

## Online Further Submission

## Further Submitter #93

<b>Further Submitters Name</b>	Leonie M Exel
<b>Further Submitter Number</b>	FS93
<b>Wish to be heard</b>	Yes
<b>FS qualifier</b>	a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest (e.g. community group)
<b>FS qualifier reason</b>	As co-ordinator for the BOI Watchdogs, I have a specific interest in submissions relating to dogs, pest control and similar matters
<b>Joint presentation</b>	No
<b>Attention:</b>	Ms. Leonie Exel
<b>Contact organisation</b>	BOI Watchdogs
<b>Address for service</b>	250 Kempthorne Road RD1 Russell, Northland 0272
<b>Telephone</b>	<a href="tel:0223177291">0223177291</a>
<b>Mobile</b>	
<b>Email</b>	<a href="mailto:leoexel@hotmail.com">leoexel@hotmail.com</a>
<b>Online further submitter?</b>	Yes
<b>Date raw FS lodged</b>	04/09/2023 2:24am

## FS93.01 - 93.052

## Further submission points

Raw FS number	Original submitter	Related Submission Point	Plan section	Provision	OS Decision Requested	SupportOppose	FS Decision requested	Reasons
FS93.1	Pacific Eco-Logic	S451.005	Subdivision	Policies	Insert policies that:  1. Clarify that significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, (including the balance lot) are to be protected as part of a subdivision  2. Require cat and/or dog-free subdivision in areas of particular importance for vulnerable indigenous wildlife (e.g., kiwi, matuku, shorebirds)  3. Require sewage and stormwater management to prevent nutrients	Oppose	Disallow	• Do not support (1) the provision

and sediment from reaching natural waterways, including natural wetlands

4. Identify priorities where riparian fencing and planting should be a condition of subdivision

of rates relief for people who ban or restrict dogs and cats in perpetuity either via conservation covenants or sub-division processes. My rates are not for their use, and this cost, in the 20/21 year, \$79,000+ for NRC and \$584,000+ for FNDC. Think of all the extra Animal Management Officers we could hire for that, to work on community education, and monitoring areas of high wildlife density.

• Agree with (2) if support is provided for fencing in poorer communities where dog owners cannot afford to fence, AND if Northland forests are predator fenced like Sanctuary Mountain Maungatautari.

FS93.2	Pacific Eco-Logic	S451.006	Subdivision	SUB-P11	<p>Insert the following to the list of matters to be considered when Council assesses land use and subdivision consent applications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The quality and extent of the indigenous ecosystems and elements present</li> <li>2. The potential impact of the proposed activity on the biodiversity values of the native vegetation present on, and in the vicinity of, the property</li> <li>3. The type and extent of legal and practical protection being provided to protect indigenous ecosystems and elements</li> <li>4. The type and scale of ecological restoration and protective management being proposed (e.g., pest control)</li> <li>5. The potential hazards posed by the construction and ongoing new activities on at-risk wildlife</li> <li>6. Controls on pet ownership to</li> </ol>	Oppose	Disallow	
--------	-------------------	----------	-------------	---------	---	--------	----------	--

Re points 1 & 2:

protect at-risk wildlife

- Do not agree with sub-division policies, or practice notes, that ban or restrict the number of dogs or cats which are allowed on a particular property.
- Banning responsible pet owners from owning and keeping pets on their own property is a breach of the wellbeing and rights of the 40%+ of pet owning households in this district. To do so in perpetuity is also a breach of the rights and potential wellbeing of future owners, including the current owners' descendants.
- These bans have been going for over two decades, and yet just this month multiple kiwi have been killed in Opuia forest by just two 'wandering dogs.' It has not worked for over two decades, and is an ineffective means of reducing predation on wildlife. It over-regulates responsible dog owners, and under-regulates irresponsible dog owners.
- Point (2) suggests banning dogs and cats from even more land in Northland, including the beaches if you consider shorebirds. Northland already has 53,000+ hectares where kiwi are present or high density. Where are the 40% of Northland pet owning households meant to live?

FS93.3	Pacific Eco-Logic	S451.006	Subdivision	SUB-P11	Insert the following to the list of matters to be considered when Council assesses land use and subdivision consent applications:  1. The quality and extent of the indigenous ecosystems and elements present  2. The potential impact of the proposed activity on the biodiversity values of the native vegetation present on, and in the vicinity of, the property	Support in part	Disallow in part
--------	-------------------	----------	-------------	---------	---	-----------------	------------------

Do not agree with (6)

3. The type and extent of legal and practical protection being provided to protect indigenous ecosystems and elements

4. The type and scale of ecological restoration and protective management being proposed (e.g., pest control)

5. The potential hazards posed by the construction and ongoing new activities on at-risk wildlife

6. Controls on pet ownership to protect at-risk wildlife

- The legal means to control dogs is the clearly-named Dog Control Act (1999). This requires strong community consultation every 5-10 years via bylaw reviews, to ensure that the dog-owning community has a say in such decisions.
- To use various clauses in the Resource Management Act (RMA) to control dogs is legally inappropriate.
- To ban dogs from anywhere without first liaising with dog owners – 40% of our community – is appalling.
- FNDC, this has been going on for over two decades. Please be the elected council which demands that dog control be managed via the legally appropriate means.
- Controls on pet ownership should never include banning dogs, or restricting a dog owner to a certain number of dogs (one, or two, or more) at the un-researched or supported whim of the FNDC District Planning department.
- FNDC chose not to restrict dog numbers by household during the consultations on the Dog Management Bylaw 2018. This was logical as the key is not numbers of dogs, but whether the owner acts responsibly towards them. Under the Dog Control Act (1996) and the Animal Management Act (1999), FNDC Animal Management Officers, the SPCA, and Police can all uplift dogs which are causing a nuisance, roaming, or being abused. The key for FNDC is to use these powers effectively, not to 'get around' the responsibility to enforce responsible dog ownership, and educate the public on what that means.

