

# Draft Keeping and Control of Cats Local Law 2023 Community Engagement Report 2023



## Contents

Executive Summary	3
Communications and Engagement Objectives	
Campaign Channels	6
Survey tool results	

2

# **Executive Summary**

Draft Keeping and Control of Cats Local Law 2023

### Purpose

The purpose of this plan is to advise our community on the significant changes to the Draft Keeping and Control of Cats Local Law 2023 to reduce the number of stray cats in the community and to encourage responsible cat ownership.

## Engaging with the Community

The City of Kalamunda undertook community engagement on the Cats Local Law from 14 January 2022 to 25 February 2022.

As a result of this consultation, significant changes were made to the Law and another period of community consultation was delivered via a comprehensive *Communications and Engagement Plan* prepared in line with IAP2 best practice principles.

The Plan delivered to IAP2 spectrum level 'Inform' to provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.

The survey ran from 9 December 2022 to 8 March 2023.

# City Priorities/Plans/Strategies relevant to the project:

Community Engagement projects work towards meeting the City Priorities, Plans and Strategies as defined in the Kalamunda Advancing Strategic Community Plan to 2031. This consultation fulfilled the following:

#### >> Priority 1: Kalamunda Cares and Interacts

*Objective 1.2 - To provide safe and healthy environments for community to enjoy.* 

Strategy 1.2.1 – Facilitate a safe community environment.

## Key Engagement findings:

The survey received 40 submissions, four separate submissions and the social media adverts received five comments.

The Engage platform received 40 visitors actively participating in the survey, out of a total of 1,200 visitors.

In delivering the overarching campaign the City hosted:

- » Community survey on the Engage HQ platform supported by direct links to information and supporting agencies.
- » A targeted social media campaign which included one post on Facebook and one post on Instagram. These garnered five comments and 1,046 link clicks

» Printed media including a survey and a newspaper advert.



» Website news.

## Visitors Summary



### Communications and Engagement Objectives

- » Disseminate information to affected stakeholders to raise their awareness of the consultation and the feedback process.
- » Educate community on City roles and responsibilities.
- » Promote a positive consultation experience among stakeholders with the City in obtaining equitable levels of feedback from community and residents.
- » Collect feedback from stakeholders to inform Draft Local Law and ensure that outcomes meet the needs of residents and landowners.
- » Gain understanding of community concerns and observations
- » Gain understanding of community practices relating to cat ownership
- » Inform and update community and stakeholders on consultation outcomes

### **Communications and Engagement Tools and Channels**

The City engaged with key stakeholders and the broader community via:

Engagement Tools	Objectives
Website News	Accessible, translatable, transparent. Single point reference. Links to Engagement Portal and Social Media.
Engagement Portal	Online survey, additional reading, useful links.
Survey	Print is tangible, tactile, is viewed as trustworthy and reaches stakeholders who are not Online. The flier and survey were distributed across all the City's buildings. E.g. Libraries, Rec Centre.
Newspaper advertisement	Reach a broader community who do not have online access.

Social Media Campaign Targeted posts can reach stakeholders 24/7: Facebook posts and Instagram.

### Communications

#### Communications included:

- » Community Survey
- » Social Media posts
- » Website: Linking to contributing nodes
- » Newspaper advertisements
- » e Newsletter

» Content was posted across the City's buildings and shared with Stakeholders.

#### Open for comment

## **Draft Local Law**

## Draft City of Kalamunda Keeping and Control of Cats Local Law 2023

The City of Kalamunda is seeking feedback on the draft Kalamunda Keeping and Control of Cats Local Law 2023.

The purpose of the proposed local law is to make provisions about,

- i. cats not being a nuisance,
- ii. prescribing where cats are prohibited, and
- iii. the number of cats kept on a premises.

The effect of the proposed local law is to extend controls over cats which exist under the Cat Act 2011.

