

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Proposal: Charles Veryard Reserve – Installation of Dog Exercise Area Fencing (Full or Partial Enclosure)

OPTION 1:

In favour (5)	Officer comments where relevant
2 favour with no further comment	Noted.
2 comments relating to amendments to the plan.	Noted. We do not see any point in the fence alignment along the western side being cut back any further and then being more open to the main active area.
Aren't dogs meant to be on leads?	Noted. Dogs are to remain on leash only if an approved sporting activity is on within the main active area.

OPTION 2:

In favour (53)	Officer comments where relevant
49 in favour with no further comment.	Noted.
2 comment relating to amendments to the plan.	Noted. Request that dog area should extend right up to Bourke Street. This is not supported mainly due to the additional cost and the fact that the area closest to Bourke Street is already landscaped and includes a path.
Charles Veryard is the only dedicated off-lead dog park in the region, it makes complete sense to fence it off to allow dogs to play without owners constantly worrying about them running off.	Noted. Option 2 is the recommended option being put to Council.
This is a great idea. Please take up Option 2. This is much safer for the dogs and great peace of mind as an owner that your dog can't run out of the enclosure.	Noted, as above.

OPTION 3:

In favour (1)	Officer comments where relevant
Option 1 and 2 will take away from the aesthetics of open and spacious parklands. As the area will not be fully enclosed it seems pointless to install a large amount of fencing.	Noted. Option 3 only allows for a small section of fencing along the Bourke Street frontage.

OPTION 1, OPTION 2 AND OPTION 3:

One in favour for all three options.

Against (11)	Officer comments where relevant
Dogs should not be allowed anywhere near the park...	Noted.
For dog owners whose animals are not under vocal control and who are concerned about the safety of their dogs running onto a road, the City of Vincent already provides fenced dog exercise options within proximity to this park.	This is not correct, there are no fully enclosed dog exercise areas within proximity to this park.
I do not support enclosing a section of park that is currently all designated a dog exercise area. At present at different times of the day/year different portions of the park are used at different times of the day by different groups.	The provision of a fully enclosed area for dogs, allows dog owners to exercise their dogs off leash whilst events are being held in the active areas of the park where there is a requirement for dogs to remain on leash at those times.
There is no need for a whole fenced-in park.	Noted.
It will look ugly and be very expensive to build and maintain.	The addition of landscaping around the fence line will assist in softening the impact of the fence installation.
The safety of the animals that enter the reserve does and should remain the responsibility of the dog owner. There is no place for the City of Vincent to be committing funds to a project to prevent animals for straying onto adjacent roadways.	Noted.
It should be the responsibility of dog owners to ensure the safety of their pets – not ratepayers.	Noted.
All dogs should be under control at all times therefore not necessitating any fences.	Noted.
As dogs are now allowed on Charles Veryard Reserve I cannot see the purpose of installing a fence on the perimeter.	Dogs are permitted to exercise off leash at Charles Veryard Reserve except when an approved activity is being undertaken within the main active areas.
Obviously having to put fencing around the park is the indication the park is not suitably sized for a dog exercise area, and if the dog owner can't control their dog then they should not expect to take off the leash or indeed they should not have it in a high density area for the inner city.	Charles Veryard Reserve is the City's second largest active sporting area and at 5.5 hectares is well suited to cater for all users including dog owners who require areas to exercise their pets.
We need more open space not delegated fence areas. It is important to remember that parks are there for all the benefit of all the community.	The proposed fence is not reducing the area of open space, simply enclosing a section of the park.

Neither for nor against (1)	Officer comments where relevant
I prefer no fencing whatsoever. However out of the three options my preference would be Option 3.	Noted.