FS93.4	Pacific Eco-Logic	S451.007	Subdivision	Rules	Insert additional rules for	Oppose	Disallow	Re points 1 & 2:
--------	-------------------	----------	-------------	-------	-----------------------------	--------	----------	------------------

					<p>subdivisions, other than environmental benefit lots, to address the protection of indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna.</p> <p>These rules should include</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (including the balance lot) as part of a subdivision</li> <li>2. The requirement for cat and/or dog-free subdivision in areas of particular importance for vulnerable indigenous wildlife (e.g., kiwi, matuku, shorebirds)</li> </ol>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not agree with sub-division policies, or practice notes, that ban or restrict the number of dogs or cats which are allowed on a particular property.</li> <li>• Banning responsible pet owners from owning and keeping pets on their own property is a breach of the wellbeing and rights of the 40%+ of pet owning households in this district. To do so in perpetuity is also a breach of the rights and potential wellbeing of future owners, including the current owners' descendants.</li> <li>• These bans have been going for over two decades, and yet just this month multiple kiwi have been killed in Opuia forest by just two 'wandering dogs.' It has not worked for over two decades, and is an ineffective means of reducing predation on wildlife. It over-regulates responsible dog owners, and under-regulates irresponsible dog owners.</li> <li>• Point (2) suggests banning dogs and cats from even more land in Northland, including the beaches if you consider shorebirds. Northland already has 53,000+ hectares where kiwi are present or high density. Where are the 40% of Northland pet owning households meant to live?</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	---

FS93.5	Pacific Eco-Logic	S451.011	General	General / Process	<p>Insert a package of non-regulatory methods to promote and assist landowners to protect significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna. This could include</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rate relief/ postponement for areas under permanent/ long-term protection</li> <li>2. Grants for plant and animal pest control, fencing and wetland restoration</li> </ol>	Oppose	Disallow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not support (1) the provision</li> </ul>
--------	-------------------	----------	---------	-------------------	---	--------	----------	--

of rates relief for people who ban or restrict dogs and cats in perpetuity either via conservation covenants or sub-division processes. My rates are not for their use, and this cost, in the 20/21 year, \$79,000+ for NRC and \$584,000+ for FNDC. Think of all the extra Animal Management Officers we could hire for that, to work on community education, and monitoring areas of high wildlife density.

• Agree with (2) if support is provided for fencing in poorer communities where dog owners cannot afford to fence, AND if Northland forests are predator fenced like Sanctuary Mountain Maungatauri.

FS93.6	Pacific Eco-Logic	S451.015	Coastal environment	CE-P10	Insert the following to the list of matters to be considered when Council assesses land use and subdivision consent applications:	Support in part	Disallow in part
7. The quality and extent of the indigenous ecosystems and elements present							
8. The potential impact of the proposed activity on the natural character values of the native vegetation present on, and in the vicinity of, the property							
9. The type and extent of legal and practical protection being provided to protect indigenous ecosystems and elements							
10. The type and scale of ecological restoration and protective management being proposed (e.g., pest control)							
11. The potential hazards posed by the construction and ongoing new activities on at-risk wildlife							
12. Controls on pet ownership to							Do not agree with (12)

protect at-risk wildlife

13. The level of anthropogenic sound that is likely during construction and with the ongoing new activities

14. The level of anthropogenic night lighting proposed and its potential effect on indigenous species.

15. The impact of the proposed development on the experiences of low-impact recreationists using public lands (including unformed legal roads) and the coastal marine area.

16. The impacts of construction and long-term vehicle use on natural character

17. Whether the development could hinder the ability of native ecosystems (e.g., saltmarsh) to migrate inland as sea levels rise

- The legal means to control dogs is the clearly-named Dog Control Act (1999). This requires strong community consultation every 5-10 years via bylaw reviews, to ensure that the dog-owning community has a say in such decisions.
- To use various clauses in the Resource Management Act (RMA) to control dogs is legally inappropriate.
- To ban dogs from anywhere without first liaising with dog owners – 40% of our community – is appalling.
- FNDC, this has been going on for over two decades. Please be the elected council which demands that dog control be managed via the legally appropriate means.
- Controls on pet ownership should never include banning dogs, or restricting a dog owner to a certain number of dogs (one, or two, or more) at the un-researched or supported whim of the FNDC District Planning department.
- FNDC chose not to restrict dog numbers by household during the consultations on the Dog Management Bylaw 2018. This was logical as the key is not numbers of dogs, but whether the owner acts responsibly towards them. Under the Dog Control Act (1996) and the Animal Management Act (1999), FNDC Animal Management Officers, the SPCA, and Police can all uplift dogs which are causing a nuisance, roaming, or being abused. The key for FNDC is to use these powers effectively, not to 'get around' the responsibility to enforce responsible dog ownership, and educate the public on what that means.

maps

Space Zone

restoration projects in areas such as:

- Pipiroa wetland on the Russell Peninsula,
- Wairoro Park QE11 covenant on the Russell Peninsula,
- Tangatapu wetlands and hillside FNDC covenant at the start of the walkway to Whangamumu from 717 Rawhiti Road

zoning the areas as natural open space to provide for better protection and reduced rates

covenant/subdivision have been happening on the Russell Peninsula in particular, and again we have recommendations here which would strengthen the illogical, ineffective, unenforceable, extensive, dog bans on this peninsula.