A copy of the Draft Kalamunda Keeping and Control of Cats Local Law 2023 can be viewed, and comments submitted online via engage.kalamunda.wa.gov.au

Alternatively, you can obtain a hard copy of the draft Local Law and provide your comments with a written submission addressed to the CEO, City of Kalamunda via:

Cityof

Kálamu

- Email: enquiries@kalamunda.wa.gov.au
- Post: PO Box 42, Kalamunda WA 6926
- In Person: 2 Railway Road, Kalamunda

Submissions close 5pm, Friday 3 February 2023

### Rhonda Hardy

Chief Executive Officer

kalamunda.wa.gov.au



# Social Media Post insights

# Campaign Channels

## Social Media Feedback

- 2 Organic Social Media Posts
- 1,046 Link Clicks
- 5 Post Comments
- 9,775 Impressions











### **Strategic Planning Alignment**

#### Kalamunda Advancing Strategic Community Plan 2021–2031

### Priority 1: Kalamunda Cares and Interacts

Objective 1.2 - To provide safe and healthy environments for community to enjoy.

» Strategy 1.2.1 - Facilitate a safe community environment.

#### IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation

Community Consultation for the project will be delivered via this Communications and Engagement Plan prepared in line with IAP2 best practice principles. The plan is designed to meet IAP2 Spectrum inform' level.

**Public Participation Goal:** To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.

Promise to the Public: We will keep you informed.

# Cat Local Laws Engage Survey Overview

# Survey | Keeping and Control of Cats Local Law

The Survey received 40 responses

## Engage

1.2	Total
k	Maximum visits
391	per day Informed
523	Visitors Aware
1 k	Visitors
	Now registrations
Profi 93%	Local



# Cat Local Laws Engage Survey Overview

### Survey tool results





### Engage survey results

Respondent	Comment	Support/ Do not support
1	The Yule Brook waterways has not been added as one of the prohibited areas for cats. All along Yule Brook is bushland that	Support
	supports birds and native wildlife. This area needs to have protections too. As residents who live on this waterway, and who	
	chose not to own cats, we and our neighbours, regularly catch cats who hunt in this area. Some cats we trap are wild, but	
	some are owned by people who live in more suburban areas. Can you please add Yule Brook to the prohibited area? Thank you.	
2	Cats roaming in Benbullen properties, Valley rd and bush at the end of Benbullen. This happens during the day and night as	Comment only
	some neighbours have sightings on security cameras. I have seen them killing native birds and other wildlife. I have quendas and reptiles in my garden.	
3	1.Can the council provide their interpretation of their word 'nuisance' that is used in regard to the control of cats, local law 2023. 2. My concern and of some other neighbours is that cats are allowed to roam into areas described in Schedule 3 of	Comment only
	the control of cats, local law 2023. 3. How will all residents be notified of any changes to the local cat laws? 4. How were the	
	residents informed regarding the recommendations that council made in article 'Newletter and Annnouncements' 2/11/2020	
4	concerning roaming cats? The proposed law needs to include a reference to the deaths and infections caused by cats (feral and domestic) due to hunting and toxoplasmosis, a disease caused by the parasite Toxoplasma gondii. The parasite is spread by cats but it can infect any bird or mammal. Around one-third of humans worldwide are infected with the parasite. (happy to provide extensive references if CoK is interested). The parasite can cause death	Support
	and/or disability, and can harm the unborn babies of infected mothers. Toxoplasma gondii infections are known in some areas, in the hills. Therefore, I suggest S3.7 (f) be altered to say The likelihood of a cat caused a nuisance, inconvenience,	
	harm or death to wildlife, the infection of humans (particularly	

	pregnant women) and/or wildlife, or/and annoyance to the occupiers, both human and non human, of the adjoining land. And	
	in (h) the likely effect on the local environment including any pollution or other environment damage or health risk caused	
	by I also ask that the permit to have cats includes a requirement for licensed cat to be microchipped (other WA	
	Councils do this), and that there is a requirement for owners to keep their cats inside, or in a cat run. The fines for non-compliance should be a lot higher, so that if the fine is meant to be a disincentive, then it will act as such.	
5	There are cat owners (otherwise good people) in my street who allow their animals to roam day and night. Birds, quendas and other small animals and reptiles have been slaughtered in my garden by these cats who enter without my permission. I regard this as a nuisance as it impacts on my enjoyment of my property.	Support
6	I am in favour of having the Keeping and Control of Cats Local Law 2023 in place. I would like to see a definition for nuisance cats behaviour on private property and a guide to dealing with such. This has not been addressed. The reason that this concerns me is that we have native fauna that is under threat by other cats coming on to our property. We have have taken steps to ensure our cats are always indoors, but have no way of dealing with other people's pets coming on to our property. We have had many baby quendas killed this way. Also I don't agree with on of the modified penalties on page 13. "Item 5 clause 3.4 (1) (b) Failure of a person to hold a permit for a cattery or cat management facility \$200." I believe that this fine should be more than that payable by a private individual, (eg item 4). I feel that a business running a cattery or the like cannot plead ignorance to requiring a permit or clearance from the City.	Support
7	Absolutely ridiculous the words "Nanny state" and "1984" comes to mind. If my neighbour doesn't like cats, then does that mean I'm denied a permit? But my neighbour can own multiple dogs that cause a nuisance by barking all hours of the day? What if I already have more than two cats? Do I just surrender the family members I've had for over a decade? Is the shire going to compensate me? What is the shire going to do about those who trap and kill domestic cats, as a resident I am far more concerned about abhorrent violent behaviour in my community than my neighbours cat sleeping in my garden. This	Do not support

