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Holiday Home Policy Feedback
Stakeholder Group: Unregistered
Background

Complaints from the community about various situations involving short-stay accommodation had filtered through to sitting Councillors, who in turn requested Shire Officers to review the Holiday Home Policy [Local Planning Policy 7 – Holiday Houses]. Deputations from various members of the public supported the call for tighter controls. As the policy is a local one, developed some years ago by the Council of the day, the officers had no choice but review the policy in light of community concern.

Additional concern surfaced that a new policy might be developed that would place stricter controls on short-stay accommodation but would perhaps be unreasonable and/or difficult to police, therefore unnecessary. A request was made to not proceed with the review until key stakeholder groups had been consulted.

The review by officers did proceed, however, it was agreed that the suggested changes would be put to three key stakeholder groups for feedback before the modified policy was put back to Council. One of the key stakeholder groups is those who operate unregistered short-stay accommodation [USSA] who use AirBnB or similar online booking platforms.

The meeting of USSA took place 9-11am on 24 Thursday 2018 at the Margaret River Community Resource Centre. Thirty people attended with a further 6 indicating interest but unable to attend. The Margaret River Business Centre facilitated this meeting and used the chart developed by Shire officers to seek feedback on each point raised for potential change. The balance of this report lists that feedback, point by point, with general commentary at the conclusion.
### Policy Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>REASON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Change name of Policy to LPP7 – Short Stay Uses in Residential areas.</td>
<td>To reflect the intended inclusion of parameters relating to ‘Guesthouses’ and ‘Bed and Breakfast’ land uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback:
- Seems a name change only
- Not a concern

| 2   | Remove ‘performance criteria’ from the Policy | This creates the understanding that there is a high degree of flexibility built into the Policy. |

Feedback:
- Remove all performance criteria
- People know what they are getting when they book, criteria are unnecessary
- Confusion over kitchens eg. Chalets
- Would you rather have people using a portable gas one-pot cooker on the bed? Or install a kitchen?
- If you rent the granny flat, kitchen in main house to be used?
- Farmers often have these ancillary dwellings and people want to be able to cook in them
- Distinguish ancillary long-term rentals from ancillary SSA, but people want flexibility in order to move with the market, ie summer vs. winter guests
- Some people are already moving between long-term and short-stay to make full use of their property
- 60% occupancy is minimum for viability; 80% more desirable
- If performance criteria are to be listed, there needs to be greater clarity

### Location

| 3   | Modify Policy Area Map to that at Attachment 2. | Avoids cutting through property boundaries. Includes properties in ‘Stewart Street’ precinct, which have been specifically identified for short stay use via prior structure planning. |

Feedback:
- Where did the 300m radius of town centre come from in the first place? Is the Post Office or Woolworth’s included?
- Boundaries are unclear; cut through some properties
- Why do we need a map at all?
- If a map is going to be used, it needs to follow streets or other clear boundaries
- The boundaries need to be justified; seems there are different rules for different people
- No SSA allowed in Rapids Landing or Brookfield but OK in Riverslea…why?
- The economy is tough, people need to be able to use an AirBnB situation to supplement incomes and be generally financially viable
- The map is inaccurate
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Include a policy provision that limits guesthouses to the same areas as holiday houses.</td>
<td>Guesthouses have the same potential to negatively impact upon surrounding residential amenity as holiday houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Agreed. Guest houses where the owner/manager lives onsite are the same as holiday homes where the owner doesn’t live there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Beach holiday houses cause much of the problem…all factors need to be taken into consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Modify Policy provision AD1.3 which currently allows Holiday Houses on lots greater than 1,000m² such that it prevents holiday houses other than in defined areas unless the property is 1ha in size.</td>
<td>A significant amount of complaints regarding holiday homes comes from owners within ‘low density’ residential areas. Owners advise that their choice to live in these areas is influenced by an understanding that they are quiet ‘lifestyle’ areas, which are different in character to more traditional suburban areas or rural residential lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Complaints come from holiday houses in low density areas…become party houses…understandable that no one wants to live next door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There are problems with holiday homes on large blocks where the owner does not live there; bush fires, power overloads, lack of familiarity with local conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It’s not just overseas visitors (Singaporeans) but also Perth visitors who think they are in the country and can do whatever they like (fires on the beach in summer, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• With no supervision on larger blocks, visitors will make a lot of noise as they can’t see the neighbors so think it doesn’t matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Standard noise ordinances can be reported to the police anyway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Seems low density, large blocks of 1ha or more, and rural blocks of less then 1000sqm are the biggest problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• I disagree with this change. These properties offer a much nicer experience for those requiring a get away from noise, and wanting to connect with nature. I do not see why a limit on property size is relevant, unless a rating code is applied for the shire to charge even more rates. If the number of visitors per night were limited that would be more considerate to the local residents. Only allowing visitors in a defined “residential” area certainly limits this opportunity. Again having the landowners either living on the property or with a 35 min drive would help maintain a quite and relaxed local environment too. The other fact is that these usually have independent water supplies because of their size and are independent of the town supply making the property more sustainable and not as big a burden on shire water resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Modify Policy provision AD5.2 so that a manager must be located with 35mins drive from the holiday house (reduced from 1 hour)</td>
<td>Ensures that complaints can be handled in a more timely way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Manager should be within 35min drive so complaints can be handled more efficiently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Perth-based owners may rent out directly initially, but often turn to an agency later as problems develop; perhaps should be required to use an agency where whole house is being let, w/o owner nearby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mobile phone range is an issue even for those owners living in the district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leave the policy as it is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good suggestion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Include a policy provision that allows the owner of a holiday house to reside in an ancillary dwelling located on the same property.</td>
<td>Currently, if a dwelling is approved for holiday house use, any ancillary dwelling on the property must not be used for accommodation purposes of any sort. The change would allow an owner to reside on the property thus being able to take an active management role, and deal with any issues immediately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Definitely add this change; if the owner resides on the property, can rent-out the granny flat long term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some wish to mix long-term with short-term rental as market demands change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The rules are strict and are meant to be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Why is there a distinction? A rental is a rental, isn’t it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This is a much better idea, allowing for visitors to be better managed. The property is better managed and any dangers reduced too, ie bushfire emergencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>Remove specific reference to a maximum of 8 occupants.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Holiday Houses fall into two categories being Holiday House (up to 6 persons), and Holiday House large (up to 12 persons). The number of persons that can be accommodated in a house is otherwise guided by such limiting factors as the number of bedrooms and the capacity of any onsite effluent disposal systems.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Remove reference to 8 occupants</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of bedrooms is sufficient to regulate this</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Most of this is in standard building regulations anyway</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>If we are regulating occupants, what about vineyard workers, etc where many are cramped into the same bedroom? The Seasonal Worker Migration Scheme has many rules anyway</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The need to limit to 8 is unclear</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Why is it up to Council to stipulate the numbers anyway?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>Include provision, which confirms that each bedroom can only be accommodated by a maximum 2 persons over the age of 2.</strong></td>
<td><strong>A greater number of residents can increase the risk of offsite issues such as noise. This provision removes the ability to have ‘bunk rooms’.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reword this to say ‘adults’ per room, not persons</strong></td>
<td><strong>Make it 2 adult persons</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Good suggestion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>Include provision which more clearly articulates the form of a guesthouse as needing to be purpose built (as distinct from a dwelling)</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Shire has received applications for structures which are purported to be ‘guesthouses’ but could also be used as two separate dwellings in an area where this level of development would not otherwise be allowed. Additional provisions will provide a greater capacity for the Shire to refuse development which does not represent a genuine form of guesthouse.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Guest houses are purpose built these days</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Homes are being built (plans are available for off-the-plan build) to accommodate 2 families with central living spaces and separate bath, kitchen, bedrooms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>If under the same roof, but family composition changes, why not allow the second living space to be rented out as SSA?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Some people are specifically designing houses with spaces that can be used as self-contained SSA space</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Higher density can be a positive trend; allows more flexibility when building

| 11 | Include a provision, which more clearly articulates the form of bed and breakfasts as being conducted within a dwelling. | The use ancillary dwellings for short stay accommodation purposes (see 13 below) can currently be achieved by removing the kitchen and changing the use of the structure to a separate part of the primary dwelling. This is not consistent with a more traditional understanding of a bed and breakfast land use where guests are accommodated within the primary dwelling. |

Feedback:
- This is unclear, ie current policy with regard to Bed & Breakfast
- Why would you want to remove the kitchen? Kitchens are expensive
- Guests want their own space and not necessarily the standard big breakfast and shared space
- Market will dictate the demand
- Agree there is no such thing as a ‘level playing field’ in business

Affordability

| 12 | Include a provision which prevents the use of single bedroom dwellings for holiday house use | Single bedroom dwellings receive a concession from the land area requirements of the R-Codes on the basis that they provide for a more affordable form of housing. Use of these properties for short stay use is counter to this objective. |

Feedback:
- Strong opposition to this change
- Shire trying to solve the affordable housing issue by regulating holiday accommodation
- Not the Shire’s role
- Puts people out of flexible housing
- Many guests are young professionals on modest budgets; want their own space but not a BIG bill
- What is the exact reason for this policy change?
- Larger businesses unoccupied pay rates, fees, land tax, etc anyway
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13</th>
<th>Include a provision which prevents the use of an ancillary dwelling for holiday house use.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ancillary dwellings receive a concession from the land area requirements of the R-Codes on the basis that they provide for a more affordable form of housing. Use of these properties for short stay use is counter to this objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback:
- This is NOT required...see earlier comments
- I disagree with this change. Ancillary dwellings should be able to be used for a multiple of different types of accommodation during their lifetime and should stay as flexible. This may be the only way a family can accommodate change in the future and enable retirees to stay independent of government pensions. Perhaps ancillary dwellings that are registered for short stay are not included in this R code. Perhaps just one ancillary dwelling for hire on each registered property bringing down the population of people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire</th>
<th>Include a policy provision to reiterate the requirements of SPP3.7 and the Planning for Bushfire Prone Area guidelines which do not support ‘vulnerable land uses’ within areas having a BAL rating of 40 or FZ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In order to reinforce the state government’s position in this regard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback:
- Agreed that holiday homes MUST look at their risk levels
- We are in a bushfire risk area
- BAL is being taken care of through housing codes
- Fire risk and BAL are separate issues
- New building regulations do specify bush fire issues and windows, etc; there are different fire ratings where houses are side-by-side
- Building codes should be enforced; especially older buildings that may need retrofitting
- Tourists are dangerous!
- We have a problem with this one as the entire region of Margaret River falls under the bushfire prone provision. This map clearly shows the whole shire pink therefore prone. Perhaps a much better provision would be properties with a BAL of 40 to be able to ask visitors to be prepared to leave on days where catastrophic conditions occur. The problem with FZ is any area that has previously been burned by a fire like Prevelly, so this does not work in our shire. The word “area” needs to be reconsidered. Perhaps “property” used instead. Now if a property owner has gone to all the trouble to prepare their property and bring it down to a better BAL rating from building and clearing etc they should be allowed to use their property for accommodation. In fact the larger the area the more effective the clearing would be.
General Comments:

1. Agreed that the Shire should go right back to the beginning with a proper community engagement process to write a fresh policy with consideration to new styles of short-term accommodation and new market demands

2. When looking at the policy look at the big picture, we may not want it (a policy) at all

3. Stakeholders are really our customers; they have the money to hire what they want

4. Is this policy Council officers just responding to complaints or are there genuine needs for a policy?

5. Isn’t this really just about money for Council? Unregistered operators don’t want to spend money unnecessarily and traditional accommodation operators are loosing money because of reduced tourism numbers and low occupancy rates

6. The world is changing; our customers are global; there are global marketing avenues, such as AirBnB; the sharing economy is here to stay

7. We need to be demonstrating to positive outcomes of tourism, such as the positive impact of AirBnB type properties on the local economy

8. For many people, and AirBnB type property allows people to earn the money to live here and they do it (the rental) well

9. One person commented they received a $50,000 infringement notice for renting an unregistered property; discussion on cost to register with Shire; discussion on the current policy, that if you don’t fit it precisely you are non-compliant and infringements are issued

10. Ask the Shire to STOP issuing infringement notices until this policy can be re-worked using an appropriate engagement process

11. The Shire needs a clear and simple complaint handling process

12. Ask your guests to write comments and give as feedback to the shire of the value of unregistered properties

13. The area needs alternative accommodation as often the hotels and other traditional places are full, especially during key events

14. No new traditional accommodation is being built; tells us that demand is changing

15. Plea to the group to think of ways that the whole concept of flexible, alternative accommodation can be painted in a positive light

16. Alternative accommodation brings money to the local community by offering consumer choice

17. Agree that ‘party’ houses need to be curtailed but disagree that AirBnB style properties are lowering the standard of accommodation and giving the region a bad name

18. Properties continuously disruptive to their neighbours should be shut down using existing regulations; address “good neighbour” concerns as they arise by using existing nuisance ordinances rather than solely focusing on the use of the property as a short-term rental.

19. Local government can fall into the trap of placing so much regulation on the sector that SSA are prohibited; a rental is a rental
20. Private property owners have the right to live in their property, rent their property on a long-term basis, or rent their property on a short-term basis and these rights do not need interference from local government; local government should protect economic opportunity.

21. Currently private property is rented out long term without any special intervention from Local Govt and therefore by default the property is deemed to be safe & suitable for you or I to live in. Why therefore if the same property is being rented on a short-term basis should it then need inspection by Local Govt to deem it safe and suitable?

22. How do I go about getting approval without being victimised by the council Nazis, especially as my property is not within their current guidelines?

23. Hotels are a time warp to the 70s.

24. I do live on a street that has lots of houses up for private rentals - and it does cause a noise issue along with other things, party houses etc.

25. It concerns me that the area has just had a big increase in funding for tourism yet the area struggles at peak times (which are becoming more frequent with the events now being run) to accommodate the visitors that we have already - and that’s with hundreds of AirBnB or other private run accommodations - how does the area cope with more visitors with less accommodation available as the shire progressively shuts down existing unregistered businesses?