- If FNDC wants to ban dogs from a particular area, this needs to be done WITH the local community, AFTER consultations. Not quietly, via sub-divisions or covenants, where rules have not been voted on by elected council members, and local people do not discover that their township has largely become banned to dogs without their knowledge, over 20+ years.

- This lack of consultation has driven conservationists and dog lovers apart, which need not have been the case.

- I am unsure of these specific zoning rules, but am concerned that individuals choosing to ban pets via covenant are receiving funding and rates relief, paid for in part by the 40% of Northland households that have dogs. I do not wish my rates to support this.

FS93.8

Marianna Fenn

S542.001

Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity

IB-O2

Amend by replacing with

Oppose

Disallow

~~Indigenous biodiversity is managed to maintain its extent and diversity in a way that provides for the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities.~~  
**The extent and diversity of indigenous biodiversity across the district is maintained, protected, and where possible enhanced**

- I do not support the deletion of



								<p>'the well-being of people and communities' from any part of this document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The well-being of dog owners has been ignored by FNDC again and again. For over 20 years, our family members have been banned from land, in perpetuity, across this district – either by sub-division consent processes, or by covenants.</li> <li>• I had no chance to be consulted, and the elected council has not voted, to do this.</li> <li>• Indigenous biodiversity and pets can and do co-exist. If this becomes either/or, we will all lose – the dogs, and the wildlife – as it is unworkable.</li> </ul>
FS93.9	Marianna Fenn	S542.009	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P7	Amend to include reference to potential incentives that could be provided	Oppose	Disallow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I DO NOT support dogs or cats ever being named in the same paragraph as 'pests.'</li> <li>• Dogs are never 'pests.' They are pets, and are our family.</li> <li>• Cats in this context are feral cats. Domestic and colony/community cats, which are often dumped, need to be excluded from any provision referring to them. Kill traps MUST not be used for feral cats – they must be live traps, and taken to be checked for microchips at a vet.</li> <li>• Research shows that killing colony/community cats leads to a 'vacuum effect' where other cats take up that space. If you trap, neuter and return, those neutered cats 'hold' the space and stop other cats from entering. Over time, this reduces the number of cats in an area better than killing them all outright.</li> <li>• I have had countless people express their horror at neighbours who shoot or trap cats, ignoring whether they are feral or domestic much-loved fur kids. This has happened in Russell, where zealots</li> </ul>

think they can get away with shooting cats. It is a terrible thing to do, to kill someone's family member.

- I do not support the provision of rates relief for people who ban or restrict dogs and cats in perpetuity either via conservation covenants, or sub-division processes. My money should not go towards something I find repugnant, and something I have not had a chance to object to.

- The cost of rates relief in the 20/21 year, for covenants which ban our pets, was \$79,000+ for NRC and \$584,000+ for FNDC. Think of all the extra Animal Management Officers we could hire for that, to work on community education, and monitoring areas of high wildlife density!

FS93.10	Marianna Fenn	S542.011	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	<p>Amend to require management and (where appropriate) limits on the numbers of domestic pets and livestock for landowners and land occupiers; and</p> <p>Amend to clarify that further limits and pest and weed control will be considered when possible and appropriate</p>	Oppose	Disallow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Livestock are catered for under the Animals bylaw. This expired some years ago and is only now being re-drafted by FNDC. That is the appropriate document to regulate livestock, not the RMA.</li> <li>• Bans and restrictions via sub-division consents has not worked for over two decades, and is an ineffective means of reducing predation on wildlife. It over-regulates responsible dog owners, and under-regulates irresponsible dog owners. It creates mistrust between council and residents, and mistrust between dog owners and conservation experts.</li> <li>• These dog and cat bans and restrictions have been going for over two decades, and yet this month multiple kiwi have been killed in Opuia forest by just two 'wandering dogs.'</li> <li>• The legal means to control dogs is the clearly-named Dog Control Act (1999). This requires strong</li> </ul>
---------	---------------	----------	--	-------	---	--------	----------	---

community consultation every 5-10 years via bylaw reviews, to ensure that the dog-owning community has a say in such decisions.

- To use various clauses in the Resource Management Act (RMA) to control dogs is legally inappropriate, and frankly, sneaky.
- The elected council of FNDC chose NOT to restrict or limit dog numbers by household during the consultations on the Dog Management Bylaw 2018. This was logical as the key is not numbers of dogs, but whether the owner acts responsibly towards them. Under the Dog Control Act (1996) and the Animal Management Act (1999), FNDC Animal Management Officers, the SPCA, and Police can all uplift dogs which are causing a nuisance, roaming, or being abused. The key for FNDC is to use these powers effectively, not to 'get around' the responsibility to enforce responsible dog ownership, and educate the public on what that means.

FS93.11	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	S364.002	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Insert SNAs in the plan using the report prepared for Council titled "Significant Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats of the Far North District - Volume 1" prepared by Wildlands Consultants (Contract Report No. 4899d, December 2019) to include SNAs in the Proposed District Plan.	Oppose	Disallow
---------	---	----------	--	--	--	--------	----------

- The sub-division chapter is of key

concern to Northland's dog owners, of which I am one.