	draft proposal is idiotic, there are far more important issues the shire could be addressing and trying to solve.	
8	I have read enough to be convinced that cats can be conditioned to remain within the house and not even stray into the garden. However it is again that minority that dont care. Our street recently had a pair of ducks with about half a dozen ducklings that ended up with zero ducklings, neighbours reported dead birds and I watched cats stalking birds. The ranger returned trapped cats to their owner after paying a fine. I really love cats but a small minority of people spoil it for the others (again). So suggest all cats to be chipped with HUGE fines if caught? Impractical? Then ban them all together?	Comment only
9	I very much support stricter control of cats, especially near bush areas with wildlife.	Support
10	Owners need to keep cats on their property at all timesthe same as dog laws. 2 cats only per household with a cat enclosure to keep the cats on the property. Cats need to be registered and Microchipped the same as dogs. I'm fed up with cats wandering on my property and within the villa complex upsetting my dogs and myselfmy dogs get stressed and bark. Wildlife is injured, cat fights are heard at night plus kittens are bornthe Rangers currently have no laws to fine the owners plssss pass these cat laws	Support
11	After having to deal with a cat coming onto my property at all hours of the night stalking, chasing and killing our local native wildlife (all caught on ctv), I would like to see a lot more done towards the protection of wildlife that actually belong in the local surroundings. After posting on a local page about the cat and having no resolve I have been forced to buy an animal trap and sprinkler spray deterrent. We have roughly 33 different types of birds many breeding and nesting on the property plus bandicoots, kangaroos, dugites, carpet pythons, brushtail possums, vanistristis black monitors and a number of smaller lizards and geckos it's definitely NOT a place for cats to roam. Melinda Goldsworthy	
12	The restrictions are insufficient given the current threat to biodiversity. We should not allow cats to be free roaming and kept in an enclosed space. After our new neighbours within 9 months of moving in with cats resulted in no sightings of quenda. Section 3.9) b) should apply to all cats, not just those under a permit. "Each cat shall be contained on the premises unless	Support

	under the effective control of a person" Keeping any cat should require a permit. Individual properties over 2,000 m2 should be able to voluntarily register to become a cat-prohibited zone if there is a significant bush/garden. Signs to that effect can be placed. The fines should be higher, twice as high.	
13	We constantly have random cats roaming and killing wildlife in our garden. This makes us extremely angry as less and less of these animals now visit. Keep your cat inside or in a cat run	Support
14	No comment.	Support
15	we have cats on every side of us who are all free roaming. They upset our pets that we keep on our own property and wee on our property. At our last count it was roughly 6 different cats	Support
16	We have quendas, bobtails and birds that live in our yard and have 2 cats that frequent our property and attack the wildlife.	Support
17	This doesn't go far enough. Cat owners should be given a timeframe within which they will be expected to create an indoor cat enclosure. Cats should not be allowed to roam around killing native wildlife. We have had several native animals killed by a neighbours cat. We managed to catch it once. We gave it to the ranger (it didn't have a collar) and it was back prowling around on our property the next day! Please consider the native animals which are already under threat due to habitat destruction in the area.	
18	The fines in dollar values are way too small. They should be 3- 4 times that amount to be a meaningful deterrent. The list of prohibited areas is also not extensive enough, people should be made to contain their cats to their property, we constantly have cats in our garden hunting birds and animals that we have encouraged into our garden with native plantings.	Comment only
19	Cats enter our property and attack the Quendas and small birds	Support
20	Several cats enter our backyard and attack our pets and I'm feed up about it and the owners should held accountable cats are a pest and a hazard to native fauna and need to be controlled	Support
21	I feel this a huge overreach of power by the City of Kalamunda. Also the wording is so woolly, referring only to a "nuisance". This is arbitrarily decided and completely subjective depending upon the person making a judgement and their own personal	Comment only