26. I would like the shire to define BnB within a commercial v hobby perimeter - hobby - if by tax laws due example you are considered not a business - lower than commercial rates, low income - under tax threshold. And to be run from Home with homeowner present during stay as opposed to whole of house commercial business. Or something like that.

27. The shire has done so much harm to the general persons impression of the shire, it’s staff and how they work, by the way they use telephone harassment and letters bearing massive fines, to bring unregistered properties to heel.

28. I am more peeved now by people advertising cooking events in their home when I know no commercial kitchen license (after we were hounded about “selling food”) the uneven playing field.

29. The Shire is coming across as no good will, no embracing new ways of work, no idea sharing or consultation and plenty of perceived or real outside influence on policy; they operated with threat - increasing your rates (but without being able to monetise the cost), fear of tax man involvement, fear of non-coverage by insurance, etc.

30. A neighbour who has just built 2 units in Parkwater have been horrified by all the negative noise on social media re the shire and AirBnB - so much so that now they don’t want to even consider registering or operating as BnB. They will do long term lease - which is fine but not good re tourism and rapidly increasing needs in the area.

31. I hope some positive changes arise but we are already missing the small income I was able to channel back into local suppliers - eggs, coffee, South West Provisions, bakery, and local buy and sell. I know many others employed cleaners, gardeners, handy people ... the reduction in private BnB will take its toll.

32. If operating from home why aren’t you treated like other home businesses - hairdresser, beautician, lash tinter, spray tanner, massage therapist, furniture restorer/upseller etc. These businesses operating from home generate far more street traffic than one car for BnB per night.
Summary:

It is clear that the idea of unregistered accommodation is a contentious one, however, there was a general acceptance that modest regulation should be in place.

Throughout the discussions, there was reference to AirBnB as a type of accommodation when in fact, AirBnB is only one of many online booking platforms. The confusion seems to arise because those who offer unregistered accommodation tend to use the sharing economy and its various platforms to advertise their offering. This needs monitoring as the policy is reformulated.

There was a consensus that accommodation of several types/styles where the owner or manager lives under the same roof as the offered space, or in a dwelling immediately adjacent to the SSA, should receive entirely different treatment than those offers of a stand-alone complete dwelling, particularly in low-density residential areas.

Concerns were raised as to the reason behind the registration of your accommodation offer with local government and there is a lack of clarity here. Many are of the opinion that registration is simply a cash grab and expressed considerable unhappiness with the tactics being used by local government to enforce the registration process.

Finally, there was complete agreement that in light of the wide variety of accommodation options, the advent of AirBnB and similar booking platforms, and the cost of living in the Shire of Augusta Margaret River, the entire Holiday House Policy needs a complete revamp. All present were enthusiastic about a ‘stage 2’ community process where accommodation providers can genuinely be engaged to help draw up a policy that protects the rights of property owners, encourages the sharing economy, and provides a variety of accommodation options to visitors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>No. of comments</th>
<th>Summary of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Change name of policy to LPP7 – Short Stay Uses in Residential areas. | To reflect the intended inclusion of parameters relating to ‘Guesthouses’ and ‘Bed and Breakfast’ land uses. | 4 in support 4 of objection | BNB or hosted holiday homes should be exempt from requirements (no approval necessary)  
Hosted and unhosted forms of accommodation should be dealt with separately. |
| 2   | Remove ‘performance criteria’ from the policy                          | Creates the understanding that there is a high degree of flexibility built into the policy.                  | 2 in support 2 of objection | Map should include whole of Shire and clearly set out permissible / prohibited areas.  
Allowable Area could be slightly wider. |
| 3   | Modify policy Area Map to that at Attachment 2.                       | Avoids cutting through property boundaries. Includes properties in ‘Stewart Street’ precinct, which have been specifically identified for short stay use via prior structure planning. | 4 in support 6 of objection | Map should include whole of Shire and clearly set out permissible / prohibited areas.  
Allowable Area could be slightly wider. |
| 4   | Include a policy provision which limits guesthouses to the same areas as holiday houses. | Guesthouses have the same potential to negatively impact upon surrounding residential amenity is holiday houses. | 1 in support 3 of objection | Should change to 3000m2  
Too restrictive  
Arbitrary |
| 5   | Modify policy provision AD1.3 which currently allows Holiday Houses on lots greater than 1000m² such that it prevents holiday houses other than in defined areas unless the property is 1ha in size. | A significant amount of complaints regarding holiday homes comes from owners within ‘low density’ residential areas. Owners raise their choice to live in these area as being influenced by an understanding that they are quiet ‘lifestyle’ areas which are different in character to more traditional suburban areas or rural residential lots. | 5 in support 6 of objection | Should change to 3000m2  
Too restrictive  
Arbitrary |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affordability**

| 12 | Include a provision which prevents the use of single bedroom dwellings for holiday house use | Single bedroom dwellings receive a concession from the land area requirements of the R-Codes on the basis that they provide for a more affordable form of housing. Use of these properties for short stay use is counter to this objective. | 1 in support 14 of objection | Should allow in R5 areas, coastal settlements and areas of significant tourist attraction. |
| 13 | Include a provision, which prevents the use of an ancillary dwelling for holiday house use. | Ancillary dwellings receive a concession from the land area requirements of the R-Codes on the basis that they provide for a more affordable form of housing. Use of these properties for short stay use is counter to this objective. | 2 in support 26 of objection | Will reduce incentive to build ancillary dwellings. Could be limited to just allowing short stay use in coastal areas. Do not support this radical new change. |
### Fire

| 14. | Include a policy provision to reiterate the requirements of SPP3.7 and the Planning for Bushfire Prone Area guidelines which do not support ‘vulnerable landuses’ within areas having a BAL rating of 40 or FZ. | In order to reinforce the state government's position in this regard. | 5 in support 5 of objection | Holiday Homes should not be approved in rural zones as risk of visitors lighting a fire in restricted season is too great.  
Too onerous.  
A BAL assessment does not go far enough.  
Yearly inspection required.  
Do not want to see vegetation removed as it has adverse impact on tourist experience.  
Need clarity on what is referred to DFES |

### Other Suggestions

| 15. | Need better explanation of what is an Area of Tourist Attraction. | 3 in support |
| 16. | Concerned about impact of policy on achieving a renewal. | 12 in support |
| 17. | Shire needs to increase policing of unapproved holiday homes. | 17 in support |
| 18. | Providers should be required to have public liability insurance. | 5 in support 1 of objection | All fees should be reduced as they are onerously high. |
| 19. | Request a maximum HH on any one street/or cap on number in the Shire. | 4 in support |
| 20. | Concerned about the impacts of holiday homes on rural residential amenity. | 1 in support |
| 21. | Policy should be more flexible | 2 in support 1 of objection | Need to provide greater certainty as to where holiday homes will/won’t be supported. |
| 22. | Concerned with use of open deck areas. | 1 in support |
| 23. | Concerned that holiday home providers are not paying the same rates as traditional providers. | 1 in support 1 of objection |
| 24. | Policy should address HH in rural zone. | 8 in support | Scheme change may be required.  
Should not be permissible as inconsistent with zone objectives. |
<p>| 25. | Holiday Homes should be treated the same as AirBnB | 1 in support 1 of objection | AirBnB help manage any issues as it provides for two way reviews. |
| 26. | Holiday Home owners should be required to join an accreditation program e.g. Australian Tourism Accreditation program. | 1 in support |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>All applications should be held in abeyance until an assessment is undertaken to determine the extent to which holiday homes are impacting traditional accommodation businesses.</td>
<td>1 in support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Remove Holiday House large altogether.</td>
<td>3 in support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>All accommodation requires on site management.</td>
<td>1 in support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Don’t understand the proposed changes and what they are trying to achieve – need more information</td>
<td>1 in support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sale of property should void approval.</td>
<td>1 in support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Holiday Homes negatively impact viability of traditional tourism operations.</td>
<td>4 in support</td>
<td>Shire should conduct more research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHEDULE OF MODIFICATIONS
**AMENDMENT NO. 56 TO LPS 1 AND RELATED STRUCTURE PLAN**  
**LOT 13 ASHTON STREET, MARGARET RIVER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Modification</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Modify Structure Plan and Structure Plan document to refer to the proposal as Structure Plan – Modification No. 2.</td>
<td>So that modifications to the original structure plan can be easily tracked over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Modify the Structure Plan so that it is consistent with Structure Plan - Modification No. 1.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Planning Policy 7 – Short Stay Accommodation

AMRShire Local Planning Policy
Changes post advertising

Local Planning Policies are guidelines used to assist the local government in making decisions under the Scheme. In considering an application for planning approval, the local government must have due regard to the relevant Local Planning Policies.

1.0 Introduction
The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance on the appropriate location, scale, use and management of short stay accommodation in the Shire. This policy is created under the Deemed Provisions of Local Planning Scheme No. 1.

2.0 Scope
Land zoned ‘Chalet & Camping’ and ‘Tourism’ is not within the scope of this policy.

3.0 Objectives
1. Short stay accommodation is located and managed so as to prevent inappropriate impacts upon the amenity of surrounding areas.
2. Short stay accommodation is sited, sized and designed to be consistent with the character of the surrounding area.
3. The primacy, affordability and use of the residential areas of the Shire for residential purposes is maintained.
4. Short stay activity is appropriately managed so as not to cause nuisance or annoyance to the owners of adjoining or nearby properties.
5. Small, purpose built affordable accommodation such as single bedroom and ancillary dwellings remain available for affordable and long term accommodation.

4.0 Interpretations

“Low Density” means land zoned ‘Residential R5’ or lower.

“Area of Significant Tourist Attraction” means a place of interest where tourists visit typically for its inherent or exhibited cultural value, historical significance, natural or built beauty or amusement opportunities and for the purposes of this policy comprises the following:

- Any town centre or village centre in the Shire
- All areas of National Park and all beaches, caves and areas of recognised natural beauty
- The Margaret River and associated foreshore and Rails to Trails Reserve as shown on Policy Plan 1
- Other attractions that provide a point of activity or amusement for tourists.


“Person” means (for the purposes of calculating occupancy), a guest of over two years of age.
5.0 Policy provisions

HOLIDAY HOMES

HH1. Holiday Houses and Holiday Houses (Large) are to be:

- Located in coastal settlements. **Or**
- Located in urban areas where:
  - The property is located in whole or in part within the permitted area as shown on Policy Plan 1; **or**
  - Within 50m of a Village Centre zone in other inland settlements. **Or**
  - Located in areas of the Shire which are outside of the permitted area shown on Policy Plan 1 where
    - The property either adjoins, fronts or is within an ‘area of significant tourist attraction’; **or**
    - Comprised an area of not less than 1ha.

HH2. Holiday Houses within grouped dwellings may be permitted on properties developed at a density of R30/40 or lower.

HH3. The 24 hour contact details of the manager and owner of the Holiday House / Holiday House (Large) is are to be visible on the property from the nearest street frontage and maintained to the satisfaction of the Shire.

BED AND BREAKFAST

BB1. The owner/occupier of a bed and breakfast must reside within the property at all such times as the dwelling is being used for short stay accommodation.

BB2. Rooms available for short stay guests must be located within the main dwelling on the property and not within an ancillary dwelling on the same lot.

GUESTHOUSE

G1. The location of Guesthouses is to be as per HH1.

G2. Guesthouses will only be approved where they are designed and managed such that:

  - The accommodation of management and staff is ancillary to the accommodation of guests;
  - The design of the development is distinct from a residential dwelling in that the primary use of floor area is for the accommodation of guests and associated common facilities such as dining and recreation spaces;
  - The guesthouse has a designated reception area; and
  - All accommodation and common areas are under one roof, or tightly clustered and linked together (as distinct from chalets).

SINGLE BEDROOM DWELLINGS

SB1. Single bedroom dwellings are not to be used for short stay accommodation purposes.

ANCILLARY DWELLINGS

AD1. Ancillary dwellings are not to be used for short stay accommodation.

AD2. Ancillary dwellings may be utilised for permanent accommodation by the owner of the property, simultaneously with use of the primary dwelling for holiday house use.

GENERAL - AMENITY

GA1. Complaints and objections received in relation to the existing or proposed use of the property for short stay accommodation will be taken into consideration when determining applicable development applications.

GA2. Sufficient information is to be supplied to allow a comprehensive assessment of potential impacts upon the local amenity.
GENERAL - DESIGN/LAYOUT

GD.1 One parking bay per bedroom is to be provided together with bays for the use of permanent residents and (where applicable) staff. In the case of grouped dwellings, a total of two bays will be accepted and guest numbers will be limited accordingly.

GD.2. A reticulated water supply is provided and/or minimum 120,000 litre rainwater tank (plus provision for firefighting) as determined by the Local Authority.

GD.3. Existing or proposed on site effluent disposal systems are to sized according to the intended number of guests, or the number of guests reduced accordingly.

GD.4. Decks and balconies are located away from the bedrooms of neighboring dwellings and, if located close to living and dining areas of neighboring dwellings, suitable screening is provided.

GD.5. There is a visible distinction between the area to be used by the guests, areas of common property and adjoining grouped dwelling areas.

GD.6. Each bedroom of the dwelling accommodates a maximum of two persons at any one time.

GENERAL – FIRE

GF.1. Short stay accommodation proposed in a Bushfire Prone Area may require a Bushfire Attack Level Assessment, Bushfire Management Plan or Statement and an Emergency Evacuation Plan.

GF.2. Short stay accommodation proposed in a Bushfire Prone Area outside of a built up area will require a Bushfire Attack Level Assessment, Bushfire Management Plan and Emergency Evacuation Plan.

GF.23. Bushfire Management Plans for a Holiday House outside of a residential built up area are to be prepared by accredited bushfire consultants and area will be referred to the Department of Fire an Emergency Services for comment.

GF.34. Short stay accommodation proposed in areas with a Bushfire Attack Level Assessment rated at BAL -40 or FZ are unlikely to be granted planning approval.

