



Subject:	Dogs on Public Transport - Response from Translink
Date:	15th January, 2020
Reporting Officer:	Mr. H. Downey, Democratic Services Officer, ext. 6311
Contact Officer:	Mr. H. Downey, Democratic Services Officer, ext. 6311

Restricted Reports	
Is this report restricted?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If Yes, when will the report become unrestricted?	
After Committee Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
After Council Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sometime in the future	<input type="checkbox"/>
Never	<input type="checkbox"/>

Call-in	
Is the decision eligible for Call-in?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

1.0	Purpose of Report/Summary of Main Issues
1.1	To consider a response from the Group Chief Executive of Translink outlining the company's policy for the carriage of dogs on public transport.
2.0	Recommendation
2.1	The Committee is requested to note the response and take any such action as may be determined.
3.0	Main Report
	<u>Key Issues</u>
3.1	The Committee will recall that, at its meeting on 11th September, it agreed, at the request of the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor McReynolds), that a letter be forwarded to Translink, recommending that it review and amend its policy covering the carriage of dogs on buses and trains, to allow for more dog owners to avail of public transport.

<p>3.2</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>3.4</p>	<p>A response has now been received from Mr. Chris Conway, Group Chief Executive of Translink, a copy of which is attached.</p> <p>Mr. Conway explains that, following the Committee’s request, Translink had benchmarked its policy against those of other public transport companies in Ireland and Great Britain. That had found that its policy of allowing assistance dogs on all of its services at all times was in line with those companies, as was its policy of permitting all dogs to be carried on its services. However, in the latter case, Translink gave staff and drivers discretion to refuse entry in circumstances, for example, where dogs were unclean or poorly behaved or where other passengers had legitimate grounds for objecting, on account of allergies, phobias etc.</p> <p>Mr. Conway concludes by pointing out that Translink was of the view that its current policy balanced the aspiration for open access with the requirement for some mechanism to assess what was appropriate in protecting the needs of other passengers.</p> <p><u>Financial and Resource Implications</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Equality or Good Relations Implications/Rural Needs Assessment</u></p> <p>None</p>
<p>4.0</p>	<p>Document Attached</p>
	<p>Response from Group Chief Executive of Translink</p>