	prejudices. We have a situation where a cat crossing a neighbours lawn, minding its own business is a nuisance, but the	
	same neighbours dog barking day and night is fine. In this later situation, any nuisance that is causes might eventually	
	get a visit from the ranger after several complaints, and all they do is make a suggestion to the owner! Clarity should be given on the specific nature of a "nuisance". A woolly law like this allows for it to be used for neighbours to harass one another out of spite. "Your cat was seen on my property three days ago"	
	Fine in the post. I appreciate that cats do kill wildlife but they are not alone in this. Clearing habitat is the main reason for	
	wildlife numbers dropping. The new Roe Industrial Park in Wattle	
	Grove, on part the city's land, cleared hectares and hectares of wildlife habitat, thousands upon thousands of animals gone, but not a peep out of the council. Why? Because you'r receiving rates now for previously unproductive land. That's a bit	
	hypocritical don't you think? Furthermore, I believe Kanyana has said that dogs injure the majority of reptiles that they receive. But no law requiring them not to be a "nuisance". Whilst I don't want to turn this into a dog v cat discussion. It is clear that whilst they are both hunters, cats must carry the rap and any restrictions. This law feels like a back door way of insisting that all cats remain inside and live a very restrictive life, bored, confined and fat. The City is taking on huge	
	powers to control peoples lives with this, perhaps stick to things you should be controlling like the absolute nightmare of randomised	
	parking at Lesmurdie Falls when the falls are flowing.( a rangers occasional Saturday morning visit to the falls doesn't really	
	make much difference to the problem) At the very least you need to pin down what acts constitute a " nuisance" so the law	
	can be applied fairly and without prejudice. Imagine if a human law relied solely on whether a council official considered you	
	a "nuisance", rather than stating which particular actions were covered.	
22	Any effort to control Cats is applauded	Support
23	If its not considered a cat if less than 6 months old, does this enable breeding without a permit? This leads to more cats	Support
	1	1

	without homes. Although cats are prohibited in bushland areas, how can we protect wildlife that is in suburbian areas from displacement for example from cats roaming streets ect.	
24	For residential homes, maximum 3 cats is preferred rather than change to 2 cats. Do residential homes need to have a separate inclusure for more than 3 cats as this might not be feasible for existing residences and current owners of 3 cats. The cost of permit is not included in the draft document, would be useful to include. The importance of cats being inside and causing nuisance to native birds and animals and plants could be included and reinforces the relevant act re cats needing to be kept inside.	Support
25	I support all steps to reduce the impact of cats on native wildlife. I have three cats who are contained to my house and cat enclosure. I think this proposal should go further and require cats to be restricted to their owners' premises. Wildlife is abundant in Kalamunda and surrounds and needs protection from roaming cats. We regularly have unrestrained cats roaming onto our property aggravating our own cats and hunting wildlife. The time is right to make this an offence, there is no need for cats to roam.	Support
26	I think it isn't reasonable to ask that much control from cat owners as cats can't be domesticated like dogs are for example. And it is also quite extreme to ask an owner to abate his pet if defined as a "nuisance". Who determines the definition of a nuisance? It can be so subjective. Some people hate cats and any little thing can be considered a nuisance. Others love them and tolerate a lot more from them. Where do we draw the line? That law sounds quite extreme and I wish the city of Kalamunda could focus on more important matters. Thanks for hearing my opinion!	Do not support
27	I think the proposed new council laws are a good start. It would be better if cats were required to stay off other people's private property, and remain in doors or in catio enclosures, to prevent the nuisance issue before it starts. But, I understand that would be hard to enforce and people would likely object. I also think the penalties aren't particularly harsh for repeat offenders, and there should be a higher penalty for people who consistently disobey the laws.	
28	It is my firm belief that cats should be treated the same as dogs in the council bylaws. Newted chipped and registered by the owners, with the owners being held responsible and to account for the behaviors of the animal along with associated fines, etc.	Comment only