GENERAL – MANAGEMENT

GM.1. Proposals are to be accompanied by

- An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Management Plan including fire escape route maps and other details which shall be prepared prior to commencement of the use.
- A plan which details the way in which the use will be managed. This will need to ensure that where management is ‘off site’ there is a manager or a contactable employee that permanently resides no greater than 35 minute’s drive from the site; and,
- A set of House Rules which apply to the site

GM.2. Amplified music may be only played outside between the hours of 10am and 10pm.

6.0 Planning Mechanisms

Development approvals issued for Holiday Houses and Holiday Houses (Large) granted under this policy shall initially be for a one year period unless the Local Government determines otherwise.

Such approvals may be renewed in the form of a new application for planning. In determining an application for renewal, the Local Government will consider the nature of any comments made regarding the operation of the activity and any other information available relating to the adverse impact of the activity on the amenity of neighbours and the surrounding area.

Where complaints have been made, issues relating to impact on amenity have been verified or other non-compliance with the planning approval has occurred, approval to the renewal application is unlikely to be granted.

Where the Local Government is satisfied that the holiday house or holiday house large has been appropriately managed, an approval of the renewal application for a period of up to three years may be granted followed by a further five year approval period for subsequent renewals.
Applications for renewal where approvals have been issued under previous versions of this policy (LPP7) will be considered notwithstanding that locational criteria (HH1-3) may not be able to be met. The Shire will have regard to the factors outlined above when determining an application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopted by Council</th>
<th>13 June 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed (Advertised)</td>
<td>24 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted by Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.2 Sustainable Development

11.2.3 REVIEW OF DOG EXERCISE AREAS

Attachment 1 – Consultants Report
Attachment 2 – Maps of Existing Dog Exercise Areas
Attachment 3 – Maps of Proposed Changes to Dog Exercise Area – Flinders Bay
Attachment 4 – Maps of Proposed Changes to Dog Exercise Area – Gloucester Park
Attachment 1. Consultants Report

DOG EXERCISE AREA REVIEW – ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Introduction

The Shire of Augusta Margaret River (AMR) reviews dog exercise facilities every four years. In January 2018, the Shire invited residents to give feedback on the adequacy of the current gazetted dog exercise areas (DEAs).

Through a survey, the community was asked to consider what, if any, opportunities exist to modify, relocate, expand, reduce or improve DEAs. Two hundred responses were received, comprising 173 online surveys and 27 emailed or hard copy surveys and/or submissions. Of the online responses, 145 (79%) were dog owners. A number of the responses commented on more than one town, resulting in 270 responses overall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Number of responses specific to each town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>74 (58 online/16 email or hard copy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowaramup</td>
<td>14 (online)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnarabup/Prevelly</td>
<td>63 (54 online/9 email or hard copy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gracetown</td>
<td>16 (online)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret River</td>
<td>99 (90 online/9 email or hard copy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Brook &amp; Witchcliffe</td>
<td>4 (3 online/1 email or hard copy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of main results

In summary, the key points raised in each area were:

Augusta

- One focus of comments related to the Flinders Bay Beach area in front of the Flinders Bay Caravan Park, currently not a DEA.
  - 5 comments were for greater ranger enforcement
  - 18 comments called for this area to be included as a DEA
- More than 50 comments were in support of more dog exercise areas being made available, both on-lead and off-lead. In addition to the area in front of the Flinders Bay Caravan Park, other suggested areas included Dead Finish, Storm Bay, Granny’s Pool, and extending Jay’s Beach to Colourpatch.
- Three comments opposed any expansion of DEAs, with 10 comments about specific areas where dogs should not be allowed.
- Comments about existing DEAs included:
  - Flinders Bay, north-east area: 10 comments, all concerned about the impact of the cut and subsequent reduction in DEAs, and including three suggestions to remove this area as a DEA.
  - Civic Park: concern about dog access to the oval, and dogs being a nuisance on the Par 3 Golf Course.
Cowaramup

- Requests for a fenced area to be provided (5 mentions)
- Concerns raised about amenity and safety as the DEA is on an oval shared with the primary school (4 comments)
- Other DEA sites suggested at Parkwater (4 mentions), and trails in general.

Gnarabup/Prevelly

- Tension between competing uses and users of DEAs
  - 22 responses requested more DEAs, and included a number of suggested locations; and 5 responses said don’t expand, and included locations where dogs should not be allowed
- More facilities were identified as needed:
  - Poo bags/bins and dog bowls (16 mentions) at Rifle Butts and along pathways
  - Fencing of playground at Rifle Butts (4 mentions)
- 13 responses called for shared or dual use to be considered and negotiated (e.g. off-lead use at certain times of day, or seasonal use);
- 7 responses raised concerns about safety and amenity in shared-use areas
- 7 comments were for greater ranger enforcement, with specific mention of monitoring of dogs at the River Mouth.

Gracetown

- Strong interest in more DEAs (11 mentions), primarily beach sites such as Lefthanders and boat ramp area

Margaret River

- Hillier Park received 69% support through the online survey responses, but there is significant concern about the prospective loss of Gloucester Oval
- Comments about Gloucester Park covered four themes:
  - If Gloucester Park goes, another area west of Bussell Highway is needed (11 comments)
  - Explore shared use (10 comments)
  - Create a fenced area (4 comments)
  - Social impact of losing Gloucester Park (3 comments)
- Hillier Park comments covered two themes:
  - Fencing needed (12 comments)
  - Concern about the boggy part and snakes (2 comments)
- Big responses about what’s needed / future opportunities:
  - Fenced DEA needed (15 mentions)
  - More DEAs needed – in general (4 mentions), off-lead (8 mentions), beach areas (10 comments)
  - Suggested new DEAs -- beach areas (12 mentions), new suburbs including Rapids Landing and Brookfield (9 mentions) and Lantana Lane (3 mentions), and trails and river walks (28 mentions)
Rosa Brook and Witchcliffe

- Desire for more space generally

Suggestions for additional DEAs outside of the towns were Hamelin Bay, Karridale, Kilkarnup Beach and Contos Beach.

The full table of responses follows in the body of this report. Draft conclusions are presented on page 35.

Statistics from the online surveys
## THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUGUSTA</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four DEAs: Civic Park, Hillview Road north to</td>
<td>58 online responses: 53% (31) in support of current DEAs in Augusta 29% (17) not in support 17% (10) unsure Plus 16 hard copy or emailed survey responses: 76% (13) supported DEAs, specific and proposed 23% (4) supported dog prohibition in specific areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Civic Centre; Leeuwin Road Park, bounded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Leeuwin Road, Osnaburg and York Streets;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Augusta - Pericles Street, bounded by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies and Pericles Streets; Flinders Bay,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the surfer’s lookout Albany Terrace to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the point where Albany Terrace turns west</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXISTING DEAs

| Leeuwin Road Park, bounded by Leeuwin Road, Osnaburg and York Streets | • We find that as dog owners who live part time in Augusta our options for exercising our dog at the beaches are fairly limited due to the river cut and also the large amount of national parks that surround us here. ... The designated dog exercise area which abounds Osnaberg St is simply not feasible it’s just a big swathe of natural bushland with a single track running thru that is very overgrown and the area is full of snakes. |

| Civic Park, Hillview Road north to the Civic Centre | Support for the DEA:  
• The Civic Park dog exercise area is also a very important area in which to exercise dogs especially during inclement windy weather.  
• Open space behind Rec Centre near skatepark is wonderful  
Fence the DEA:  
• The current dog exercise in Augusta behind the Rec centre is in a suitable location however it could be transformed into a great fenced dog enrichment area where dogs are safe from traffic and running off after kangaroos. The park could include climbing challenges with planks at different levels, a wading pool and drinking fountain. |

### The Par 3 Golf Course

**Concern about off-leash use:**  
• My area of concern is the illegal use of the Civic Park 3 par golf course by dog owners. On any given day you will find 3 to 5 dog owners exercising their dogs without leads and without respect for golfers.  
• Dogs should be kept on a leash at all times and only let off up at the Civic Park bush area near the Lions Fenced area. They should not be allowed to roam anywhere on the Par 3 Golf Course  
**Allow shared use:**  
• As there are not many open grassed areas to walk your dog another idea I have is to allow dogs off lead on the Par 3 Golf Course at set times. e.g. early morning and evening. I often walk my dog through there and it is not a heavily used course. I tend to go there early morning and evening and usually no one is playing golf.  
**Make it a prohibited area for dogs:**  
• Requesting that the Par three Golf Course be marked on the Dog map as a Prohibited Area for dogs as people are letting their dogs loose when playing Golf and we have had numerous complaints of dogs picking up balls that are in play and the dog owners have been quite abusive when asked to put their dogs on a leash or to remove themselves and their dogs from the Golf Course. Do dogs should be allowed on the Golf Course even if they are on a leash.  
**Unusable space:**  
• DEA opposite police station is unusable as the bush is too thick with no uncleared spaces  
Shire Oval (3 mentions)
• The Shire Oval should be removed as a Dog Exercise area as the dog owners are not picking up dog droppings and this is a health hazard to anyone playing sport on the oval.
• I’m unsure if the town oval is an exercise area, but it should not be!!! Dogs should not be allowed inside the fence at any time.
• Dogs shouldn’t be allowed to go on the OVAL either as kids and adults use it all the time.

East Augusta

| No comments |

Flinders Bay, north-east area (other side of the cut)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern about impact of the cut:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The current off lead area at the beach at Augusta has been greatly reduced by the new channel cutting through. It would be great to have an additional area off lead alongside the water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By constructing the “Cut” at Augusta, this effectively more than halved the dog exercise area at Flinders Bay. It is incumbent on the Shire to compensate for this by developing further areas nearby as these are so important for the health and wellbeing of not only dogs but the dog owners themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The beach area for dogs isn’t big enough. It was fantastic before the cut, but of course nothing can be done about this anymore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very important that dog exercise areas are not restricted, or reduced any further, from what they are now. In fact 2/3rds of the area of Jay’s Beach was lost to dog exercise following the cutting of the river mouth from the ocean to the Blackwood river. The map, enclosed as part the information, clearly shows that dog owners and others have been severely disadvantaged by this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog exercise area in Augusta was fantastic until the stupid cut was put in!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What good is the beach on the cut....how are we meant to access that area with our dogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lovely long flat beach we used to enjoy i.e. Jays beach is all but gone. Two thirds is denied us as it is on the other side of the river now due to the river cut. What is left is often eroded to the point that older people find it dangerous to walk on, or the beach disappears in places altogether.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remove as a DEA:

| I think the area cut off by the cut should be removed as a dog exercise area. It now has value as a less disturbed shore bird nesting area. E.g. Hooded Plovers |
| Dogs should not be allowed near the old mouth of the river as the birdlife here is rich and warrants protection. |
| The new river mouth only brings it back to where it was from 1945 to 1996 so the area for exercising dogs east of the river mouth should be deleted as an exercise area. |

Flinders Bay, from the surfer’s lookout Albany Terrace to the point where Albany Terrace turns west

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jays Beach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important dog exercise area especially during the summer snake season. Augusta has a reputation as a dog friendly town and this is the reason many visitors come here for their holiday - they make a great deal of use of the beach to exercise their dogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay’s Beach and Dead Finish Beach provide more than enough beach for dog exercise. Flat rock near the yacht club also makes a great dog exercise area at the other end of the town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

June’s Beach

| Obviously since the river cut the large beach area to exercise dogs has been decreased dramatically unless you are lucky enough to have a boat! This leaves the fairly short region from the river mouth to Junes Beach which at times is not that accessible due to large amounts of seaweed etc to perhaps many dog owners, including many older folk |

Use of areas that aren’t part of DEAs

| The dog exercise beach area located between Turner Caravan Park and Flinders Bay Holiday Park is excellent and I take my 2 dogs there 2 or 3 times a week. |
• Beach from Colourpatch to Junes Beach is fantastic - we use this regularly & it works well for all involved. Airport trails are a wonderful addition during winter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More poo bags and bins</td>
<td>Deere Street entrance to Jays Beach (5 mentions): bins and bags needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranger enforcement

General comments:
- I believe there should be more pressure of dog owners to keep dogs on leash more regularly in public places. I realise dog owners want access to beaches for their animals and we have to adjust to this, but there needs to be a recognised code of conduct in on leash or other public areas.
- I feel that as long as one’s dog is under control and not a nuisance or danger to anyone, fines should not apply. However, not picking up after one’s dog and letting it run amok just ruins it for everyone. Those people need to be hit hard with fines.
- I would support the Shire being stronger on fines to those people who do not pick-up.
- Colour Patch has dogs roaming around, on and off the leash, going into the water also. With so many dogs around now the dog areas should be changed for the safety of the public… Dogs are also roaming around at the marina too. We definitely need a ranger patrolling Augusta all the time, so we can walk around safely. Owners should be complying with the Dog Act.
- There needs to be adequate policing of ‘by-laws’ regarding dogs especially at holiday times. Obvious signs for no dog areas displayed.
- The Shire Rangers are not controlling dog owners breaking the rules under the Dog Act in Augusta, every day I see dogs roaming free and others with owners but not on a leash, any day if I were a ranger I could fine at least 15 owners for not complying with the Dog Act.

