

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
PROPOSED KEEPING OF ANIMALS BYLAW 2022

#	Name	Summary of Submission	Relief Sought
1	Jim Risk & Yvonne Ward	Snodgrass to be rural (not included in the urban area)	1. Snodgrass to be excluded from urban area
2	Jackie Mathers & Bart Gillman	Urban boundary should match residential zoning in current District Plan and settlement in proposed TTPP. By including rural areas opening door for vexatious claims against rural dwellers. Boundary lines as drawn are arbitrary.	1. Urban boundary should match residential zoning in current District Plan and settlement in proposed TTPP
3	Kim Ashby	Disagree with increase to 4 cats per dwelling	1. Only 3 cats per property
4	Jeff Richards		
5	Gray Jeffery	<p>1. Urban area bee keeping - bees are needed to pollinate fruit and vegetable crops. Desirable to have a pair. Hives with vegetation or building between them and neighbouring property forces bees to fly higher and avoid problems. Up to 5 hives</p> <p>2. Rural - since the manuka honey gold rush there have been issues and often too many hives.</p> <p>3. MPI should be involved in urban situation - every beekeeper pays a levy for each apiary location</p>	1. Reasonable sized urban property can have up to 5 hives without problems

6	Annamarie & Kevin Jackson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Owned and grazed property within urban area for 25 years. Double fencing property (to keep 2m from boundary) - who pays and it causes issues with growth and fire danger. Loss of land utilisation - compensation ? 2. Increasing cat number to 4 endangers native bird species 3. Rabbits not mentioned - becoming major problem in town area and damage. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No 2m separation between animals and next door property 2. No increase in cat numbers 3. Manage rabbit pest population with regulations
7	Kelly Reedy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Snodgrass Road is rural (post) Rural settlement (TTPP). Like to have rooster and other animals 2. Livestock 2m from boundary - if choose to live next door to lifestyle/rural block should not complain . 3. two to three cats in urban area - native bird protection 4, Support many of the other proposals for true urban properties 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review urban boundary (Snodgrass) 2. Remove 2m from boundary for livestock 3. 2-3 cats in urban area only
8	Sue Hattersley	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend 7.1 to reduce cat numbers due to threat to native wildlife - they are ruthless hunters and kill copious numbers of birds, lizards and invertebrates. 2. Amend 8.2 to reduce number of poultry to 6. This is more than adequate to feed family of 5 people. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum 2 cats 2. Maximum 6 chickens

9	Kelly Reedy (Supplementary)	<p>Further to #7</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revisit urban boundaries 2. Currently have chickens, roosters, cats, ponies, horse, cattle and sheep surrounded by similar properties. 3. If minority complains would be forced to abate 4. Rural town should have a rural belt on the edges. 5. During Red warnings Snodgrass residents told to evacuate stock without any help but now being told what we can keep. 6. Talk to other agencies who consider Snodgrass to be Rural. 6. Save the Victoria Park Rooster 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review urban area boundaries to exclude areas like Snodgrass Road
10	Westport Trotting Club	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Urban boundary should exclude the racecourse. 2. Local trainers use facilities on regular basis and also location of the A and P show. 3. Westport Trotting Club provide and maintain facilities bringing financial benefits to whole district and providing iconic Boxing Day meets. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. exclude Patterson Park from the urban area on the same basis as the Pony Club and Reefton Racecourse
11	Glenys Adams	One cat is sufficient	one cat only
12	Pat Reedy	Against increasing cat number to 4 - one per dwelling	One cat per dwelling
13	Ross & Marlene Burrow	Totally against bylaw allowing 4 cats	Not 4 cats
14	Hayden & Lisa Ferguson	Strongly disagree with 4 cats provision - dog owners have restrictions on them whereas cats roam free	Not 4 cats
15	Gerald Hart	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One cat per household too many. 2. council should think long and hard about this important decision 	No Cats