- The legal means to control dogs is the clearly-named Dog Control Act (1999). This requires strong community consultation every 5-10 years via bylaw reviews, to ensure that the dog-owning community has a say in such decisions.
- To use various clauses in the Resource Management Act (RMA) to control dogs is legally inappropriate.
- This consultation on the DP is immensely complicated and cannot be seen as a substitute for consultation with communities about matters which affect their wellbeing.
- The wellbeing of dog owners, who comprise between 40-50% of Northland households, is deeply adversely affected by not being able to live with their dog.
- Dog owners - overwhelmingly in the research - consider their dogs to be a family member.
- Dog owners are increasingly being forced out of Northland by dog bans and restrictions on subdivisions.
- Less than 5% of rental properties in Northland allow dogs
- Northland Regional Council (NRC) recommends that landlords ban pets in leases. This is outside NRC's scope, and inappropriate in a housing crisis.
- There is no evidence to suggest that the 2 decades of dog bans through sub-divisions have led to any reduction in the number of kiwi killed by dogs in Northland, or to the number of wandering dogs in Northland.

FS93.12	Director-General of Conservation (Department of	S364.003	Subdivision	Rules	Amend the Subdivision chapter to include more stringent controls to allow for the consideration and	Oppose	Disallow	• Loosen the controls on dogs,
---------	--	----------	-------------	-------	---	--------	----------	--------------------------------

Conservation)

scheduling of SNAs in the subdivision chapter.

don't add to them!

- Immediately halt all bans on dog ownership, and restrictions on the number of dogs allowed in each household, as is currently occurring via FNDC's sub-division chapter.

- Use evidence-driven methods to reduce wandering dog populations. The dog loving community is likely to support these strongly.

- Over the last (approx.) 30 years in Northland, around 10-12 kiwi have been killed each year by dogs. More kiwi have been killed by cars.

- On the Russell Peninsula, there has been argument in the community about dogs and kiwi for some years. Figures we obtained from DOC, for the period 1990 – early 2018, showed 4 kiwi had definitely been killed by dogs on the Russell Peninsula. They suspected an additional 3 were killed by dogs but this was not confirmed.

- Here are the number of kiwi known by DOC to have been killed in Northland, over a 2.5 year period:

- o 2019: car - 21; dog - 20; cat - 0; cat or stoat - 1

- o 2020: car - 20; dog - 13; cat - 0; cat or stoat - 0

- o 2021 (to June): car - 12; dog - 9; cat - 0; cat or stoat or unknown - 2

- When kiwi are killed by dogs, they are most often dogs who are wandering without their owners being 'in control' of them at the time.

- These dog and cat bans and restrictions have been going for over two decades, and yet this month multiple kiwi have been

								<p>killed in Opua forest by just two 'wandering dogs.' The dog bans don't work!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FNDC is responsible for educating dog owners about responsible dog ownership, and police owners who let their dogs wander. These two factors – education and effective policing – along with de-sexing dogs across the district, are the most effective solutions to reducing wandering dogs.</li> <li>• Stop using sub-division consents and covenants to ban dogs and cats across New Zealand. Once the community becomes aware of how land has been banned or restricted to pets in Northland, there will be an outcry.</li> </ul>
FS93.13	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	S364.005	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	<p>Amend the Plan to be consistent with the NPSIB exposure draft. Specifically, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect SNAs and identified taonga on Māori lands inline with clause 3.18 of the NPSIB exposure draft.</li> <li>• Include objectives, policies, or methods in the PDP for managing the adverse effects of new subdivision, use, and development on highly mobile fauna areas.</li> <li>• Incorporate NPSIB Appendices 3 and 4 or like principles into the PDP. Update proposed Policy IB-P4 to require that any biodiversity offset, or biodiversity compensation be in accordance with these principles.</li> </ul>	Oppose	Disallow	<p>Dog owners can ensure their dog stays under their control in a number of ways, one of which is to fence their property securely. This prevents their dog from wandering, which is the primary risk to kiwi from dogs.</p> <p>It is unreasonable to demand that a dog owner NOT fence their property, in case wildlife of various sort choose to walk through it. This is likely to have the opposite of the desired effect, which is protection of that wildlife.</p> <p>If an area is of such great importance to the survival of a particular species, do not develop it at all.</p>
FS93.14	Director-General of Conservation	S364.006	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	<p>Insert overlays that identify locations of 'kiwi present' or 'high-</p>	Oppose	Disallow	<p>DOC wishes to 'lower the bar' on</p>

(Department of Conservation)

density kiwi areas, with a mechanism for updating these maps.

which species are protected. This in turn 'raises the bar' for dog owners, as it expands the area where FNDC may choose to ban or restrict our dogs.

A similar DOC-driven change related to the definition of 'high density kiwi.' A few years ago, this was dropped from 7 calls per night, to 5 calls per night. At the same time, the category formally known as 'kiwi absent,' where no kiwi calls were heard, was altered to become 'data deficient'. The rationale was that kiwi MIGHT have been in the area, but were not heard.

Such changes to the dividing line for kiwi have major implications for dog owners. We mistrust how the changes seem to always err in favour of our dogs being banned or restricted in number.

Kiwi are precious and they need our protection. The work that has been done by conservation groups in Northland is extraordinary. I agree that mapping of kiwi and other wildlife density is useful to the community.

After many years of requests, FNDC has just begun to gather data on how and where dogs have been restricted across our district.

If there were no negative implications for dog owners flowing from this change, I would support it wholeheartedly.

As it implies further illogical banning of dogs, I cannot support it.

STOP the dog bans, and restrictions on allowable dog numbers, via sub-division resource

consents. This will allow all of us to unite, and focus on the methods that really will help kiwi – by reducing the number of wandering dogs.