29	It is an utter disappointment that the Committee has watered down this bill and no longer provides the native wildlife any protection from wandering cats on private property. I would like the city to elaborate on the reason for removing section 2.3 'Control of cats in places that are not public' as "due to this clause being rejected previously by the Committee to other Local Governments restricting cats from wandering" is not a sufficient explanation.	Do not support
30	The Act as drafted is to support the wildlife and ensure that domestic pets are not a nuisance to others. There is not a problem with such a outcome - and one i support given I am planting my gardens to provide a home for native wildlife and encourage more diversity in my own property and surrounding reserves. It does not address the fact that many residents do NOT register or control their cats. Therefore, the residents who will be penalised, punished, persecuted and traumatised by this amendment are those who have complied with the existing laws. (clause 4.7 of the City of Kalamunda Local Law: Animals and Nuisance (2011) ) The council already has a record of those households with 3 registered cats. Where there is no recorded nuisance, these households should not be forced to rehome or euthanise the third much loved family member to conform with an Act that appears to have retrospective application. The existing laws allow for 3 registered cats. To suddenly change this requirement without appropriate and reasonable transitional requirements is causing undue distress and trauma. Please consider why you are intent on traumatising ratepayers who have complied with the current laws ? Ensure the transitional requirements are published and do not punish people who have complied with the laws of the day.	
31	l dont think these laws are enough. Surely cats need to be registered?? (They should be prohibited everywhere except their registered address).	Comment only
32	It would be much more beneficial to seek advice from ecologists and other scientists researching the environmental impacts of introduced species rather than asking ratepayers their opinions about future policy concerning cat owners' obligations. The ongoing maiming and killing of native fauna by pet cats needs to be addressed by legislation requiring mandatory containment of pet cats. If local shires do not make this change soon, many native animals will be hunted to critical levels.	Comment only

	Asking ratepayers for their opinions on this issue is similar to asking alcoholics what they think about restricting pub opening hours. Requiring cat owners to keep their pets contained at all times may mean an initial construction cost as well as requiring a change of mindset and some inconvenience. However, I think that the initial cost of building a cat run and the inconvenience of emptying litter trays are nothing compared to losing our native wildlife from where we live.	
33	Penalties for cat owners place undue pressure on cat owners. Most are trying to be responsible in managing domesticated cats. Given the busyness of families, people going in and out of homes, cats will escape homes and cat runs. Penalties are not the solution and place great stress upon responsible cat owners!	Do not support
34	l don't support this proposal.	Do not support
35	There are other ways to keep cats from harming wildlife, rather than banning them.	Do not support
36	Neighbours giving fines is excessive. They keep their cats inside locked at night, and controlled using bells and collars during the day. This is reasonable and adequate.	Do not support
37	This proposed legislation is unworkable from the point of view of a landowner who is harassed by cats attacking wildlife. We constantly have cats wondering across our property. The local small birds, bandicoots and other small native animals are not only hunted and killed but also scared off. We have tried repeatedly over the years to catch the cats and return them to their owners, but the cats are cunning. Reporting the occurrence of such invasions to an "authorised person" will be of no benefit at all if the cat is no longer on our property. The only workable way of protecting home owners from the trespass and damage of cats is to put the onus on cat owners to KEEP THEIR CATS ON THEIR OWN PROPERTY.	Comment only
38	Please allow the domestic cats t bit of freedom.	Do not support
39	I believe the act should require cats to be confined to their owner's property. Failing that, how do I register my property as a "prohibited area" as per the act?	Support
40	If people who have cats cannot keep them because of the new laws, I am concerned that there may be a rat and mouse infestation. Cats keep these rodents under control.	Do not support

41	Section 3.4 should include provision for cats who are temporarily present. Key example would be if someone is petsitting for family/friend and keeps the cat at their house and ends up over the 2 cat limit, it seems unreasonable to expect them to apply for a permit. Section 3.9 puts a condition that cats subject to a permit have to be contained - why is this specific to cats under a permit and not all cats? Schedule 1 requirements really seem to be for catteries, not for pet cats. Hard to see how the permit system gets applied to pet cats.	Comment only

### **Direct submissions**



P.O. Box 656 Kalamunda W.A. 6926 http://nrgg.org.au/ https://www.facebook.com/KalamundaNRPG https://www.facebook.com/nrpg.bushcare

Nature Reserves Preservation Group of Kalamunda, Inc.