16	Sue & John Bennett	Cats toilet in the garden and spray on front door. Bird life great at Carter's Beach. Against increase to 4 cats per household	Not 4 cats
17	Lorraine Richards		
18	Ross Eddy	1. No pig keeping in urban areas. 2. No roosters in urban areas. 3. No increase from 3 cats per household in urban areas	1. No pig keeping or roosters in urban areas. 2. No increase from 3 cats per household in urban areas
19	Lee-Ann Avery	Against increase to 4 cats per property. NZ spends millions of dollars protecting native birds. Birds in garden being killed by cats. Cats use other properties for toileting.	1. Cats per household remain at 3. 2. Should be desexed and vaccinated as well.
20	Brent Oldman	1. Include Charleston town in urban areas. 2. Agree with banning roosters and loud livestock. 3. Disagree with 4 cats per household - difficult to contain, abandoned and neglected, threat to native wildlife. Ideally no cats but support 2 per household	1. Include Charleston in urban areas 2. Maximum 2 cats per household
21	Mr Heslop	Stench from cows at Market Cross worse than noises from chickens and roosters	
22	Ben Leech	1. Opposes 4 cats per household as they are a nuisance breed. 2. Karamea is a rural community - no need to have these rules and regulations	1. Opposes 4 cats per household. 2. Exclude Karamea from Urban area
23	A-M Goulding	Oppose 4 cats limit but maybe if they had more (unless breeding, they must be spayed or neutered)	
24	Kathryn Bainbridge	Number of cats should be 2 and require desexing and microchipping - native birdlife suffering	1. Maximum number of cats per household - 2. 2. Requirement for desexing and microchipping

25	Shona Coles		
26	Erin McLean	Keep cats indoors at night, One cat per household, make owners responsible for animals and damage caused.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Require cats to be kept indoors at night. 2. Maximum of one cat per household 3. make owners responsible for damage caused
27	Alex Edwards	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All cats should be microchipped, desexed and registered. 2. All cats kept indoors or catteries. 3. if not complying with 1. above - limit to one per household. Roaming cats killing wildlife, carry dangerous toxoplasmosis. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All cats should be microchipped, desexed and registered. 2. All cats kept indoors or catteries. 3. if not complying with 1. above - limit to one per household
28	Shayne Barry	Number of cats no more than 2	Maximum number of cats - 2
29	Gerald Freeman	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cats to be treated like dogs: Licenced, kept under control, microchipped, only 2 per household and inducement to neuter leading to fewer cats killed on roads, better care by owners and less damage to wildlife and gardens. 2. owners should be responsible for containment of stock and take responsibility for damage done if cattle or sheep escape 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Licence cats. 2. Keep cats under control at all times. 3. Microchip cats. 4. Maximum 2 cats per household. 5. Inducements to neuter cats 6. Owner responsibility for damage done by escaped cattle and sheep
30	Sophie		
31	Gemma Main	Council should not be involved in this matter.	
32	Sharon McLeod	Chickens should be in fenced areas and not allowed to enter other properties	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contain chickens within owners property

33	Vicki	Snodgrass is not urban, reason for living there is to have sheep, cows and horses	1. Remove Snodgrass area from urban boundary
34	Caitlin Ansley	Council should consult with the community and listen. Stop penalising people and creating bylaws and fees.	
35	Jo Newbury	Agreement with all proposals except increase in cats. Large number of domestic cats already, animal welfare agencies over run with cats and kittens, create havoc for wildlife and neighbours (toileting in gardens, feral cats on increase as un0dexed cats breeding.	1. No increase in number of cats per household
36	Hans Wiskerke	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cats are apex predators 2. Roaming cats cause damage to wildlife outside the 'urban' zone 3. Cats toileting in in others gardens (risk of disease if in vegetable garden) 4. Territorial animals and noisy 5. Compulsory micro-chipping would allow identification of owners if cats trespassing on other properties 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum number of cats - 1 2. Microchipped at 4 weeks 3. Kept within property boundaries
37	John Main		
38	Dave	Increase in number of cats would be a disaster for wildlife and birds. Violent and predatory. Would decimate only just recovering wildlife	1. No more cats
39	Margaret Mackley	Karamea surrounded by national park - blue duck, kiwi, takahe and rock wren. Cats can travel long distances if allowed to roam.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cats to be treated as other animals and kept on property. 2. No increase in numbers - should be reduced.
40	W Barry Thomson	Karamea surrounded by National park and ecologically significant estuary. Karamea Estuary Enhancement Project have a trapping program. Roaming cats are the problem.	1. Contain cats on owners property

41	Sacha Healey	Cats are a top predator, using poisons in landscapes to reduce predation of native fauna. Must protect fragile, valued species.	No increase in number of cats per household
42	Kair Lippiatt	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inaccurate maps - should align to existing BDC district plan and proposed TTPP maps. Make maps more detailed and align with rural residential boundaries. Some rural sections split in two. 2. Granity is not urban like Westport - in TTPP 'settlement zone'. Should allow to continue to live off land and have one rooster per property. 3. Reduce cats to one or two per household and sinking lid. Cats are pests. Could be exempt if owner can prove it is an inside cat. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Align boundaries to district plan zones 2. Exclude Granity from Urban definition. 3. Cat number down to one or two with sinking lid - exemptions if proven indoor cat.
43	Karl Barlow	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Snodgrass area is rural area currently, in TTPP and rural postal delivery. Zone as rural - number of properties existing farms and lifestyle blocks. 2. oppose increase in cats - destroying native fauna. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exclude Snodgrass area from urban area - Urban boundaries stop at westside of Orowaiti Bridge 2. no increase in cat numbers per household
44	Renee Jones	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bee-keeping - In urban areas with close neighbours difficult to have more than 5 hives. In semi-rural townships anything over 1 acre could support 10 hives to be economical. e.g. 500m² 2 is about right, 1500m² approx. 5. 10-15 hives should be maximum under 1ha and agree all NZ laws and conditions should be upheld. 2. Checking with commercial bee-keepers on regulations - would be fair to have more than one opinion as beekeeping is competitive industry. Bigger companies putting 30-40 hives per site to push other out. 	Semi rural town - 500m ² - 2 hives, 1500m ² - 5 hives, 1ha - 10-15 maximum.