Specific areas where problems have been experienced:

Flinders Bay Beach (south of FB Caravan Park) (5 mentions):
- There are already many people exercising or walking their dogs (off leads) in the prohibited zones south of Albany Terrace. Most days during summer there are dog owners that take their dogs to Flinders Bay Beach/Picnic Area (south of caravan park) with dogs off leads on the beach or at the children’s playground. Currently there does not appear to be any policing of the Prohibited Areas as dog owners continue to allow dogs to roam around the area. This can be verified by speaking to any regular user eg early morning swimmers, locals that visit the beach regularly.
- I also have three young children who love to play on the beach at Flinders and grannies pool I know these are dog free zones as they should be but it really does need to be policed.
- What is the point of having designated areas when they are flouted so consistently and not policed by the rangers? A dog beach should be in front of Flinder’s caravan park but with strict notices and enforcement about taking dogs onto the beach at Flinders Bay. Regularly - almost daily - I have to swim with at least one dog and often more and in 700+ days I have only once seen a ranger on site.
- Any beach that is used by the public, whether for swimming, fishing or walking should be excluded from the dog exercise areas. I’m sure the rangers would be aware of continuing conflict between dog owners and non-dog owners on beaches. I was personally threatened (and nearly assaulted) with a large piece of driftwood for asking an owner to stop his dog from jumping at my wife and I on a beach in Augusta. There is also a clear defiance of the regulations with many owners still exercising, and allowing dogs to run uncontrolled on the beach adjacent to the Flinders Caravan Park the beach.
- A ranger should be appointed to stay in Augusta over the Christmas holidays and Easter to make sure the rules are adhered to. Would like caretakers at Flinders Bay Caravan Park to inform park patrons they cannot take their dogs onto Flinders Bay Beach.

Old Flinders Beach and Storm Bay (2 mentions):

30
Dog owners ignore the dog prohibited areas in Augusta ALL THE TIME. For example, dogs are always at Old Flinders Beach and Storm Bay. We need rangers here more often fining people for allowing their dogs in prohibited areas.

Dogs should be on a lead at all times on the walkway to the boat harbour and they should not be able to go along the grass walkway to Storm Bay without a lead as well.

Par 3 Golf Course (1 mention):

My area of concern is the illegal use of the Civic Park 3 par golf course by dog owners. On any given day you will find 3 to 5 dog owners exercising their dogs without leads and without respect for golfers. It is requested that the Shire carry out the following remedies.
1. Erect a sizeable sign or signs in a prominent position stating dogs are prohibited on the course.
2. Have the shire ranger patrol and prosecute dog owners who do not comply.
3. On the Shire maps showing dog exercise areas clearly mark in red the golf course as not a dog exercise area.

Signage

Updated signage needed to signify DEAs
Specifically needed at Jay’s Beach:
- Jays beach is the perfect dog exercise area. Better signage is needed closer to the Flinders bay swimming area to say dogs are not allowed, as people presume they can take their dogs onto that beach and play area.

SUGGESTION S AND IDEAS

**Dead Finish area (7 mentions)**
- Open Dead Finish Beach as a 24/7 unrestricted dog beach
- Need large areas to walk dogs. What about Dead Finish to the boat harbour. extend areas in slow times of the year. Eg May till October. Remember walked dogs are happy dogs.
- Dead finish should be a dog exercise area from the disabled jetty north to the start of the boat harbour as there is very little sand to walk on in winter at Jays Beach and you finish up in the scrub which is not helpful to wildlife. Dead Finish is the only beach alternative that gives any decent length of beach....I walk Jays or Dead Finish with the dog nearly every day of the year and anyone who knows Augusta knows that there are very few people who swim or sunbake there in summer because of the wind. Most days you see a few dog owners, with some visitors walking Jays
- .. between Dead Finish and the Boat Harbour. It is a fairly steep beach and not frequented by people generally and I wouldn’t think it was a favoured area for sea birds.
- Dead Finish Beach and beaches all along the southern ocean to the Lighthouse Bay as this side of the road is not national park.

**Granny’s Pool (3 mentions)**
- Allow some other beaches e.g. Granny’s Pool and south of the Small Boat Harbour, for dog exercise before 9am and after 5pm daily.
- I think we should be allowed to take our dog past Flinders Bay Caravan Park (it’s a dog friendly park) right up to Flinders Bay (can be on lead there?) and be able to walk past Grannies pool and to boat Marina.

**Turner caravan Park (2 mentions)**
- I understand that Turner Caravan Park may not be able to cater for dogs in peak holiday season but why can’t it take dogs in the off season. At that time Flinders Caravan park is not available either.
- Dogs should not be allowed on Flinders beaches and not in the caravan park alongside them. Rather at Turner caravan park.

**Behind the oval (2 mentions)**
- The bush trails behind the Augusta football oval and firebreaks near the airport are appropriate dog exercise areas.
- Suggest the tracks between town oval and industrial area be approved as an exercise area.
Beach area in front of Flinders Bay Caravan Park (18 mentions)

- As a frequent use of Flinders Bay Caravan area the beach area in front of the caravan park is currently dog prohibited, we use the caravan park as it is dog friendly but the dog exercise area is 500 meters along the beach front access to this area is from the main road, I would like to see the dog prohibited area in front of the caravan park lifted to allow pet friendly owners to be able to access the current dog exercise area from the beach front from the caravan.

- I suggest an extension of the dog exercise area to the Flinders Bay Caravan Park (which accept dogs)

- At Flinders Bay Caravan Park have some of the beach for dogs as it’s a dog friendly park but you cannot take them across from the caravan park to the beach.

- That the dog exercise area along Jays Beach and Junes Beach be extended south to provide easy access for visitors using the Flinders Bay Caravan Park (FBCP). The situation now is that dog owners need to exit the caravan park precinct, cross the road twice to travel safely and walk quite a distance to access the current Dog Exercise Area. As the FBCP is government owned and is a dog friendly caravan park, at least one of the entry points from the park onto the beach should be within the dog exercise area; not only from a common sense point of view but because ‘duty of care’ comes into consideration.

- We would like to see the dog beach exercise area extend to include the beach area adjacent to the dog friendly Flinders Bay Caravan Park. If this is not an option due to conflict of use over busy holiday periods would the Shire consider seasonal closures, allowing dog access over the quieter months and limiting access during the summer season. This concept could be applied to other areas currently closed to dogs, seasonally making them off-lead exercise areas or if that is not acceptable then allowing dogs to be exercised on-lead.

- I believe that the allocated dog exercise areas in Augusta should not be diminished at all and in fact augmented. The exercise area from the Blackwood River cut south would benefit from being extended further south to the corner of Albany Tce (where it turns west towards Leeuwin Rd) this would mean that there is a nice beach area with protected reef pools for swimming with dogs. On many occasions during the busy season there are often dogs in this area anyway. There isn’t anywhere to swim all year round with your animal at the moment as Jay’s beach (near the Blackwood cut) is often very shallow, full of seaweed and the beach is normally not sandy for the humans to enjoy too! That minor extension would make a great improvement to the existing exercise area and would be a nice place to take both children and dogs for a day at the beach.

- I would like to see the dog beach exercise area on Albany Terrace at Junes Beach extended South, but not include Flinders Bay swimming beach. I cannot see the point of having a Caravan Park owned by the Shire which accepts dogs to stay, but dog owners cannot access the beach directly below the caravan park. That area of beach is hardly used by people. I have had tourists complain to me of having to walk out the front of the Park, along the footpath to the current dog beach, when the sensible access for owners and their dogs to have direct access to the beach from the park, head North and join up at Junes Dog Beach.

- There should be dog access from Flinders Bay Caravan Park all the way to the river mouth

- I would like to see the beach exercise areas extended from the cut all the way down to Flinders Beach Caravan Park, and then continue along the beach the other side of Flinders Beach Caravan Park.

- The area in front of Flinders bay CP which is dog friendly should be in the dog exercise area as this is why we and all other dog owners come to Flinders Bay CP. The area around the old boat ramp can be for swimmers and no dogs for at least 50 metres north of the walkway but from there to town should be dual use, dogs and humans.

- Because Flinders Bay Caravan Park allows pets supervised I feel the area in front and to the left of our small jetty can be allocated for dogs
## Extend Jays Beach to Colourpatch (3 mentions)
- Jays Beach needs to be continued north through the cut and stop as you reach the start of the boardwalk at the southern end of the Colourpatch. Too short otherwise.
- The majority of the area for the Augusta map is inaccessible due to the new river mouth. Realign the area correctly, and extend into Colourpatch.
- Extend from the beach in front of Flinders Bay Caravan Park to the River mouth corner down from the Colour Patch Rec Area.

## Storm Bay (4 mentions)
- This is an area where dogs can be contained as it is not national park

## Quarry Bay (2 mentions)
- Open up Quarry Bay (near the lighthouse on the Skippy Rock road) to be a dog beach. This beach would give dog owners an easily accessible alternative when the winds are in the south east.

## Other
- The area bounded by the airport road, Hillview Rd, Jack French park road and Allnutt Tce (excluding the school site) should also be included.
- Old railway levee
- The little park by Lilly Street and Bovell Street could be included as I go there regularly with my dog it is rare that I see anyone using it or the facilities.
- Open up the area along Blackwood River north, from Victoria Parade car park by the reserve all the way along to the Yacht Club.
- An on-lead trail from the estuary / inlet all the way to the lighthouse would be great.
- Off-lead at the ocean beach
- Flat Rock area near Yacht club
- Extend current area south to include Flinders bay Caravan Park (as a walk-through on lead) out to the marina via the footpath.

## Suggested new areas outside of Augusta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karridale (2 mentions)</th>
<th>Contos Beach (1 mention)</th>
<th>Hamelin Bay (6 mentions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It would be very nice to have a section of the area near Hamelin Bay opened up to a dog beach so that when the wind is in the south east as is very common in Augusta we can take our dog over to the western side of the cape and get out of the wind without having to travel too far north towards Margaret River.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live near Karridale and we have no area to exercise our dog except for driving 15 minutes to Augusta which has a very limited area or 30 minutes to Gnarabup. In speaking with some DBCA P&amp;W rangers there would be support from them of a dog exercise area at Hamelin Bay accessed from the Northern beach carpark with area being on the beach North of that to the rocks along Hamelin Bay (around 1 km). There are no Plover concerns as it is not a nesting area as the tide goes up to the sand dunes in that spot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be awesome if in the off season Hamelin Bay Beach could be an on lead dog beach to allow people to walk up this beautiful coastline. In Yallingup on the school holidays and peak tourist seasons certain beaches aren’t allowed to have dogs during specific dates and time but then the same beach is a dog beach in the off times or early in the morning and late in the evening when most of the crowds are gone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is annoying that dogs are prohibited at Hamelin bay and Granny’s Pool as it cuts short a terrific walk from Jays beach.

I feel that Hamelin Bay beach north of the boat ramp and north of the furtherest parking area now in place. People are bringing their dogs anyway on a regular basis to Hamelin bay disregarding signs Of NO Dogs. There is a better chance of managing the dog exerciser areas if it is a designated spot. NO one is going to be able to control people taking dogs to Hamelin as the population in new suburbs increases.

**More areas in general**

On-lead and off-lead

- I feel strongly that we need more off-lead exercise areas and areas where dog owners can be allowed with their dogs on lead. Dogs need to be exercised and it helps the owners too...In the spring and summer the snake danger to dogs is high if walking in the bush. Quite a large area of gazetted dog exercise area is bushland, which is why walking by the river and on the beach is so attractive to us all.
- There are not enough safe options for off lead exercise areas, the beach exercise area has dramatically reduced due to the relocation of the rivermouth and the area at the rear of Augusta Oval is used by vehicles travelling at speed through the bush on the trail from the BMX park to the LIA. Not safe for off lead dogs.

Shared use / restricted times

- More beach areas could be opened up for dog owners and perhaps allow dogs and owners access to the popular beaches on a time share basis i.e. before 9am and after 5/5.30pm.

**More areas for dogs**

- I think there is good free exercise area but feel that dogs should be allowed on more beaches if kept on a leash and owners responsible for cleaning up after them. Beaches should be for everyone including the family dog.

Options needed during snake season:

- Every dog owner is fully aware of the risks re- snakes along the dog bush walking tracks that are available especially during summer.
- I am concerned about snakes when walking my dog and my parents’ dog in bushland so any paths that are well maintained are terrific.

**The voices against expanding DEAs (3 comments)**

- Current dog exercise areas are more than appropriate in the area of Augusta & Flinders Bay.
- Any expansion of the proposed dog exercise area south of the prohibited area in Albany Terrace is not supported as it will only encourage more dogs into the area used by many small children and will result in additional fouling of the area. This area should be dog free for tourists and locals that use Augusta’s main beach. If additional dog exercise areas are required then they should be in areas like south of the aerodrome but not on our limited pristine beaches.
- I feel there is more than adequate areas for dogs and find dog owners use Flinders Bay swimming area for their dogs to swim. I feel that humans should be able to have fifty metres of beach for their exclusive use. I use the beach most mornings for walking and don’t mind dogs along the 2000 metres but find it frustrating to ask so many dog owners to not allow their dogs to swim, poo, wee and run wet over towels on fifty metres of beach at Flinders Bay. They have the use of the entire waterways everywhere else.

**Specific areas where dogs shouldn’t be allowed**

Beach at old boat ramp (3 mentions)

- Only the section near the old boat ramp should be **not** pet friendly, as this is where most people swim.
- I would like to have the opportunity as a responsible dog owner to take my dog and my 3 year old daughter swimming at the beach at the same time safely. At times in Augusta the only protected beach area is immediately south of the old boat ramp at Flinders Bay and I am not allowed to take my dog, even if on a lead, beyond the grassed area at Flinders Bay Bathers Beach or risk being fined. I should be permitted to take my entire family swimming at the same time provided I clean up after my dog and keep her on a leash.

Flinders Bay and Granny’s Pool (1 mention)
- Would like Flinders Bay and Granny’s Pool to remain dog free with more and larger signage and bigger fines if people ignore them as is happening now.

**Shire Oval (3 mentions)**
- The Shire Oval should be removed as a Dog Exercise area as the dog owners are not picking up dog droppings and this is a health hazard to anyone playing sport on the oval.
- I’m unsure if the town oval is an exercise area, but it should not be!!! Dogs should not be allowed inside the fence at any time.
- Dogs shouldn’t be allowed to go on the OVAL either as kids and adults use it all the time.