FS93.15	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	S364.007	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Insert framework into the District Plan to promote pet-free subdivisions in high-density kiwi areas.	Oppose	Disallow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stop the dog bans, and restrictions on allowable dog numbers, via sub-division resource consents.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that the dog bans/restrictions in Northland have worked.</li> <li>• These bans/restrictions are so widespread that they are ignored by responsible dog owners, who keep their dogs under control. They pose minimal risk to kiwi or other wildlife.</li> <li>• Owners who let their dogs wander do not obey the Dog Control Act (1996) and they - not landowners, and not dogs - should be the focus of increased control, using that very Act.</li> <li>• De-sex dogs, educate the community, and effectively police the owners of wandering dogs.</li> <li>• In 2006, DOC funded research on the efficacy of their kiwi aversion training. It was found to be ineffective ( Jones, B. M. (2006) "Assessing the effectiveness of a Department of Conservation procedure for training domestic dogs to avoid kiwi"). In that paper, it clearly states that dog bans/prohibitions are likely to be counter-productive (p6): "Given the threat that dogs pose to kiwi, measures to keep dogs out of kiwi habitats seem to be justified and necessary for the protection of kiwi. However, James (2000) argues that the prohibition of dogs from those habitats may impact negatively on kiwi conservation if an authority's approach is perceived by dog owners as rigid or inconsistent. In addition, such</li> </ul>
---------	--	----------	---------	--	--	--------	----------	---



measures are often impractical for a number of reasons. First, kiwi frequently inhabit privately owned land, or protected areas that are immediately adjacent to either private land, or public areas where dogs are permitted. Some overlap of the habitats of kiwi and dogs is, therefore, probably unavoidable. Second, dogs have proven to be extremely useful for hunting feral pigs (*Sus scrofa*), deer (*Cervus spp.*) and goats (*Capra hircus*) and measures to control these populations undoubtedly also benefit kiwi. Third, given the geography of most kiwi habitats, enforcing dog restrictions is likely to be extremely difficult, especially in rural areas where recreational hunting is popular.”

FS93.16	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	S364.038	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P3	<p>Amend Policy IB-P3 as follows:</p> <p>Outside the coastal environment:</p> <p>a. <del>avoid, remedy or mitigate</del> significant adverse effects of land use and subdivision on Significant Natural Areas <del>to ensure adverse effects are no more than minor</del>; and</p> <p>b. avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems to ensure there are no significant adverse effects.</p>	Oppose	Disallow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagree with these recommendations.</li> <li>• We will not ensure a healthy environment by banning pets entirely.</li> <li>• Nor can we ensure the health of our communities and indigenous biodiversity by writing documents which add more and more control.</li> <li>• We have to work together to encourage everyone to get involved, in a balanced, evidence-driven manner.</li> </ul>
FS93.17	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	S364.041	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P6	<p>Amend Policy IB-P6 as follows:</p> <p>Require landowners to manage pets and pest species, including dogs, cats, possums, rats and mustelids, to avoid risks to <del>threatened indigenous species</del> <b>At Risk or Threatened indigenous fauna</b>, including avoiding the introduction of pets and pest</p>	Oppose	Disallow	Beginning in 2021, we polled our

species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas.

members as below:  
 In your view, if you move into, or live in, a town or zone where there are many weka or kiwi present, whether or not they were always there or have been actively released there, what rules or restrictions should there be in relation to dogs?  
 The top responses (of 646 votes) give an indication of the kinds of restrictions that dog owners consider acceptable:  
 19% - Fencing required  
 17% - Dogs must be registered and micro-chipped  
 11% - More frequent checks by dog control officers in such areas  
 11% - Don't release ground dwelling endangered birds in or near urban areas.  
 9% - Require dogs to be neutered or spayed  
 7% - Dogs must be indoors at night

FS93.18	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	S364.053	Subdivision	SUB-O2	Amend Objective SUB-O2 as follows:  Subdivision <b>recognises and</b> provides for the:  <del>a. Protection of highly productive land; and</del>  b. Protection, restoration or enhancement of Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Natural Character of the Coastal Environment, areas of High Natural Character, Outstanding Natural Character, wetland, lake and river margins, Significant Natural Areas, Sites and areas of Significance to Māori, and Historic Heritage.	Oppose	Disallow	Social wellbeing is of national importance. This needs to be acknowledged, as the dog bans and restrictions are affecting the wellbeing of our community NOW.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STOP the dog bans and restriction of the number of dogs on sub-divided land</li> <li>• INCREASE de-sexing</li> <li>• INCREASE animal management coverage in specific areas</li> <li>• INCREASE community education</li> </ul>
---------	---	----------	-------------	--------	---	--------	----------	---

FS93.19	Russell Landcare Trust	S276.001	General	General / Process	Not stated	Support	Allow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree wholeheartedly with this</li> </ul>
---------	------------------------	----------	---------	-------------------	------------	---------	-------	--

comment.

- The Proposed District Plan took full-time staff years to devise, and yet we had just 12 weeks to wade through it and respond, after-hours.
- The stack of printed documents for us to consider is taller than some of our dogs.
- We fear missing some clauses, or policies, or (not attached, for 'internal use only') practice notes, which might further harm our right to live in Northland with our furry family members.
- This consultation on the DP is immensely complicated and cannot be seen as a substitute for genuine consultation with communities about matters which affect their wellbeing.