		3. Livestock - people have large sections to have more livestock - animals must be kept in a humane way.	
45	Lisa Gregory	<p>1. Past experience with disruption and sleep deprivation with 4am crowing of rooster in Westport. Should only be in low population areas and away from houses.</p> <p>2. No increase in cats - impacts of roaming cats on wildlife.</p>	<p>1. Support rooster ban in urban area.</p> <p>2. Oppose increase in number of cats</p>
46	Tania Reynolds	<p>1. Snodgrass Road has many larger blocks with animals - very much rural environment. Also included in TTPP as General Rural.</p> <p>2. Maps include portions of working farms of Utopia Road.</p>	Remove Snodgrass Road from Urban area - stop urban area west bank of Orowaiti River
47	Companion Animals NZ/Sarah Olson	<p>1. Desexing cats is part of responsible cat ownership. Large numbers of stray cats - can breed with un-desexed owned cats. Can rapidly increase cat population. 1.7 cats per NZ household and 15% of them un-desexed. Thousands of cats and kittens taken to shelters each year. Desexing also has disease prevention and behavioural improvement benefits.</p> <p>2. Microchipping cats has many benefits - locating lost cats, locating owners of injured cats, less time in the animal shelter, nuisance cats owners identified.</p> <p>3. Five councils doing this already</p>	<p>1. Mandatory desexing of cats by 4 months. (exemptions for registered breeders or vet certifies desexing would adversely affect health/welfare)</p> <p>2. Mandatory microchipping of cats</p>
48	Willie McLaughlin	<p>1. Do not support wording of proposed by law - unreasonable, overly restrictive and insufficient justification for level of restriction for all animals except cats.</p> <p>2. Do not support proposed urban area boundaries - many rural and rural-residential</p>	1. Do not support wording of proposed by law or proposed boundaries of urban areas.

		areas inappropriately included and proposed urban areas not included	
49	Ann Blythe	No roosters in Urban areas	1. Support roosters banned in urban areas
50	Rebecca Walker	Urban area boundary through working farmland	1. Revisit urban area boundary (McKenna Road)
51	Elizabeth Jane Duncan	<p>1. Snodgrass is zoned rural and TTPP general rural. Contradictory to class as urban in bylaw. No consideration of reverse sensitivity issues</p> <p>2. 13.1 and 13.2 'become offensive' term is too subjective and use of screen impractical</p> <p>3. Existing land use should be considered e.g. hen house existing before neighbouring land built on should comply</p> <p>4. Meaning of Clause 11.1 'keep livestock 2m from a boundary' ? Strip of land becomes unusable - fire risk, noxious weeds.</p> <p>5. Noise requires further clarification - how do you stop cows mooing or sheep baaing.</p> <p>6. 'Fees payable (Clause 14) ambiguous - should be clearly outlined when fees required.</p> <p>7. Timing - Snodgrass Road currently being hammered with regulations and restriction. Only thing land suitable for is keeping stock.</p>	<p>1. Snodgrass not suitable for 'urban' definition</p> <p>2. review 13.1 and 13.2 measures re. livestock slaughter</p> <p>3. Consider existing use rights for non-complying uses e.g. hen houses</p> <p>4. Refine 11.1 (existing uses) and impractical 2m rule</p> <p>5. Noise 11.2 needs clarification</p> <p>6. Fees Payable (clause 14) needs clarification</p>
52	Glen Anthony Duncan	As for #51 above	As for # 51 above
53	Anna O'Toole	Inclusion of Westport racecourse land in urban area - with accompanying restrictions re. nuisance. Huge impact for Westport and Buller. Land and facilities used on permanent basis. Events bring financial gain to district. A and P show also affected. Pony club land excluded as is Reefton	1. Exclude racecourse land from urban area