**Deere’s Beach (2 mentions)**
- The beach area at Deeres should be a dog free area as well, so many kite surfers and surf boarders use it most days, also people fish there as well.
- The area from the deck area near the Colourpatch to Deere Street, all along Deer’s Beach and into the river, must be made a Dog’s Prohibited area as this is the most popular area for Board Surfers, Kite Surfers and is a major area for fishing by the people staying on the Turner Caravan Park. Dogs must be prohibited as the activities cannot coexist with dogs not on a leash.

**Other**
- Dog owners should not be able to take a dog on a leash to the Town Markets.
**COWARAMUP**
One DEA: Recreation Ground*, bounded by Bussell Highway, Waverley Road and Cowaramup Primary School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amenity and safety in shared-use area (4 mentions) | • The current dog exercise area is also the current people recreation ground. Unfortunately, there are daily doggie parcels left on this space which is used for people to run and exercise on. It is also adjoining the area that is leased by the school for the school children to play on. As the dog exercise area is only a notional area, there is often as much dog poo on the leased school area as on the dog exercise area.  
  
  • The oval in Cowaramup is a great space for dog exercise, however many people do not pick up after their dogs and as the oval is also used by Cowaramup Primary, it is becoming an issue.  
  
  • Need more space and options available. Having a dog park on the grounds which is heavily used by the primary school is not ideal and probably not safe. |

| Enforcing rules (2 mentions) | • Emphasis on dogs being restrained if taken to the bush or in communal areas of town where other dogs or children could get hurt.  
  
  • Increasing numbers of dog owners/ cyclists / hikers are using the rails to trails and AMR council needs to install dog owner signage and bins highlighting "dogs to be on leads" on entrances / exits of rails to trails at Ellenbrook Rd end / Burnside Rd and all others deemed necessary in the Shire |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUGGESTIONS AND IDEAS</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Install fencing (5 mentions) | • Allocation of a fenced area with water source and poo bins please.  
  
  • Need a place that is grassed and fenced!!! and big enough for some dogs to run around crazy with each other playing/exercising without disturbing other people who are not in the area for their dogs to exercise, e.g.: people playing sport.  
  
  • We exercise both of our shire registered dogs at the Cowaramup Beach animal exercise area and the area at the Cowaramup Primary school. With both school sporting events and out of school sporting events held at the Cowaramup primary school oval it becomes quite difficult to exercise one’s dogs off lead in this area. The unsecured gate openings to the west of this exercise area and their proximity to the Bussell highway and its traffic are poor at best and reason for constant concern for dogs off lead.  
  
  Specific suggestion for fenced area at the recreation ground:  
  
  • It would be awesome to fence the triangular area at the Bussell Hwy end of the oval, bordered by Waverley Rd, Bussell Hwy, the oval boundary and in a line opposite Peake Street. Including a watering station and bin station so dogs can be let off to run and socialise, without the concern of kids at the school and dogs running onto the highway. There are a lot of trees that dogs love, shade, a few seats for owners and even some agility structures would be just awesome. Parks like these are popping up all over Perth and it is very much needed down here. |

| Facilities - poo bins (2 mentions) | • More available bins to put your full dog poop bags in. Currently only one post has a bin allocated. Could also do with another at the western entrance to the oval on Waverley Road. |

14 online responses:
64% (9) in support of current DEAs in Cowaramup
14% (2) not in support
21% (3) unsure
| Future DEAs for consideration | • Rails to Trails, more trails (3 mentions)  
|                              | Parkwater (4 mentions)  
|                              | • I suggest this [existing] area is closed down as a dog exercise area and the area in Parkwater south of Sunset Drive that sits between Daisy Rise and Coral Vine Cross north of the lake, be open to be the dog exercise area. This area is not a designated people exercise space and doggie poo left behind unlikely to be such an impost on others.  
|                              | • Also develop the Parkwater oval into a dog exercise area as it currently appear to be underutilized for recreational activities.  
| Other comments:              | • Incorporate an agility course similar to that at the Georgette St Park at the Cowaramup Oval, possibly on the lower section on the corner of Bussell Highway & Waverley Rd  
|                              | • I have been to the current exercise area. It is adequate for an old dog. Younger more active big dogs would benefit from a larger off lead area preferably unfenced. |
**GNARABUP / PREVELLY**

Three DEAs:
Gnarabup Beach, from Narda Avenue approximately 300m south-west
Gnarabup public open space, Riedle Avenue to Marmaduke Point Drive (“Gnarabup Oval”)
Rifle Butts Reserve excluding the children’s playground area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>54 online responses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78% (42) in support of current DEAs in Gnarabup / Prevelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16% (9) not in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% (3) unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plus 9 hard copy or emailed survey responses:
75% (8 comments) supported DEAs, specific and proposed
25% (4 comments) supported dog prohibition in specific areas

### EXISTING DEAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rifle Butts</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Difficult as there is a children’s playground and kids on bikes and lots of passing traffic – it’s not highly suitable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• You have designated Rifle Butts reserve a dog exercise area, except for the playground, but this is not realistic. Unfortunately in our experience, dog owners do tend to ignore the boundaries of designated dog exercise areas.... You have designated Rifle Butts reserve a dog exercise area, except for the playground, but this is not realistic to expect dogs won’t enter the playground, and from experience, we can tell you they are there in the playground.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paths</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The limestone path from G to P is great – we walk the dog there a lot! Ditto the path from the point to the rivermouth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUGGESTIONS AND IDEAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expand dog exercise areas (22 mentions)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• In general there needs to be an increase in dog exercise locations and total area within the shire. Prevelly is a focal point for local dog owners who love the beach life experience and there is not enough total area available. Areas suggested:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The whole beach (1 mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The current dog exercise areas are very limited, particularly the beach. It is understandable that dogs are required to be on a lead on the path that leads from the White Elephant Carpark through to Rifle Butts however the stretch of beach for off lead exercise along this stretch is terrible. It is often washed out, covered in weed, unsafe for swimming for kids and at a very steep angle making it difficult to walk on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach south of Gnarabup (Back Beach) (4 mentions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A second beach access eg south of Gnarabup to ease the difficulties of so many dogs on one beach including lots of young families. The southern beach is often deserted and is well away from main roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach south of Gnarabup (back beach), Used primarily by locals, especially in winter. The beaches designated as dog beaches north of here are extremely busy with tourists. The beach just south of Gnarabup boat ramp was a dog ex area and then a sign went up only with a lead this beach is not used much as i use it daily just the odd fisho/diver n local with a dog so it should remain as was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Bay and Boodjidup beaches (4 mentions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perhaps it is time to open up the northern end of Boodjidup beach for dogs - as long as dogs are prevented 500 metres from Boodjidup Creek.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifle Butts Beach (4 mentions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Riflebutts is a good open exercise area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The current dog exercise area is in the wrong position. The Georgette carpark is quite shallow and very dangerous when people are opening the rear of their vehicles and letting children and dogs out so close to Mitchell Drive which is very busy. I feel the dog exercise area should be relocated to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Riflebutts where there is a secure car park which is not on the main road and there are no roads surrounding the park making it much safe for dogs and children. The dog exercise area should go from Riflebutts down to approximately in front of Narda Avenue which would be less ambiguous than the existing dog exercise area which is in the middle of the entire Prevelly Beach area. Most people don’t abide by the signs anyway.

- If we are to have a dog beach it should be in front of Rifle Butts where the dogs can be contained.

**Reef Beach (1 mention)**

- WHY RIFLE BUTTS AND REEF BEACHES SHOULD BE DOG BEACHES:
  * These beaches are not conducive to families - hazards such as turbulent waters, slippery rocks on the shoreline and sharp rocks protruding randomly in the sand are prevalent at these beaches.
  * They both have large and under-utilised carparks which would help spread the car parking along the beach strip.
  * Rifle Butts Beach is conveniently adjacent to the dog exercise oval.

**Prevelly Beach (1 mention)**

- The suggestion is to alter the dog recreation area to begin at the southern access track to Prevelly Beach and close the area to the north that would then include the little beach areas and basalt rocks. This means the two family friendly swimming areas being Gnarabup and Prevelly would be dog free. There is still a considerable area between these two safe beaches for dogs to socialise and run freely.

**Other suggestions:**

- Walking trail on the beach (2 mentions)
- Beach areas adjacent to Gnarabup eg south of Gnarabup headland (1 mention)
- Park area adjacent to the Resort at Gnarabup, above the emergency services sheds (1 mention)
- The bush walks on the east side of Baudin Drive (1 mention)
- Dogs on leads on present public tracks (1 mention)
- Kilcarnup Beach (1 mention)
- It would be great to have more trails that are dog on or off lead as many are in National Parks or dog banned. (1 mention)

**Don’t increase dog exercise areas – happy as is (5 mentions)**

- Rifle Butts and Gnarabup ovals provide a great space and there seems to be enough beach areas.
- I don’t think that it’s appropriate to add further dog exercise areas, because many residents want to use public space without interference from dogs
- I believe the dog exercise area on the ocean front should only stretch from the Rifle Butts area to level with the Narda walkway, as originally planned. That way the front would be more evenly divided between dog and non dog areas. Please do not change the ban on the River Mouth area. Even though I do not own a dog I enjoy their company BUT NOT EVERYWHERE I GO.

**Specific areas where dogs shouldn’t be allowed**

- Prevelly (2 mentions)
  - At present one of the dog exercise areas in Prevelly is on the best swimming beach.
  - We have lost the opportunity to enjoy the beach because of the presence of dogs. Almost every time we have visited the beach in recent times we have had incidents of dogs running all over our belongings, dogs frightening our young children and urinating on their towels…. We question why dogs have a designated area that spans almost ¼ of the entire stretch of the bay…. We propose that the dog exercise area remain but be reduced to the middle stretch of the bay.
  - GEORGETTE AND NARDA BEACHES SHOULD BE DOG FREE BECAUSE:
    * They are family friendly beaches: the inshore reef limits swell and therefore provides calmer waters for children to play on the shoreline, clear water for
snorkelling and ideal conditions for relaxed swimming for young and old. Such sheltered ocean conditions with easy accessibility are not common along the Margaret River coastline.

*Dogs pollute this family friendly environment, not only by their faeces on the beach and paths and urination on towels, but also by their dominating behaviour either aggressive or over-friendly (knocking over children, fighting amongst themselves, disturbing sunbathers and spraying people and belongings with sand and water etc)

* If dogs are removed from Georgette and Narda beaches, the heavy concentration of families using Gnarabup Beach is likely to stretch northward to Narda, thereby taking pressure off the Gnarabup Beach carparks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fencing of dog areas (5 mentions)</th>
<th>Rifle Butts:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The children’s playground area should be fenced to keep dogs/children separated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Having a dog exercise area at Rifle Butts incorporating a playground makes this space pretty much a no go zone for families without dogs. Could some consideration be given to either fencing the dogs or the playground?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whilst Rifle Butts is a good space for the dogs it would be greatly improved if it were fenced. This would limit uncontrolled interaction with non-dog users and particularly with the children’s play area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rifle Butts is a good area for off leash exercise, however the children’s play area should be fenced off.
Fenced area at Gnarabup oval needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relax rules re use at certain times, off-leash areas, and off-leash at restricted times (13 mentions)</th>
<th>Off-lead areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• More off lead walking areas, most people walking the track in the morning have dogs it would be nice to be able to let them off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would be good if south of Gnarabup beach were off-leash areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An off-lead section north of the rivermouth would be good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More flexible use during winter
Prevelly:
• I would like to the beaches at Prevelly (that are currently out of bounds to dogs) made available during the winter months when these areas are largely unused by beach goers. A similar ruling operates in Busselton and Bunbury and I have found it useful on many occasions.

Use at specific times of day:
• I really like the idea that they utilise in Busselton whereby dogs can be taken on the beaches at specific times of the day
• With respect to the beach it could make sense to allow greater access for dogs on a seasonal and/or time of day basis as is the practice elsewhere.

Off-lead and Flexible use:
• With respect to the beach it could make sense to allow greater access for dogs on a seasonal and/or time of day basis as is the practice elsewhere. The same could apply to requiring dogs to be kept on leads at all times. As an early morning/late afternoon dog walker (at the beach, on trails, by the river) I keep my dog on a lead but almost never encounter anyone but other dog walkers and cannot see the necessity or the benefit of this requirement.

• A more flexible approach should be taken in regards to dogs being allowed off lead along the beach path and on other parts of the beach. In other areas of Australia and overseas this is usually a combination of seasonal (eg during winter months when pretty much the only people using the path regularly are dog walkers) and time based (eg early morning).

• It would be nice if the Shire could look at opening up the whole stretch of beach from the boat ramp all the way through to Rifle Butts. A happy compromise would be to make it seasonal like some beaches further north. For example Smiths Beach between December - March is off lead exercise area before 9am and after 5pm and prohibited to dogs between those times.
The rest of the year it is unrestricted. The Gnarabup stretch is the only beach in the area that is not NP and it seems unfair that the best stretch of beach which is closest to the cafe and the safest for swimming is a no go zone for dogs. Restricted hours during peak periods and unrestricted during the winter months would be a happy compromise and would go a long way to satisfying most dog owners as far as beach locations are concerned.

- I would like to see the path along Prevelly be dog off leash before 9am and after 5pm! Like a lot of local areas.

**River Mouth (currently a non-gazetted area):**

- I would like see access to the beach at river mouth and along the river. A curfew system allowing dogs on the beach before 9 am and after 4. 30pm would allow a fair approach for locals (and visitors) or a marked area on the beach similar to the dog beach at Gnarabup / Prevelly.

- The River Mouth should be open to dogs off leash during the winter months or May to August as is the case with Bunbury beaches) Perhaps this could extend to some other areas also.

- A restricted hours/seasonal compromise at the River Mouth Beach.

- River Mouth am till 9am and after 5pm

- How about considering the River Mouth in winter – dogs on leads so we can walk north. On the beach, not the river.

**Other**

- What about dogs off lead from Fraggle Rock right around to the current dog beach? Only in winter. Cottesloe do this and it works well.

### ISSUES

#### COMMENTS

**Enforcement (7 mentions)**

- All dog areas and NON-dog areas need more ranger services to impose the regulations. You take your life in your hands if you protest to an owner about their dog being in the wrong place or off lead etc.