9 Jan 2023

TO: Rhonda Hardy, CEO

CC: enquiries@kalamunda.wa.gov.au

SUBJECT: Submission on Draft of Kalamunda Keeping and Control of Cats Local Law 2023

#### Dear Rhonda,

The NRPG appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft Cats Local Law 2023, as follows:

Excerpts from the draft are 'boxed' for ease of reference.

#### 1.4 Definitions:

Cat prohibited area means an area as outlined in Schedule 3.

The definition of prohibited area is limited only to reserves. However, there would be many other areas in which cats could destroy wildlife, and if allowed to continue under this by-law, would be a very poor outcome, given the dire state of species extinction and threats to our environment.

NRPG asserts this definition should instead include the premise that cats should be prohibited from <u>all areas in the boundaries of the City</u>, except for the provisions in this by-law. This dramatically improves protection and simplifies reporting of violations because it does not require reference back to specific reserves, and puts the onus on the owner to take full responsibility.

At the very least, cats should be prohibited from all bushland or wetlands (with a 200m buffer zone around all), which would align with the City of Stirling local law 1998, and others. (Reference attached: City of Stirling "Responsible Cat Ownership" and City of Cockburn "OCM Agenda 9-07-2020").

cat means an animal of the species *felis catus* or a hybrid of that species;

For clarity, scientific names should begin with a capitalized genus name: Felis catus.

#### nuisance means-

 (a) an activity or condition which is harmful or annoying and which gives rise to legal liability in the tort of public or private nuisance at law;

(b) an unreasonable interference with the use and enjoyment of a person of his or her ownership or occupation of land; or

(c) Interference which causes material damage to land or other property on the land affected by the interference;

The definition of 'nuisance' should specifically include reference to the environmental nuisance and damage caused by cats in harming native wildlife, as this is a serious issue and relates directly to Kalamunda's Clean and Green Strategy and other environmental policies.

NRPG has previously raised the issue of the lack of mention of environmental impacts in the City's current "Responsible Cat Ownership / "Cat Owner Fact Sheet" pamphlet, in prior correspondence and meetings with the City. For this reason, 'nuisance' should include trespass of a cat outside of the boundaries of the owner's property, as the inherent damage caused by a cat's presence (predation threat, plus egress of wildlife due to the olfactory markers caused by predator presence) is detrimental to the environmental value of the neighbour's garden, thereby causing a 'nuisance'. Presence of cats outside of property boundaries also increases the risk of introduction of Toxoplasmosis to wildlife, other domestic cats, and humans. Therefore, NRPG request inclusion of the threat of spreading Toxoplasmosis as a threatening activity and a 'nuisance' posed by wandering cats.

#### Section 3.1 Interpretation

3.1 In this part, cat does not include a cat less than 6 months old.

The above section indicates that kittens are not included within the regulations. This makes it unclear as to the regulation of cat breeding within the City, and if there is a requirement of applying for a permit to produce a litter. It should be made clear if cats are required to be registered with the City and sterilized (unless covered under a breeding permit), as it is important to regulate the domestic cat population and the likelihood of abandonment and introduction of feral cats to the City.

Section 3.4: Cats for which a permit is required

Cats for which a permit is required (1) Subject to subclause (2) a person is required to have a permit to— (a) Keep more than 2 cats on any premises; or (b) Use any premises as a cattery or cat management facility. (2) A permit is not required under subclause (1) if the premises concerned are— (a) A refuge of the RSPCA or any other body prescribed in regulation 4 of the Cat Regulations 2012; or (b) A cat management facility which has been approved by the Local Government; (c) A veterinary surgery.

There is mention of a permit required for more than two cats, but it is not made clear that to keep one or two cats, both must be registered with the City.

#### Section 3.9 Conditions

(1) Every permit is issued subject to the following conditions-

(a) Each cat kept on the premises to which the permit relates shall comply with the requirements of the Act;

(b) Each cat shall be contained on the premises unless under the effective control of a person;

(c) The permit holder will provide adequate space for the exercise of the cats;

(d) The premises shall be maintained in good order and in a clean and sanitary condition; and (e) Those conditions contained in Schedule 1.