		racecourse - review boundary to exclude racecourse land	
54	Wayde Dunlop	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Poultry and poultry runs should be located in line with general rules regarding livestock i.e replace 9.2b with 11.1 (only if cause a nuisance should livestock be kept 2m from boundary). 9.2b will restrict area for runs and reduce grassed area for chickens. Or reference General rule of avoiding nuisance Rule 6. Other rules sufficient. 2. Bees – 10.6 max. number of hives should be 3. Need two hives to one hive in spring when hives are split creating nucleus hives. OR removing rule 10.7 b) i. would also work as this would avoid having to have a quarter acre section and allow smaller sections to manage hives if approved. Definition of nucleus hive as a hive causes issues. 3. Essentially – need three ‘hives’ at the end of spring to have two hives in winter to have a good chance of one hive the following spring. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove 9.2b (location of poultry houses and runs) rules with Rule 11.1 (general livestock) rules or the general Rule 6. 2. 10.6 – increase to three hives
55	Ruth Vega	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No more than 2 cats per household anywhere (7.1) 2. Cats MUST be desexed if more than one, include terms and conditions as council considers appropriate in the circumstances, including requirement for desexing.(7.3) 3. Agree no roosters, ganders peacocks in urban areas (8.1) Except the Vic Square rooster to remain 4. Disagree with 12 hens - 6 maximum unless commercial venture in rural area 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. two cats maximum on any property (urban and rural) 2. desexing of cats 3. Max. 6 hens

56	Richard and Ingrid Taylor	Oppose increase in number of cats to 4 - should be fostering and protecting native flora and fauna. Support DOC and Local gardeners who are encouraging native birds with plantings and feeders	1. Reduce Max. number of cats per household to 2 - if more already in a household allow to live out natural lives.
57	Paul Murray	Karamea is rural and remote - can hear the sounds of rural NZ. Living remotely people need to keep animals for food, weed control, natural fertiliser and recycling scraps as there is a lack of services	Back off on the proposed changes to the bylaw. Concentrate on important issues e.g. sorting out discrepancies in the addresses in Karamea.
58	Kyle Avery	Graze livestock on paddocks within town boundaries. Bylaw will impact negatively. If one neighbour complains may have to remove livestock. Also TTPP will reduce land use options as there may be a building ban. Same as Snodgrass.	General issues with livestock provisions in urban areas
59	Jared Avery	As for #58 above	
60	Brett Avery	As for #58 above	
61	Paul Avery	As for #58 above	
62	Paul Avery (Snr or Jnr?)	As for #58 above	

63	Frida Inta	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No need to replace existing by law to control noisy poultry 2. Cl 3.1 - crowing rooster does not affect public health and safety 3. Nuisance (interpretation) - some people like roosters crowing, it depends on perception. Should be on case by case basis. 4.Noise - should be measured in decibel level 5. Urban Areas - need to be tightened up using GPS 6. Keeping of Animals 6.1 - Question how to determine something is likely to become a nuisance or offensive. Also why use 'in the opinion of Council'? Need facts not opinions. Delete or heavily amend 6.1. 7. Keeping of Poultry - no roosters, ganders or peacocks - ADD if they are a nuisance. Needs more balance. 8. Urban area limit 12 head of poultry - should be per spatial extent (size of property) as some properties within urban area could be an acre. 9. Cl 6.4 -No nuisance to 'any' person - could lead to one person in a neighbourhood to get relief at expense of neighbourhood. 10. Cl 9.1 - objects to use of 'chicken' - use poultry. No distinction between poultry kept domestically and for commercial purposes. Commercial would require further boundary distance - same for pigs 11. Cl 9.1 if poultry house is maintained to bylaw standard 1m from boundary is adequate - also needs to be existing use rights for those already established (reference to RMA). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Issues with interpretation of nuisance. 2. Noise measured in decibels 3. Urban area boundaries defined better (GPS) 4. Use of opinion rather than fact re. 6.1 - delete or heavily amend 5. Apply ban of roosters, ganders and peacocks only if cause a nuisance. 6. Number of poultry should be related to property size. 7. Use 'poultry' rather than chicken term 8. Domestic vs. commercial poultry (and pigs) - commercial should be more restrictive. 9. Recognise existing use rights for existing poultry houses 10. Provide pigs with same level of protection re. shelter and conditions as poultry. 11. Need hot line for immediate reporting slaughtering breaches.
----	------------	--	--

		<p>12 Cl. 12 - pig keeping needs to require adequate shelter for pigs. Also should there be constraint on number of pigs allowed. Need similar requirements to Poultry.</p> <p>13. Cl 13 - Slaughter of animals provisions - agrees with these but written abatement notice system too slow, need hotline and immediate action.</p> <p>14. Cl 15.2 Operational policies should be transparent and made publicly available</p>	
--	--	---	--