- Laws regarding dog restraint need to be enforced more, because many dogs are off leads outside of dog exercise areas.

- There needs to be a bigger ranger presence for people (mostly tourists) bringing their dogs to the southern part of the Gnarabup beach which is not a dog exercise area.

- Dog control in Margaret River is out of control!! It is not safe to walk on any trails, coastal walks, beaches, town streets. Everyone flaunts the putting dogs on a leash rule....the rangers are doing a great job but simply can’t keep up and be everywhere.

**River Mouth (currently a non-gazetted area):**

- Monitoring of dogs at the River mouth in summer is needed

- People bring their dogs to prohibited areas (all of Gnarabup beach and the River Mouth); we need more rangers to fine offenders as signs do not work.

- Dogs at River Mouth are problematic, as since they’re allowed in the car park, people continue onto the beach with their animals, or have them running off leash. It is rare to spend a summer day at the River Mouth without dogs being on the beach. This needs more signage and more ranger presence, due to wildlife issues as well as comfort of beach goers.

**Amenity and safety in shared-use areas (7 mentions)**

- Gnarabup/Prevelly/River mouth is a very restricted geographical area, with intense recreational pressures and very limited spaces available. The swimming area and parking available to NON dog owners is very limited due to both limited safe swimming areas, and sharing the spaces with boats, SUPs, lessons of various kinds, the cafe and hire businesses in season.

**Impact on birds**

- Community education including signage on the impact of dogs on shorebirds and beach-nesting bird species.

- There is a strong push in the Gnarabup community for the banning of dogs at the Back Beach (Long Reef, Grunters and Sewers) due to the presence of
nests) hooded plovers as well as many other birds (red-capped plovers, cormorants, Pacific Gulls, ospreys and oystercatchers). The sheer number of dogs means that dog fights are common and scary for our kids. Excrement is everywhere and locals without dogs are being driven off these beaches.

Impact on people

• The set aside dog areas at Gnarabup and Prevelly have taken over a misappropriated amount of public space, the one clear safe swimming hole for families near the Rifle Butts playground has been designated a dog exercise area this makes no sense and has stopped the general public from using this area due to the vast number of dogs not on leashes and also dog waste everywhere, the once pristine swimming family beach is now a dog toilet. The dogs need to be in a set aside area away from the general public not in two separate locations on the Prevelly to Gnarabup cafe strip which is proving to be unmanageable.

• The beach area at the end of Georgette is where many women and young children go to swim and their safety is jeopardized by the many dogs that are running around in that very small section.

• Rifle Butts Car Park and the recreation area are great assets to all the community. However the easier access to the little Prevelly beach means that especially in summertime many dogs are brought there. It is also used by families with small children. There can often be up to 8 dogs at a time and unfortunately often not restrained or monitored by their owners. My grandchildren have been knocked over by dogs chasing each other and ignored by owners who maintain they are socialising. It can be frightening for babies and toddlers to have loose dogs running in that quite small safe swimming area between the reefs.

Facilities – poo bins and dog bowls (16 mentions)

Suggestions as to specific places where these are needed include:

Rifle Butts:

• It could be a good idea to place a dog poo bin and bags at the south end of Rifle Butts car park on Mitchell Drive for the dogs who visit the south end of Rifle Butts beach which is accessed by the long limestone walkway from the south end of the car park to the beach. The bin would be easily accessed for emptying from the car park/ Mitchell drive.

• Rifle Butts oval does not have bins (even though this is also a bbq area) - the shower and toilet block is regularly cleaned as are the bbqs. Couldn’t a bin be emptied by the contractors who do the cleaning?

• Water to be provided at Rifle Butts reserve. Bin closer to dog exercise area to encourage dog owners to pick up their dog’s poo.

• The bin at Rifle Butts is 200 m away and there is a tap for water but no bowl underneath.

• A bin could be put there for dog refuse, containing chemicals so they can decompose without the smell. The bags could also be biodegradable.

• A bin at the BBQ area (2 mentions)

Gnarabup pathway (2 mentions):

• The Gnarabup pathway from boat ramp to surfers point is a wonderful dog walk however there is no bins provided for dog poo. The problem is that people will not carry a bag of dog poop for the distance required due to lack of bins. The bags end up thrown in the dunes, dumped on the path or worst of all tied to the fence wire. More bins would help solve the problem. There is enough access along the path for a small vehicle to empty the bins on a regular basis.

• The walking trail from Gnarabup to the point needs extra bins and bag supply, at least one more at say Georgette – on the path – till will make a big difference to dog owners’ compliance.

Along pathways:
- Have bags available along the beach track which will encourage dog owners to pick up. Bins would be great.
- We don’t need poo bins on the footpath because who is going to collect the poo bins from that difficult to access location?
- Is there no access by a vehicle at all anywhere along that path where you could put at least one bin?
- More dog waste disposal bin/bag stations need to be provided along the walk track at Gnarabup / Prevelly.
- The tracks at Prevelly smell of dog waste.
- Many people tie the black plastic bags containing dog waste on the fence or leave them on the paths, beach also.
- On the beach trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signage (2 mentions)</th>
<th>It needs to be clearer where the dog beach begins. I think people walking from Gnarabup along the beach often get confused as to why there are suddenly dogs running around when they reach the dog exercise area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce the signage (it is visually obnoxious and polluting) between Surfers Point and Marmaduke Point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GRACETOWN**  
Two DEAs:  
Cowaramup Bay Road, from Cowaramup  
Brook to Salter Street.  
Recreation Hall Reserve, west of the hall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUGGESTIONS AND IDEAS</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More beach DEAs (9 mentions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  • *Entire Gracetown beach to be full dog beach between 1st of April and 1st of October* (1 mention).  
  Main Beach to North Point, currently dog prohibited zone, (1 mention).  
  *This would be from the rock area to the north of the main beach to North Point.  
  This area is ideal as it is a beach not normally suitable for beach goers as it has a rocky shore. Many local people have encouraged this idea when I have mentioned it and this includes dog owners as well as non-dog owners.*  
  Lefthanders Beach (2 mentions):  
  *The current dog beach area is ok if you don’t need to take your dog for a long walk. The stretch from Leftys to Ellenbrook would be more suitable as it is only mainly used by surfers and packed with families and tourists on the beach. This stretch is also good as the beach is super wide and with high dunes so the dogs would normally just stick to the water and not disturb wildlife.*  
  Boat ramp area (2 mentions):  
  *Dogs should be allowed on that small stretch of beach left of the boat ramp and beyond the devastating cliff collapse memorial at the back of South Point. If dogs are allowed at the bottom of the stairs at South Point, it should be stretched to the rocks just before the Cobblestones surf area.*  
  Melaleuca Beach (1 mention) |
| Recreation Hall DEA (1 mention) |  
  • The area near the town hall is too large; dogs should be confined just to the oval.  

Other possible DEAs (2 mention) |  
  • The oval in the middle of Parkwater Estate should also allow dogs as this is hardly used and such a perfect meeting place for doggy play dates  
  • Cow River trail |

**ISSUES**  
Seaweed |  
  • The only dog beach currently, for the most part of the year, is full of seaweed.  
  • Cowaramup beach is too small for a dog exercise area, 9 months a year it has seaweed often banked up making it unsafe for animals and unpleasant to enjoy. If the AMR shire engaged a contractor to undertake regular removal of this seaweed as they do on Perth suburban beaches, then this section of the beach may remain attractive year round. |

16 online responses:  
69% (11) in support of current DEAs in Gracetown  
25% (4) not in support  
6% (1) unsure
MARGARET RIVER
Four DEAs:
Bussell Highway north, bounded by private properties, the Margaret River and Bussell Highway.
Georgette, bounded by Georgette Drive and McKeown Place.
Hillier Park, bounded by Tingle Avenue, Spinebill Ramble and Hillier Drive.
Gloucester Park north of the hockey/cricket change rooms and bounded by the western access roads (to be removed)

90 online responses to the question “Due to demand, the dog exercise area at Gloucester Oval is soon to be developed into a sporting oval in the recreation precinct. Do you support development of Hillier Park as a central DEA in Margaret River?”:
69% (62) in support
14.5% (13) not in support
16.5% (15) unsure

Plus 9 hard copy or emailed survey responses:
82% (9 comments) supported DEAs, specific and proposed
18% (2 comments) disappointed that Gloucester Oval would not continue as a DEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING DEAs</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgette (3 comments)</td>
<td>• I use Georgette Park regularly. I like the mix of agility and trees. but I feel any dog park should be fenced to make it a secure as both these parks are surrounds by roads...we need the space for them to run and agility obstacles and some bush to keep it interesting would be tremendous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Georgette Park is good but it's a major thoroughfare and sometimes as a dog owner you feel uneasy when a family with young kids for instance, walks through to use the paths - and you aren't doing the wrong thing by having your dog off the lead but I tend to feel uneasy by it. Not everyone is aware it's an off the lead area, despite the signs. Because of the shared nature of this area, it is also a hazard for cyclists and dogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It [Hillier Park] should be fully fenced with “Dog Mesh” and gated to allow off-lead play ... or at least a large section of it. The same goes for Georgette Park too.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Bussell Highway North  
(1 comment only) | • I would like to know if the Shire is going to find a safe replacement for the well-used dog park in the recreation centre area. I note from the map that there is an area off Bussell Highway/Tunbridge Road, but this looks like a treed area. I would not support the felling of trees to provide an open area for dogs to socialise. |
| Hillier Park | What needs to be done to it to make it good for dogs / fencing (12 mentions)  
• If Hillier Park is to be the central dog exercise area it would be appreciated for at least a portion of the oval to be enclosed. This creates a safe space for young dogs and those still being trained off lead with little fear of them escaping. I have seen a number of fine examples of enclosed dog exercise areas on the east coast of Australia where the area is segregated to allow small or timid dogs to be exercised alone whilst still allowing the majority of dogs & owners the space to exercise. Some form of agility equipment would also be good to ensure dogs are given ample mental stimulation as well as physical exercise.  
• Hillier Park would be great but you need to fence an area off so that the dogs do not run onto road and also people that are walking around there don’t get dogs running up to them etc.  
• Hillier Park gets a lot of traffic down Tingle Ave and it’s a complete hazard to cars and dogs in the current state that it’s in (unfenced). The dogs also play in the wetlands there which houses lots of bird species as well as snakes, so excluding this from the fenced area would be ideal.  
• I have stated "Unsure" in respect of Hillier Park as a central dog exercise area because it is a large open area, bounded on two sides by busy roads. I feel that if Hillier Park is to be used as a dog exercise area then it should be completely fenced in order for dogs to have a good run and play... I don’t consider that Hillier Park, as it is presently, is a safe protected environment.  
• I would like to see Hillier Park developed into a proper dog exercise area, many suburbs of Perth have these now. There is one I have accessed in Jandakot which has two separate enclosure - a large and small dog one. Each is double gated and fenced with seats, water and play activities inside the enclosure. I fear letting my dog off the lead due to snakes and baiting in many areas of Margaret River but it would be amazing to have a fenced enclosure to keep dogs safe and allow people to exercise off lead. Unfortunately a lot of local people believe their dog can go anywhere off lead but this causes many issues and a lot of dogs ours included get agitated meeting an off leash dog when he is on lead. Having an area set up as a fenced designated dog area would encourage people to use this and keep their dog on leash on trails etc. This would be an amazing step forward for the region  
• Hillier Park may be a suitable alternative to the current area at Gloucester Park but would need to be fenced due to the close proximity to the surrounding roads.  
• We need at least one fully-fenced exercise area for dogs in town. Hillier Park is bordered by roads on three sides. Traffic will be increasing on Tingle Road once the bypass opens, increasing the risk to dogs (and drivers) if the area is not fenced. Kids riding to school can be frightened by dogs running towards them. It also contains long grass around the stream (risk of snakes).  
• Park should be fenced in. Provide water.  
• Margaret River really needs a large, safe, fenced dog exercise area. This will also help prevent dogs being off leash in other areas where they are not allowed to be free. As long as Hillier Drive will not prove a noise nuisance or nuisance to local residents surrounding I am happy with this proposal.  
• I would like further information with regards to the development of Hillier Park. We currently live across the road, a number of people and dogs access the park throughout the day and it is a great meeting space for dogs and owners alike. |
It could be useful to plant some trees/bushes lining Tingle Ave to create a natural fence line along the road that borders the park. This might help to create a bit of a boundary and increase safety given Tingle Ave is becoming a busy road.

- Hillier Park is a great dog exercise area but it would be good to be fenced down Ingle Ave and Hillier Drive. This would keep the grounds from being cut up by cars. Also some levelling of the ground, as there are a lot of older people going to dog training. This happens twice a week. Also some trees planted on Ingle Ave side for more shade. Could a rubbish bin and bags be put there on Ingle Ave.
- It should be fully fenced with “Dog Mesh” and gated to allow off-lead play ... or at least a large section of it. The same goes for Georgette Park too.

Concern about bogs and snakes (2 mentions)

- The best part of the dog exercise area at Gloucester Oval was that it didn’t have major roads surrounding it like Hillier Park, so you could feel comfortable having your dog off the lead without the worry of cars at speed occupying the boundaries - i.e. if a dog was chasing a ball and kept knocking it along the ground, sometimes they end up close to the road and it’s never a comfortable feeling. The uneven surface of Hillier Park is also a hazard for both dogs and their owners. The marshy wetlands area is a haven for snakes in summer and during winter a lot of the surface on the lower/southern end of the park is boggy and unusable. Having to wash your dog after an exercise period each time is not ideal.
- I have heard that the dog park near the recreation centre and cricket oval is to be terminated to be replaced by a soccer field. This is a pity because it really is the only safe off lead dog park in Margaret River. The dog park in Hillier and Tingle Avenue is smaller, unfenced from the road, and has a ‘pond’ which would attract many dogs who like water. It also has a boggy area, and probably a few snakes in the undergrowth.