Mention of keeping cats on the premises they have been registered to is only located in the section above, in the context of applying for a permit for 3 or more cats. However, it should also be made clear that all cats, not just those under the extra permit, are required to be kept within the boundaries of the owner's property.

Given that cats can harm wildlife within the boundaries of the owner's premises and noting that a large area of the City is in private ownership and has habitat used by native wildlife, item (b) should emphasize that containment measures be put in place to prevent cats from harming native animals, such as cat runs or cat patios ('Catios'). At the very least, cats must be fitted with bells or other techniques to warn wildlife, or be on a leash any time a cat is in an area shared by wildlife.

To further ensure safety of our wildlife, there must be provision to monitor the measures, both by the random setting of IR cameras by the City Rangers, and include for allowing of reporting by any person or body of harm to wildlife even within another owner's property.

NRPG further reiterates the importance that these by-laws must address the need for protection of our environment and the devastating impacts that cats are well known to cause to our native animals. This point was made in the NRPG submission on 25 Feb 2022, yet it has been omitted in this draft, and we are not aware of an explanation for this. This issue is now particularly topical with Minster Plibersek's revealing of the dire "State of the Environment Report" in 2022, making pledges for zero extinctions and rebuilding our "Nature". The City's bylaws must support the scientific understanding which underpins the long-term viability of our Environment, which relies on our native wildlife in our ecosystems for completeness and survival.

Overall, we support the control of cats within the City of Kalamunda, but recommend the above amendments for clarity and effectiveness of control.

Kind regards,

Nature Reserve Preservation Group admin@nrpg.org.au

From L.Pilcher <a href="https://www.englight.com">l.Pilcher</a>

 Date
 Mon Dec 12 05:30:10 PM AWST 2022

 To
 Enquiries Enquiries@kalamunda.wa.gov.au

 cc
 bcc

 Subject
 Draft City of Kalamunda Keeping and Control of Cats Local Law 2023

Hello

I have just had a look at this new draft law. The only comment I wish to make is, I cannot find any mention of what happens to cats caught in a prohibited area when they have no form of identification e.g.. microchip, collar with tag.

If they are going to be euthanized then I think that should be mentioned.

Regards Glenice Pilcher

### Good Morning

I have written in prior regarding the amount of Cats that are roaming free around the area and I now see that these laws are up for review As a law abiding dog owner I find it hypocritical that we must keep our dogs on leash at all times (unless in a designated area) yet Cat owners can let their wildlife killers do whatever, whenever We see many Cats in the local area roaming free and have seen not only Cats with wildlife in their grips but dead wildlife around with the overwhelming majority being birds.

These birds range from Willie Wagtails (which I believe are on the endangered list) to honey eaters, ducks etc.

I have actually had cause to chase a Cat that indeed had a baby duck in its mouth,

fortunately I was able to rescue this

duck and return it to its family

Roaming Cats also cause issue for us whilst we are walking our dogs because the dogs want to go and see the Cats, obviously. Trying to hang onto large dogs can be challenging and spoils what is otherwise a pleasant walk

I have complained about these things for many years, I have even been down to the local government office, whilst my concerns were noted, there was nothing that could be done. Hopefully this will change as I know some shires, especially the Cockburn shire have much stricter rules on Cats being able to roam free

Cats should be contained and not allowed off the owners premises unless on a leash just like we have too with our dogs

I have attached my last correspondence with the Shire Andrew & Claire Carter

1# February 2023

#### City of Kalamunda Keeping and Control of Cats Local Law 2023 (Draft Policy)

Dear Councillor.

I write to you with regard to the above Control of Cats Policy, which if ratified in it's current form would represent a serious error of judgement by this council with potentially devastating consequences for the native fauna of this City as well as, I believe, not adequately protecting the "rights" of any person neighbouring a cat owner's property.

It would also mean that this Council is going to deliberately choose to ignore all the current research, the findings of a report to the Federal Government(ref.1) and will have deliberately chosen to ignore the recommendations of both the Federal Government and the RSPCA(ref 2) as well as those of almost any conservation group you care to mention.

I have nothing against cats and fully understand their valuable role as companions and pets. But .... they must be contained 24/7, as recommended.

Why do I think this ? Some Facts.