FS93.20	Russell Landcare Trust	S276.013	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	Policies	Insert policy to ban cats and dogs from 'new subdivisions' in high density kiwi areas (as per the Council's practice note) and from other areas with threatened species where cats and/or dogs are a significant threat (e.g. some shore bird areas).	Oppose	Disallow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kiwi are precious and they need our protection. The work that has been done by conservation groups in Northland is extraordinary.</li> <li>• The wellbeing of dog owners is deeply and adversely affected by not being able to live with their dog.</li> <li>• Dog owners – overwhelmingly, research shows - consider their dogs to be a family member.</li> <li>• Figures we obtained from DOC, for the period 1990 – early 2018, showed 4 kiwi had definitely been killed by dogs on the Russell Peninsula. They suspected an additional 3 were killed by dogs but this was not confirmed.</li> <li>• There has been no consultation with iwi or hapu in relation to the specified areas.</li> <li>• Māori households are significantly more likely than other ethnicities to share their home or property with a dog (46%) and this continues to rise. The policy of banning and restricting dog owners from being able to live with their</li> </ul>
---------	------------------------	----------	--	----------	---	--------	----------	---

whanau members in Northland thus disproportionately affects the Māori community. This should be reviewed for potential – even if inadvertent – systemic racism.

- Dog owners are increasingly being forced out of Northland by dog bans and restrictions on subdivisions.
- Less than 5% of rental properties in Northland allow dogs. Yet Northland Regional Council (NRC) recommends that landlords ban pets in leases. This is outside NRC's scope, and inappropriate in a housing crisis.
- There is no evidence that the dog bans/restrictions in Northland have worked.
- These bans/restrictions are so widespread that they are ignored by responsible dog owners, who keep their dogs under control. They pose minimal risk to kiwi or other wildlife.
- Owners who let their dogs wander do not obey the Dog Control Act (1996) and they - not landowners, and not dogs - should be the focus of increased control, using that very Act.
- Use evidence-driven methods to reduce wandering dog populations. The dog loving community is likely to support these strongly.
- The methods known to reduce wandering dogs best are - de-sex dogs, educate the community, and effectively police the owners of wandering dogs.
- When kiwi are killed by dogs, they are most often dogs who are wandering without their owners being 'in control' of them at the time.
- These dog and cat bans and restrictions have been going for over two decades, and yet this month multiple kiwi have been killed in Opuia forest by just two

'wandering dogs.' The dog bans don't work!

- FNDC is responsible for educating dog owners about responsible dog ownership, and police owners who let their dogs wander. These two factors – education and effective policing – along with de-sexing dogs across the district, are the most effective solutions to reducing wandering dogs.

- Stop using sub-division consents and covenants to ban dogs and cats across New Zealand. Once the community becomes aware of how land has been banned or restricted to pets in Northland, there will be an outcry.

- In 2006, DOC funded research on the efficacy of their kiwi aversion training. It was found to be ineffective ( Jones, B. M. (2006) "Assessing the effectiveness of a Department of Conservation procedure for training domestic dogs to avoid kiwi"). In that paper, it clearly states that dog bans/prohibitions are likely to be counter-productive (p6): "Given the threat that dogs pose to kiwi, measures to keep dogs out of kiwi habitats seem to be justified and necessary for the protection of kiwi. However, James (2000) argues that the prohibition of dogs from those habitats may impact negatively on kiwi conservation if an authority's approach is perceived by dog owners as rigid or inconsistent. In addition, such measures are often impractical for a number of reasons. First, kiwi frequently inhabit privately owned land, or protected areas that are immediately adjacent to either private land, or public areas where dogs are permitted. Some overlap of the habitats of kiwi and dogs is, therefore, probably unavoidable.

Second, dogs have proven to be extremely useful for hunting feral pigs (*Sus scrofa*), deer (*Cervus spp.*) and goats (*Capra hircus*) and measures to control these populations undoubtedly also benefit kiwi. Third, given the geography of most kiwi habitats, enforcing dog restrictions is likely to be extremely difficult, especially in rural areas where recreational hunting is popular.”

• Beginning in 2021, we polled our members: “In your view, if you move into, or live in, a town or zone where there are many weka or kiwi present, whether or not they were always there or have been actively released there, what rules or restrictions should there be in relation to dogs?”

The top responses (of 646 votes) give an indication of the kinds of restrictions that dog owners may consider acceptable in sensitive areas:

- 19% - Fencing required
- 17% - Dogs must be registered and micro-chipped
- 11% - More frequent checks by dog control officers in such areas
- 11% - Don't release ground dwelling endangered birds in or near urban areas.
- 9% - Require dogs to be neutered or spayed
- 7% - Dogs must be indoors at night

Please! Allow our community to unite:

- STOP the dog bans
- INCREASE de-sexing
- INCREASE animal management coverage in specific areas
- INCREASE community education

Bird Protection Society of New Zealand

and indigenous biodiversity

**The extent and diversity of** Indigenous biodiversity **across the district is managed to maintained its extent and diversity in a way that provides for the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities.**

“the social... well-being...” from any part of this document.

- Social wellbeing is of national importance. This needs to be acknowledged, as the dog bans and restrictions via sub-division consents are affecting the wellbeing of our community NOW.
- The wellbeing of dog owners is deeply and adversely affected by not being able to live with their dog.
- Dog owners – overwhelmingly, research shows - consider their dogs to be a family member.
- The well-being of dog owners has been ignored by FNDC again and again. For over 20 years, our family members have been banned from land, in perpetuity, across this district – either by sub-division consent processes, or by covenants.
- I had no chance to be consulted, and the elected council has not voted, to ban or restrict dogs across the rohe.
- Indigenous biodiversity and pets can and do co-exist. If this becomes either/or, we will all lose – the dogs, and the wildlife – as it is unworkable.