Make it an on-lead area (1 mention)

- As a previous resident of Hillier Drive I feel that the Hillier Park area is a great spot for use by dog owners. I am sure local residents who don’t have dogs and who would like to feel safe letting their children go to the park would prefer to see a large section for use by dogs and an area where dogs are restricted to only on lead.

Gloucester Park

If we don’t have GP, we need another area on west side of Bussell Highway (11 mentions)

- You need a space on the west side of town to replace Gloucester Park.
- So disappointed to hear about the loss of our dog exercise area at Gloucester Park. This is the only exercise area west of the town. Can this be reconsidered? Or have the provision of another exercise area within a close locality? Our only dog exercise on the beach was reduced by several 100’s metres, just a few years ago.
- Gloucester Park was ideal for us, walking distance from home. All other gazetted areas would require me to take my husband and the dog by car.
- It is dangerous to have to cross Bussell Highway each time a resident that lives on the other side of the highway wishes to walk their dog... Limiting dog walking areas limits community support for those living socially or economically on the peripheral edge. There are currently a unique set of dog walkers who utilise the dog park at Gloucester Oval who will be ostracised by not having the ability to walk somewhere close to their home and socialise with members in their community who they have quick and easy access to. Many of these people do not have their own transportation. Many of these people are also inhibited with personal mobility (walking sticks etc). This is reason enough for the shire to consider them and somewhere closer to residents near Gloucester Oval.
• Although I understand that the current exercise area is going to be used for a sporting ground, it would be ideal if there was somewhere west of town for people who live there. I can’t see myself going over to Riverslea to walk my dog. This is also true of people in Brookfield and Rapids. Most families in town own a dog, and it is a shame that it is so difficult to include them in day to day activities.

• If the exercise area at Gloucester Oval is going to be developed there needs to be an alternative option for those living west of town. A new location needs to be developed along with Hillier Park. While the Hillier Park location may be getting “developed” the Shire is still reducing the number of off lead exercise areas by 1 when there are already very limited locations around town and on the coast to exercise off lead without fear of being fined. I can currently walk my dog to Gloucester Park from where I live, it is a very convenient location especially if restricted for time. Now it means driving so I can exercise my dog off lead. It also means a more concentrated area of dogs in one location and there are thousands of dogs in the Margaret River town area which will most certainly see a rise in altercations. Taking one exercise area away and simply “developing” another is insufficient for the dog population of our town.

• The other good part of Gloucester Oval was that it was a flat rectangular oval, no trees or other obstacles to interfere with. I regularly use this oval to not only exercise my dogs but to exercise myself at the same time by running and doing other exercises etc up and down the oval. This was the only suitable surface to do this where dogs are allowed. I would suggest that another area needs to set up that was similar to Gloucester Oval that was off main/common roads but still within central Margaret River town.

• If Gloucester Oval is to no longer be available we need more in town dog exercise areas, and also more beaches accessible for dogs.

• It’s a huge shame that Gloucester Park DEA is being abolished. It means you have to travel further and further from home to find a suitable area for off-lead play

• If [shared use of Gloucester Park] is not possible, then please try to find a grassy area west of Bussell Highway. On the principles of a ‘walkable Margaret River’, we need somewhere that people in the Basildene estate and other areas west of Bussell Hwy can walk to (as we can now) or at least not have to drive so far to go as Riflebutts or Hillier Park (Wrong side of Bussell Highway - traffic in summer makes this unattractive). [Hillier Park] too far out for people who live West side of town - Gloucester Park was a middle ground and easy for West and East of town people.

• 1) an area is required west of Bussell Hwy so that you can walk to the dog area. Hillier park is too far from the west side of town. OK for the pooches but not for elderly owners
  2) A fenced area is essential
  3) the area should be dry during winter
  4) no access to tall grass due to danger of snakes
  5) access to drinkable water for the pooches
  6) the area needs to be BIG. 50% bigger than you can throw a ball with a ball launcher. The existing area at Gloucester oval is the minimum required

Explore shared use of Gloucester Park (11 mentions)
• The dogs and owners are very happy at Gloucester Park - can this park not be dual use like other places?
• As a regular user of the Gloucester Park exercise area, and a resident on the west side of town I am most disappointed at its closure. I do not see why this area cannot be dual use with dog use limited to particular times of day or days of the week. My experience in Perth is that many reserves are used for both sport and dog exercising without any problems. We need to retain a dog exercise area to the west of town.
• I fail to understand why the current dog exercise area in Gloucester Oval has to go completely - why can it not be dual use? When there are no sporting events there dog owners could still use it - this is the practice at many ovals in Perth and elsewhere. I’m pleased Hillier Park is being made a central dog exercise area for those for whom it is convenient, however, as I live west of town it is of no direct benefit to me.

• Any increase in dog exercise areas ie Hillier in this instance is to be welcomed however the loss of Gloucester Oval leaves the western areas of Margaret River as particularly short of, lacking in open space/parkland dog exercise areas. As all dogs owners know and appreciate, dogs do benefit enormously from being socialised. The west Bussell Highway area is predominantly bush and therefore poses a risk to dogs off lead during summer. Why can Gloucester and the oval to the south thereof not be used as dog areas when not in use by sporting events? We are aware of this joint usage of sporting ovals from our previous life in Perth and can vouch for its success.

• Why does taxpayer money need to be wasted on developing a new dog exercise area when the existing ones were adequate? Couldn’t the sporting club’s share usage of all the ovals at the recreation precinct? The only time they actually require exclusive usage is during matches, couldn’t the oval be mixed use outside these hours?

• Nippers oval located at the southern end of Gloucester park could be used as a dual purpose area ie Sport/DEA (Cowaramup Oval already does this). Home owners from the west side of town will be reluctant to walk or drive to exercise their dog/s at the Hillier Park location.

• Instead of not allowing dogs at all at Gloucester Park and other areas why not look at adopting other options from other councils/shires. For example, in North Fremantle dogs were still allowed off lead on a sporting oval unless a sporting event was on then they had to be on lead. Or what about using the time of day as Busselton does, where dogs are allowed before 7am or after 5pm.

• Lastly, why do sports ovals and dog parks need to be mutually exclusive. Many other communities / shires / local governments around Australia quite often share these facilities, why can’t this not be the case in Margaret River? Early hours, middle of the day during the work weeks and evenings - quite often these ovals are not being used by anyone.

• There really needs to be a more centralised dog exercise area to replace the Gloucester Park area. Would it be possible to still allow dog exercise access there, say before 8 am or 9am and after 6.00pm? Winter/summer hours could be varied. Timed areas are popular in other shires eg certain beaches in Busselton/Dunsborough and also in some metro council areas. This would make full use of the facility for a wide variety of users.

• Why are sport and dogs mutually exclusive? We know of other places eg Claremont, which permit mixed use. Maybe consider making Gloucester Oval open to dogs in a certain time period - many people use it after work. If the few people who don’t ‘pick up’ are the issue, maybe we could get dog owners to form a poo-busters and keep the oval clean?

• I think the sports complex at Gloucester Park is quite adequate and the cricket/rugby field could well accommodate a soccer field area. They are not all used at the same time. I would advocate the Gloucester Park Dog exercise area as the more ideal area.

Keep Gloucester Park and fence an area (4 mentions)

• Near the soon-to-be-closed dog exercise area at Gloucester Park is a fenced area (next door to the Bowls Club). We were hoping this was to be the new dog exercise area? The Gloucester Park dog space was absolutely not fit for purpose as it was not fenced, and traffic could be busy, especially on weekends. Dogs running free through sports games is also not a great idea!
I like the dog exercise area where it is. I would like an area that is completely fenced, that way dogs can play and run and be kept enclosed to protect the surrounding public areas. I have taken my dog many times to classes on the field which is wonderful, why do you need more sporting fields, Gloucester Park is huge and should satisfy the needs of all sporting bodies.

Please can we have some grass on the new fenced area next to the bowling green? The other areas being suggested are not fenced so are not suitable for all dogs.

It is rumoured that the newly graveled and fenced area next to the Bowling Club is to be designated as a DEA. If so, this is a travesty of a dog park...

What we lose if Gloucester Park goes – social impact (3 mentions)

There is also an important community social aspect with people casually and informally meeting to exercise their dogs at Gloucester Park. These people are often not a part of well organised sporting groups that can put pressure on councils to extend their sporting facilities. They are still local ratepayers and their views and their access to facilities are no less important than the other groups, despite them being less vocal. Over the course of a day large numbers of people exercise their dogs at Gloucester Park but never as a large group so they may be less visible to council. Valuable dog training classes also take place at this park - maybe 40+ people and their dogs. Easy central access and parking facilities will be hard to replicate at Hillier Park.

I'm sad about losing Gloucester Oval as we use it frequently to throw the ball, as well as (previously) Wholistic Dog Training. It is a popular spot and probably the main source of exercise for some dogs who have time-poor owners.

It is a tragedy that Gloucester Park is no longer a dog exercise area. It was and still is used by a great number of dog owners. The report in the paper that only a small few would be inconvenienced was based on what? Bo more ratepayers own dogs or play rugby? Dog owners are a large section of our community who remain largely silent in the face of constant harassment from certain lobbyists...

Other (2 mentions):

Dogs can be integrated onto Gloucester park close to the cattle pen areas.

South oval near tennis club. Live on West side of town and don’t always have time to drive to Hillier etc. We need more parks like Rifle Butts, playground for kids and dogs can have a run - busy mums able to have both kids & fur kids run it out... Perhaps make grass area in front of footy oval (next to playground), exercise area?

Happy with DEAs overall (1 mention)

I feel the dog exercise areas in town are awesome. I love to come into town and take the dogs for a good decent walk in the forest whether it be down Carters Rd or down around the Rotary Park.

ISSUES

More enforcement needed (2 mentions)

I feel like AMRS is quick to ban dogs or blame dog owners for being irresponsible. Yes there will always be those people but there are a lot of responsible dog owners out there that are craving better dog facilities and missing out for a few bad ones. Isn’t that what fines are for?

More ranger resources needed (1 mention)

With the huge increase in the number of dogs in town, there has become a serious problem with rangers not having the resources to monitor dog owners who continuously disregard the dog laws and have their dogs off lead in public areas. Hopefully, an area where they can exercise their dogs off lead may alleviate this problem. However, providing another small, unfenced area is a waste of time.

Less enforcement needed (2 mentions)

It would be easy to develop a persecution complex given the punitive restrictions placed on us - more so than in most other countries I have visited. It seems to me that the majority are constantly being "punished" for the
misdemeanours of a small number of people. Deal with them, fine them, educate them, but please don’t keep in place the current level of constraints on the enjoyment of the rest of us. I have met many visitors who have expressed disappointment at the lack of dog friendliness in this town.

- The current dog exercise areas are very limited. Beach access is limited and often requires a dog on a lead at all times. There is no relaxation around peak times and in Winter this is very unfair. In comparison to other shires and councils, Margaret River appears to have excessively strict dog laws and restrictions on owners. It is not clear why similar laws that apply in Dunsborough cannot be applied here. Signage is very aggressive - there is always warning of “dog on a lead at all times” and fines imposed - however little money or care from the shire appears to go back into providing adequate parks, bins and general support of dog owners who ARE doing the right thing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUGGESTIONS AND IDEAS</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signage (2 mentions)</td>
<td>• The signage needs to be clearer in regards to dog exercise areas, to let people know that dogs are allowed off lead (as long as their owners are near and in control).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fenced area and facilities needed</th>
<th>Fenced area (15 mentions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Please can we have a fenced exercise area in the town? I am worried about my dog running onto the road in the only places he is allowed to walk off his lead.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• So long as the shire offers a fully fenced dog exercise area fairly central to town I think the locals will be happy. It has been talked about through the community for a long time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would like to suggest you look at Brisbane off lead dog parks as an ideal example of something that is really ideal for everyone to use - fenced, double gated, picnic benches, trees, water, poo bag stations and bins, a bit of dog exercise equipment. The one at Powerhouse is lovely! ……dogs love to run freely off lead but we can’t do this due to roads etc. <a href="http://www.mustdobrisbane.com/dogs-parks/powerhouse-dog-park-new-farm">http://www.mustdobrisbane.com/dogs-parks/powerhouse-dog-park-new-farm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At least one large dog exercise area in the shire needs to - be fully fenced (snake proof, if possible) - have a separate fenced off area for old/ small dogs - have shade and bench seats - have human and dog water fountains - have exercise and training equipment (eg see-saws, balance beams, jumps etc) - adequate parking - and lots of dog poo bags and bins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It would need to be fenced in and a park with a dam is not suitable for off lead exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any exercise area that is fenced off will be supported by myself. Farmhouse Park can likely support a fenced off area as can the green area near Yellow gum walk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specific exercise areas should be fenced and if possible shaded. With the perimeter road works people and dogs have lost many of the walking areas on the east side of town. We have lost access to the ten mile dam trail, and Darch trails.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fenced off doggy parks are a much needed community resource.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fenced area so dogs can socialise off lead.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • I would love to see an enclosed dog exercise area in town similar to the ones in Perth. This enables dogs and owners to relax knowing their dogs cannot run off - especially when meeting up with other families with dogs who have
children – it’s a lot to keep an eye on and the enclosed dog parks are very beneficial.

- A dog exercise area is definitely needed in Margaret River and it should be a large area and fenced, not only to stop dogs from wandering off, but also for people and children outside the dog exercise area won’t need to worry about dogs coming up to them
- Was hoping that it would be possible for a dog exercise area to be fenced so that dogs can be free to run off lead and not risk bolting onto roads or up to people passing by.

Poo bags and bins (5 mentions)

Other facilities (3 mentions)

- In terms of facilities, please ensure that if you are going to call it a dog exercise area you provide appropriate and well positioned facilities (not like Rifle Butts with a bin 200 m away and a tap but no bowl for water).
- I think that there are many amazing trails to utilise in the area. For a specific dog training area I would love to see a fenced area with access to water, rubbish bins, seating & shade. If there were able to be agility type obstacles that would be amazing.

