs up to 5 kgs (giving consideration to the exclusion of puppies of known troublesome breeds). Few people are aware of the latest data that Staffies were responsible for more injuries to humans and other dogs than any other breed. 3. Information pack to new residents and or new dog registrations advising of responsibilities in relation to dog ownership and off lead areas. 4. Information pack to all Airbnb who permit dogs and requirement they ensure their guests are aware of regulations. 5. Ongoing monitoring of small dog breeds Owners' as to outcomes;</p>	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	<p>Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.</p> <p><b>No change to proposed local laws.</b></p>
59	I would like to bring to council's notice that there is nowhere south of Caloundra where we can run a dog on a beach off leash. I propose an area between Onslow St and Jellico St Golden Beach with an off leash time between 4pm and 8am.	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	<p>Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.</p> <p><b>No change to proposed local laws.</b></p>
60	I am requesting consideration to add a fenced off leash Dog Park in the Mapleton or Montville areas, for the immense benefits to the local residents as well as the many tourists who travel with pets, who visit the area. Council to implement the provision of a fenced, off leash dog park within Mapleton Lily-ponds Park area as foreshadowed in Councils Concept Masterplan of 2003, for the immense benefits to the local residents as well as the many tourists who travel with pets, who visit the area. Council to implement the provision of a fenced, off leash dog park in the parkland bordering the recently upgraded parking facility behind the Montville shopping strip, for the immense benefits to the local residents as well as the many tourists who travel with pets, who visit the area.	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	<p>Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.</p> <p><b>No change to proposed local laws.</b></p>
61	I am requesting consideration to add a fenced off leash Dog Park in Mapleton or Montville areas, for the immense benefits to the local residents as well as the many tourists who travel with pets, who visit the area. Council to implement the provision of a fenced, off leash dog park within Mapleton Lily-ponds Park area as foreshadowed in Councils Concept Master-plan of 2003, for the immense benefits to the local residents as well as the many tourists who travel with pets, who visit the area. Council to implement the provision of a fenced, off leash dog park in the parkland bordering the recently upgraded parking facility behind the Montville shopping strip, for the immense benefits to the local residents as well as the many tourists who travel with pets, who visit the area.	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	<p>Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.</p> <p><b>No change to proposed local laws.</b></p>
62	No changes to off leash areas on current beaches. There are already not enough. No changes to off leash dog beaches in the Caloundra + Golden Beach / dicky Beach areas.	<p>The amendment local law proposes no changes to the existing dog off leash areas on the beach. There is currently over 13.5 km of beach across the region that is dedicated dog off leash areas.</p> <p><b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b></p>	<p>Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.</p> <p><b>No change to proposed local laws.</b></p>
63	That off leash areas to start 20m from the beach end of beach access walkways. This would allow dog owners to have space to view the beach situation eg other dogs, children, people before allowing their dogs off leash.	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	<p>Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.</p> <p><b>No change to proposed local laws.</b></p>
64	Quite happy to have more off leash areas but then council need to be very strong on those owners who do not obey the rules. I do not walk the beach anymore and have not done so for some years purely because at Coolum dogs are off lease in a leashed area. Furthermore I will not use public transport if dogs are permitted on buses/trains etc. I do not use eating houses that allow dogs inside or near food tables. Our club rules stipulate that at afternoon/morning tea and other eating areas dogs are not permitted.	<b>This submission does not relate to current amendments.</b>	<p>Submission will be referred to appropriate operational areas within Council.</p> <p><b>No change to proposed local laws.</b></p>