- STOP the dog bans
- INCREASE de-sexing
- INCREASE animal management coverage in specific areas
- INCREASE community education

FS93.22	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	S511.062	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P6	Amend IB-P6	Oppose	Disallow	
					to reflect introduction of district wide mapping and rules for SNAs in addition to non-regulatory methods. Amend to include reference to consideration of nature based solutions to mitigating the effects of climate change e.g wetlands and afforestation to mitigate drought			• I do not support the provision of

					and flood effects. Amend to include potential for a reduction or waiver of rates where there is good pest and weed control in place or where maintenance/enhancement of indigenous biodiversity will provide significant ecosystem services e.g. wetland establishment to mitigate flood risk to the wider area.			rates relief for people who ban or restrict dogs and cats in perpetuity either via conservation covenants, or sub-division processes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My rates should not go towards something I find repugnant, and something I have not had a chance to object to.</li> <li>• The cost of rates relief in the 20/21 year, for covenants which ban our pets, was \$79,000+ for NRC and \$584,000+ for FNDC. Think of all the extra Animal Management Officers we could hire for that, to work on community education, and monitoring/policing areas of high wildlife density.</li> </ul>
FS93.23	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	S511.064	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend to clarify that restrictions on pet ownership and pest/weed control will be considered as conditions of consent for subdivision and development	Oppose	Disallow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence that the dog bans/restrictions in Northland have worked.</li> <li>• These bans/restrictions are so widespread that they are ignored by responsible dog owners, who already keep their dogs under control. These owners pose minimal risk to kiwi or other wildlife.</li> <li>• The legal means to control dogs is the clearly-named Dog Control Act (1999). This requires strong community consultation every 5-10 years via bylaw reviews, to ensure that the dog-owning community has a say in such decisions.</li> <li>• To use various clauses in the Resource Management Act (RMA) to control dogs is legally inappropriate.</li> <li>• Owners who let their dogs wander do not obey the Dog Control Act (1996) and they - not landowners, and not dogs - should be the focus of increased control, using that very Act.</li> <li>• Use evidence-driven methods to reduce wandering dog populations. The dog loving community is likely to support these strongly.</li> </ul>



- The methods which research shows us best reduces wandering dogs are - de-sex dogs, educate the community, and effectively police the owners of wandering dogs.
- When kiwi are killed by dogs, they are most often dogs who are wandering without their owners being 'in control' of them at the time.
- These dog and cat bans and restrictions have been going for over two decades, and yet this month multiple kiwi have been killed in Opuia forest by just two 'wandering dogs.' The dog bans clearly don't work!
- FNDC is responsible for educating dog owners about responsible dog ownership, and police owners who let their dogs wander.
- In 2006, DOC funded research on the efficacy of their kiwi aversion training. It was found to be ineffective (Jones, B. M. (2006) "Assessing the effectiveness of a Department of Conservation procedure for training domestic dogs to avoid kiwi"). In that paper, it clearly states that dog bans/prohibitions are likely to be counter-productive (p6): "Given the threat that dogs pose to kiwi, measures to keep dogs out of kiwi habitats seem to be justified and necessary for the protection of kiwi. However, James (2000) argues that the prohibition of dogs from those habitats may impact negatively on kiwi conservation if an authority's approach is perceived by dog owners as rigid or inconsistent. In addition, such measures are often impractical for a number of reasons. First, kiwi frequently inhabit privately owned land, or protected areas that are immediately adjacent to either

private land, or public areas where dogs are permitted. Some overlap of the habitats of kiwi and dogs is, therefore, probably unavoidable. Second, dogs have proven to be extremely useful for hunting feral pigs (*Sus scrofa*), deer (*Cervus spp.*) and goats (*Capra hircus*) and measures to control these populations undoubtedly also benefit kiwi. Third, given the geography of most kiwi habitats, enforcing dog restrictions is likely to be extremely difficult, especially in rural areas where recreational hunting is popular.”

- There has been no consultation with iwi or hapu in relation to dog bans and restrictions via subdivision consents.

- Māori households are significantly more likely than other ethnicities to share their home or property with a dog (46%) and this continues to rise. The policy of banning and restricting dog owners from being able to live with their whānau members in Northland thus disproportionately affects the Māori community. This should be reviewed for potential – even if inadvertent – systemic racism.

- Dog owners are increasingly being forced out of Northland by dog bans and restrictions on subdivisions.

- Less than 5% of rental properties in Northland now allow dogs. Yet Northland Regional Council (NRC) recommends that landlords ban pets in leases. This is outside NRC’s scope, and inappropriate in a housing crisis.

FS93.24	Stephanie Lane	S468.002	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Accept the decisions requested in the Bay of Islands Watch dog submission - 354 (inferred)	Support	Allow	
---------	----------------	----------	---------	--	--	---------	-------	--

Stephanie Lane is a former vet, dog

								fosterer for BOI Animal Rescue, and all round lovely, law-abiding person. Her knowledge of dog care and control is substantive. Please listen to her views - they are well-informed. She is also an environmentalist who would not recommend anything she considers might hurt indigenous biodiversity.
FS93.25	Stephanie Lane	S468.002	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Accept the decisions requested in the Bay of Islands Watch dog submission - 354 (inferred)	Support	Allow	I agree with Stephanie's recommendations. Dog bans and restriction on numbers of dogs may have been 'well-intended' by past council managers, however they have failed to achieve the desired result, which was a reduction in wandering dogs leading to kiwi deaths. FNDC needs to increase funding for animal control officers to work in sensitive areas more closely, and those areas where wandering dogs are currently a problem. And please consider funding an external organisation for community education - dog owners are unlikely to trust a council staff member in this role. In addition, please consider support for and funding of de-sexing of dogs across the rohe.
FS93.26	Kate Burdekin	S507.001	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend wording so that pets and pests are not used in the same breath. Rather than an overall ban on dogs, put covenants in place allowing ownership of companion animals under certain conditions – fenced garden, animals to be kept inside at night (this also ensures their safety), no dogs to be chained and must be adequately cared for, and encourage dog owners to get involved in protecting kiwis. Maybe a campaign with positive ideas how dogs and kiwi can live side by side.	Support	Allow	