New dog park in Baldivis suggested as a model to follow (1 mention)

More areas needed

Overall (4 mentions)

- I am concerned that by concentrating dogs and owners into the remaining smaller parks (even more so as they’re in built up residential areas), it increases the risk of antisocial, dog on dog, and dog on people incidents.
- More DEAs are needed on a neighbourhood level – you should not have to drive to get to one, they need to be accessible on foot. They can be smaller, many and varied. Many parts of the world have smaller areas fenced with dog mesh and gated, to allow off-lead play for dogs and their owners. Benches for humans to sit on and socialize, shade trees, pergolas, grass and mulched areas, doggy bags and rubbish bins provided – all of these are manifestations of a humane and civilized society.
- The health benefits (and commensurate lower Shire health-related costs) to dog owners from walking with their dogs are universally well-documented... The more dog exercise areas there are, the healthier is this owner-segment of the population, accompanied by lower Shire expenses.
- Hillier Park is already a dog exercise area. Additional areas are needed if the Gloucester Park is to be taken away.

Off-lead -- in town (2 mentions)

- Not enough places around town that are dog off leash areas - the rails to trails was always so awesome. We need areas that you can walk along etc not just an oval that the dogs run around in! A lot of time people have dogs to get exercise I don’t want to stand on an oval while my dog runs around! Rotary Park is another place where it’s great for dogs to sniff and smell but they have to be on a leash! The dogs love to be able to go for a swim which isn’t supposedly allowed unless they are on a leash!
- We definitely need more safe open spaces for dog free running. Georgette has bikes and lots of through traffic. Ovals are great as the grass is mown and mostly no snakes. A patch of bushland where dogs can run free would be great such as the once near Brookfield Ave and ? (can’t read).

Off-lead -- other (6 mentions)

- It is vitally important that dogs are well socialised. They need to be able to run off lead in a safe area. The more dogs are exercised & socialised properly the less problems there maybe for rangers to deal with. Unfortunately the bush tracks are not suitable in summer due to snakes.
- There are plenty of places to walk dogs on lead, including Wardandi Track, but we need open grassed areas for ball and dog agility. The little park behind the Primary School is excellent - we love the equipment.
- Not sure where, but I believe there needs to be more than 1 off-lead socialising area for dogs in the Margaret River township.
- It feels as if dog owners are targeted by Rangers in AMR Shire. Most people want to do the right thing and follow the rules regarding dogs being off lead, but desperately need off lead exercise area so they can do this.
- Dogs are part of our family: they enhance our physical health, our social interactions, and our mental and emotional wellbeing - it should not be made so difficult to allow them valuable off lead time which is considered important to their wellbeing and socialisation. I feel that with a more creative and flexible approach to managing our shared public areas everyone could benefit.
- Part of the rail to trail track or along Walcliffe Road - path up to Merino. Walking for a long distance with dogs off lead, like the beach but in the bush.

### New beach areas

- More beaches. We have one small beach and I'd like to know how many dogs are registered in Margaret River so I can provide you with a map which indicates how many dogs there could be on that small beach if they all used it at the same time.
- Given most of the coast is managed by DPaW, virtually all the coast is not accessible for dogs. As a dog owner you are very limited on where you can take your dog. It seems crazy that you can drive a 4x4 on beaches like Kilkarnup, Boranup but you can't take a dog there. The town is growing, we need to expand and provide for more dogs exercise areas.

### Overall comment (3 mentions)

- Perhaps a similar model to Busselton Shire where the Augusta/Margaret River shire beaches have set times when you can have dogs/walk dogs off lead ie. early mornings/later afternoons and not at all during Dec/Jan. More dog friendly beaches and parks.
- Perhaps some beaches can be open to dogs in off peak season during certain hours as is offered in Busselton to alleviate the congestion on our smaller stretches of coastline.

### Kilkarnup Beach (2 mentions)

- We need more dog beaches.. Gnarabup isn't enough and Kilkarnup should allow dogs.. Cars can drive along that coast, why can't we take our dogs there? I realise it's National Park, but the dunes are of no interest to the dogs, they just want to be on the beach and in the water with their families!! Perhaps fine dogs who are roaming away (unwatchable) from their owners, but let responsible dog owners have their dogs with them...
- Allow dogs onto Kilkarnup beach. This is a great family beach where families spend hours surfing, swimming and enjoying themselves. This beach would be great as there is no threat to local wildlife as people drive on the beach, great open space, and the sand is hard sand that is great for those who wish to walk their dogs on a beach but have injuries or mobility issues.

### General beach or river (5 mentions)

- River side areas or beaches for dogs would be preferred to parks
- I feel there is not enough areas around the beach we only have one beach in Prevelly. Surely out of the whole coast line we could have another area.
- Off lead walks along the river
- Given that the only beach areas that are for dog exercise are in Augusta or Gnarabup / Prevelly, I would welcome the creation of a dog exercise area somewhere in the middle of the two. From my experience the northern beach at Redgate (north of the carpark access) would be a great dog exercise beach.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas in new suburbs</th>
<th>Rapids Landing / Brookfield (9 mentions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Current exercise areas suit leisurely walks/strolls and small dogs but not active larger dogs or active owners. An extra beach area would be nice too, the current one has only a small section safe enough for swimming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I live in Rapids Landing and like to walk my dog around Brookfield and Rapids Landing and so do a lot of other people... I would love an enclosed dog park that residents of Brookfield and Rapids could use. As I walk around I hear dogs in so many yards and it would be lovely to meet these dogs in a safe play area together... Moving back down to Margaret River this has been the most difficult part is exercising my dog without having to drive him somewhere. Every suburb I lived in in Perth was so well equipped for walking and exercising your dog with ample bags locations for collecting their poo. I really hope this can happen down here in the new development areas of Rapids and Brookfield.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need to allocate space in Rapids and Brookfield for dog off lead areas as there are none. I don’t want to have to put my dog in the car to get somewhere to exercise her. Exercise for a big dog has to be off lead to enable cardiovascular exercise. A good exercise area for Brookfield would be the grass/vegetation strip/area including the lake and playground from Bussell Highway all the way east along Brookfield Ave to and including the open grass area just past tingle rd. Also the natural bush area at the back of Brookfield is a perfect place for dogs to run.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dog exercise areas are desperately needed in Brookfield and Rapids Landing. There are numerous parks there, some of which could be designated as dog exercise areas. Dog exercise areas create a community hub for local residences but need to be within walking distance, this should be a priority as it comes at very little cost to the Shire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The suburbs of Brookfield and Rapids Landing have no dog exercise areas at all, you have to drive to get to one in town (particularly if you are in Brookfield).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantana Lane (3 mentions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The other area that may be used could be the one side of the park at the back of lantana lane. Preferably fully fenced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trails and river walks</th>
<th>Darch Trail (5 mentions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• I have a border collie and the current areas are nowhere near large enough for her and I to go for a decent run off lead, it's virtually impossible to run them on a lead because of all the tempting smells along the way, so a decent stretch of trail like Darch would be fantastic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rails to trail, River Heritage Trails or Carters Rd Trails (15 mentions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MR to Cowaramup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I like all the rails to trails that you can take your dog for a walk on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I am unsure why the rails and trails and river walks can’t utilised more maybe sections away from town should be opened as exercise areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I wish Rails to Trails was an off-lead area, but I appreciate that it is used by cyclists and too many other people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rails to trails Boodjinup Rd to Gnarawary, or part of it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Walk trail out to 10 mile brook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A trail west of town such as a section of rails to trails.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dogs off leads on the Rails to Trails north of Carters Road and south of Gnarawary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I believe that some of the trails like 10 Mile Brook and Rotary Park circuit should be off lead, I would be interested to know what trails/bushwalks you have which are off-lead. It seems that they are all on lead.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I think dogs should be allowed off the leash on the trails from the Hairy Martin through the Barrett Street Weir providing owners are able to restrain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trails and river walks</th>
<th>Rails to trail, River Heritage Trails or Carters Rd Trails (15 mentions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• MR to Cowaramup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I like all the rails to trails that you can take your dog for a walk on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I am unsure why the rails and trails and river walks can’t utilised more maybe sections away from town should be opened as exercise areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I wish Rails to Trails was an off-lead area, but I appreciate that it is used by cyclists and too many other people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rails to trails Boodjinup Rd to Gnarawary, or part of it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Walk trail out to 10 mile brook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A trail west of town such as a section of rails to trails.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dogs off leads on the Rails to Trails north of Carters Road and south of Gnarawary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I believe that some of the trails like 10 Mile Brook and Rotary Park circuit should be off lead, I would be interested to know what trails/bushwalks you have which are off-lead. It seems that they are all on lead.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I think dogs should be allowed off the leash on the trails from the Hairy Martin through the Barrett Street Weir providing owners are able to restrain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their animals if required. Perhaps this could be trialled and adopted if successful</td>
<td>• You are removing the oval as a dog exercise park but not replacing it as the hillier park is already a dog exercise area. There is huge demand for more dog exercise areas in general particularly along the river. Currently there are no off lead areas at the river (e.g. weirs, rivermouth, etc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Off lead walks along the river</td>
<td>Barrett Street Jetty area so dogs can swim (3 mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is currently no legitimate access for dog to swim off lead in the Margaret River. Barrett St Wier or somewhere similar could be used as a dog exercise area.</td>
<td>Riverslea (1 mention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow off-lead on Wardandi Track (2 mentions)</td>
<td>• Allow dogs off leads on trails such as the Wardandi track, Requirements to keep dogs on leads at all times are unnecessarily rigid and limit their healthy exercise. As an early morning/late afternoon dog walker (at the beach, on trails, by the river) I keep my dog on a lead but almost never encounter anyone but other dog walkers and cannot see the benefit of this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I would like to see the current restriction on walking dogs off leash along the Wardandi Track lifted. Again, the majority of users that I see (and I walk stretches of it several times a week) are dog owners and respectful of areas where there is livestock. I also think the river walk should be an off leash zone - again this could be timed, say anytime before 9am. This system works well elsewhere and would be no more difficult to patrol than at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National park (1 mention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old rubbish site off Walcliffe Road, next to speedway (1 mention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamelin Bay (1 mention)</td>
<td>• I would like to address the need for a dog exercise area at Hamelin Bay beach... This is to address the regularly disregarded National Park regulation of NO DOGS. People are taking their dogs to the beach anyway which makes all the beaches from Cosy Corner, Foul Bay, Boranup Beach and Contos targets for sneaking dogs in. If there was a designated dog beach at the far end of the Hamelin Bay car park this may discourage the use of dogs being taken to above mentioned areas. There is room to extend the car park north muchly need anyway during the summer months. This area is growing in population and people inevitably will have dogs as pets and keeping it in one place prevents the confrontations that are happening with non-dog owners at the above mentioned spots. If there is a place to use people will use it and hopefully avoid taking their dogs to other beach locations in the National Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area not suitable for off-leash exercise</td>
<td>• I feel very strongly that the A class reserve site is not at all suitable for a dog exercise area. This area is the home of good quality bush, with a number of endangered species such as ringtail possums and black cockatoos, and has many hours of volunteer labour from the Friends group go into managing it. Natural bush areas are simply not appropriate dog off leash spaces. In addition, it encourages dogs being off leash on the Wardandi track, with associated dangers for cyclists and walkers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROSA BROOK AND WITCHCLIFFE
Two DEAs:
Reserve 1956, Rosa Brook Road
Mammoth Street, west of Mammoth Street
bounded by Redgate Road (south), Railway
Reserve (west) and May Street (north).

3 online responses:
0% (0) in support of current DEAs in Rosa Brook and
Witchcliffe
33% (1) not in support
67% (2) unsure

1 hard copy or emailed survey response:

SUGGESTIONS AND IDEAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More space generally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need more dedicated green spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New to the area but feel sure there would be other areas suitable for dog exercise. Some owners may not have cars due to age or disability etc. These are large areas and could support more pockets of dog exercise areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We often walk the dog along the Darch Road track. It would be great if this was designated off-lead as well, from Rosa Brook Road to Riverslea.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

Augusta:

1. Extend the Flinders Bay Beach DEA south-west to incorporate the beach area in front of the Flinders Bay Caravan Park.
2. Introduce some controls at Civic Park to overcome the issues expressed
3. Put in more dog facilities at Deere Street (dog bags, bins, water bowls)
4. Consider the other suggestions for additional DEAs, and a timeframe for their consideration / implementation.

Cowaramup:

5. Fence a portion of the oval for dogs, to provide a boundary between the dog area and the Primary School space

Gnarabup/Prevelly:

6. Fence the Rifle Butts playground
7. Install extra facilities as identified in the comments (dog bags, bins, water bowls)
8. Consider the other suggestions for additional DEAs, and a timeframe for their consideration. This includes giving serious consideration to shared use arrangements.

Gracetown:

9. Consider the other suggestions for additional DEAs, and a timeframe for their consideration / implementation.

Margaret River:

10. Re-consider the decision about Gloucester Park, including consideration of shared use arrangements
11. Fence part of Hillier Park
12. Consider the other suggestions for additional DEAs, and a timeframe for their consideration / implementation.

Overall:

13. Review possibility of DEAs at Hamelin Bay, Karridale, Kilkarnup Beach and Contos Beach
Attachment 2. Existing Dog Exercise Areas
Attachment 4. Existing Dog Exercise Areas
Proposed changes to Dog Exercise Areas

Flinders Bay

PROPOSED Dog Exercise Areas
AUGUSTA MAP 1

Legend
- Property Boundary
- Dog Exercise Area
- Dogs Prohibited
- Proposed Area Amendment
PROPOSED Dog Exercise Areas
Margaret River Map 1
Nippers Oval Proposed as shared use enclosed DEA subject to 12 month Trial. Monday - Friday before 3pm
Saturday and Sunday between 5pm and 7am

Legend
- Property Boundary
- Dog Exercise Area
- Dogs Prohibited