Cats (both feral and domestic) kill some two billion (2,000,000,000) native Australian animals annually (ref. 3 & 6). That rate of killing is equivalent to the entire population of the City of Kalamunda dead every 16 minutes and every single one of the 2.7 million inhabitants of WA gone in under 12 hrs, and every 12 hours of every day of every week of every year that rate of killing continues. It is unsustainable. It needs action by you, sooner rather than later. The Federal Government has stated "control of domestic cats should be done by Local Government" (ref. 1).

Domestic cats alone kill 390 million native animals a year (ref.3). Domestic cats, because of their density in suburban environments kill 30-50 times more animals per square kilometre than feral cats (ref.7).

Australia has the worst record of mammal extinctions of any country in the world and over 2/3 of these extinctions have been attributed to cats since their introduction (ref.8).

Australia's native animals are one of the key elements that make Australia unique, cats are not.

#### Cats transmit disease

The parasite Toxoplasmosis relies on cats as it only reproduces in the gut of cats. No cats, no Toxoplasmosis(ref.4)

Millions of eggs of the parasite are deposited on the ground with cat faeces. They can live in the soil for many months and from there can be taken up by humans and other animals.

Toxoplasmosis is a serious pathogen. Infection in pregnant women can result in birth defects. It can over time alter brain chemistry. "Chronic toxoplasma infections have been linked with illnesses including degenerative neurological disease, schizophrenia and brain cancer" (ref. 4 & 5).

Therefore, taking into consideration all of the above, Part 2 of the draft Keeping and Control of Cats Local Law 2023 should be amended.

#### Section 2.1 Cats not to be a nuisance

It should be obvious now that any cat not contained within a cat owner's property does present a nuisance. It's not the fault of the cat...it can't help itself. But neighbours (and their native animals) should be protected and not have to engage in any debate about whether a neighbour's cat is a nuisance or not. If a neighbour's cat is on your property it should be automatically deemed as being a nuisance, because it

will without doubt be hunting, killing and defecating on that property to the detriment of the wildlife on that property, as well as also possibly spreading disease.

The nuisance law therefore is an inadequate mechanism to rely on. If a neighbour's cat is on your property it should be deemed an offence and carry a fine.

#### Section 2.2 Cat Prohibited areas

This should be simplified to "cats are prohibited from any and every area that is not the property of the registered cat owner".

If a cat is not contained within the boundaries of the registered owner's property then an offence has been committed and a fine should apply.

The City of Kalamunda Council does not have to fear or worry about having to justify mandating the containment of cats 24/7 to its residents. A great deal of research has been done. A Standing Committee of the Federal Government has reviewed the findings of this scientific research and has made it's recommendations

In addition to 24/7 containment, the proper enforcement of the mandatory registration, wearing of collars, de-sexing and micro-chipping is important.

This whole issue should not be viewed simply about controlling cats or cat owners, it is not, it is about protecting the native wildlife of this country.

#### Some Ouotes.

1. Federal Government Standing Committee's Report of Feb 2022 "Tackling the Feral Cat Pandemic". The recommendation is that domestic cats be contained 24/7, and that control of domestic cats should be done by Local Government (ref. 1).

2. RSPCA publication "Identifying Best Practice Domestic Cat Management in Australia (2018) which states: "Cat containment regulations need to mandate 24-hour containment, rather than night-time curfews, if they are to significantly reduce wildlife predation, breeding of unwanted cats and cat nuisance" (ref 2)

3. "From a wildlife perspective keeping pet cats contained 24/7 is the only responsible option" (ref 6).

#### References.

- 1. Australian Government Response to the House of Representatives Standing Committee on the Environment and Energy Report: Tackling the Feral Cat Pandemic. (Feb 2022).
- 2. The RSPCA 2018 publication: Identifying Best Practice Domestic Cat Management.
- The CSIRO 2019 publication: Cats in Australia: Companions and Killers.
   The Conversation: "Cats carry diseases that can be deadly to humans and it's costing Australia up to \$6 billion every year". Published online October 16th, 2020.
- 5. The Conversation: "Cats that are allowed to roam can spread diseased to humans and wildlife". Published online June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2022
- The Smithsonian Magazine, March 2021: Australia's Cats Kill Two Billion Animals Annually. б.
- Threatened Species Recovery Hub, National Environment Science programme 15th May 2020
- 8. Threatened Species Recovery Hub: Research findings factsheet, Project 1.1.2