submissions do not and cannot give the full picture about dog bans and restrictions. Please read these 3 submissions on dogs in FULL - Kate Burdekin, Stephanie Lane, and BOI Watchdogs. Then you will understand the research, the history, and the community angst. Those 3 submissions contain all the solutions that we need to bring our community together, dog lovers and conservationists and council. Kate was one of the founding members of the Watchdogs, and put years into working towards the betterment of dog welfare in Northland. She has a thorough understanding of these issues, has worked as a vet nurse, and volunteers with the Rolands Woods trust. Her views are very well informed, and I fully support them.

FS93.27	Angela Caroline Morley	S469.001	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Amend Plan to give effect to relief sought in the 'Bay of Islands Watchdog' submission (354).	Support	Allow	
FS93.28	Heather Golley	S254.003	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-O2	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map – Support Document'.	Support	Allow	I agree that all documents used to ban dogs and cats need to be at least referred to in the district plan, so that it is transparent and clear.
FS93.29	Heather Golley	S254.004	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P7	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices)	Support	Allow	

(inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map – Support Document'.

FS93.30	Heather Golley	S254.001	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map – Support Document'.	Support	Allow	For some reason, Heather Golley's summarised submission has been repeated 5 times? not sure why
FS93.31	Jillian Jane Kearney	S343.001	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Delete any objective, policy or rule that limits dog ownership in the district, and also dog ownership on land within Significant Natural Areas (inferred)	Support	Allow	

• These dog and cat bans and

restrictions have been going for over two decades, and yet this month multiple kiwi have been killed in Opua forest by just two 'wandering dogs.' The dog bans clearly don't work!

- Dog-bans over-regulate responsible dog owners, and under-regulate irresponsible dog owners. It creates mistrust between council and residents, and mistrust between dog owners and conservation experts.
- Please use evidence-driven methods to reduce wandering dog populations. The dog loving community is likely to support these strongly.
  - The methods known to reduce wandering dogs best are - de-sex dogs, educate the community, and effectively police the owners of wandering dogs.
  - When kiwi are killed by dogs, they are most often dogs who are wandering without their owners being 'in control' of them at the time.
  - It over-regulates responsible dog owners, and under-regulates irresponsible dog owners. It creates mistrust between council and residents, and mistrust between dog owners and conservation experts.

FS93.32	Jillian Jane Kearney	S343.002	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Accept the decisions requested in the Bay of Islands Watch dog submission - 354 (inferred)	Support	Disallow	<p>Please! Allow our community to unite:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STOP the dog bans</li> <li>• INCREASE de-sexing</li> <li>• INCREASE animal management coverage in specific areas</li> <li>• INCREASE community education</li> </ul>
---------	----------------------	----------	---------	--	--	---------	----------	---

FS93.33	Shirley Grant Murray	S460.001	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Supports recommended decisions in the 'Bay of Islands Watchdog' submission (354).	Support	Allow	<p>Please! Allow our community to</p>
---------	----------------------	----------	---------	--	---	---------	-------	---------------------------------------

unite:

- STOP the dog bans and restriction of numbers
- INCREASE de-sexing
- INCREASE animal management coverage in specific areas
- INCREASE community education

FS93.34	Karen B Wilkinson	S566.001	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Amend PDP to address relief sought in the 'Bay of Islands Watchdog' submission (354).	Support	Allow	Please! Allow our community to unite:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STOP the dog bans and restriction of numbers</li> <li>• INCREASE de-sexing</li> <li>• INCREASE animal management coverage in specific areas</li> <li>• INCREASE community education</li> </ul>
FS93.35	Danielle Hookway	S309.006	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	Rules	Delete SNAs/wetlands from the District Plan.	Support	Disallow	
FS93.36	Danielle Hookway	S309.007	Subdivision	Policies	Delete SNAs/wetlands from the District Plan and retain operative policy 13.4.6: 'That any subdivision proposal provides for the protection, restoration and enhancement of heritage resources, areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, threatened species, the natural character of the coastal environment and riparian margins, and outstanding landscapes and natural features where appropriate.'	Support	Disallow	SNAs are, for dog owners, just another way to ban our family members from living in Northland.
FS93.37	Danielle Hookway	S309.008	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend IB-P9 so that it does not infer a blanket banning of pets in the Far North (inferred).	Support in part	Allow in part	

100% agree with no dog bans or

ownership restrictions via sub-division consents across our region.

Research shows that kiwi avoidance training is ineffective. It also uses electric shock collars which have been banned in multiple countries worldwide. The three most effective means to reduce wandering dogs are community education, de-sexing of dogs, and effective policing of irresponsible dog owners.

FS93.38	Allen Hookway	S311.008	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend IB-P9 so that it does not infer a blanket banning of pets in the Far North (inferred).	Support in part	Allow in part	<p>Agree with NO MORE dog bans or restrictions in sub-divisions.</p> <p>Do not agree with kiwi avoidance training as a pre-requisite for living in kiwi areas, as it has been shown to be ineffective, and uses shock collars. Aversive techniques are more likely to extinguish than reward-based techniques for dogs.</p>
FS93.39	Lianne Kennedy	S310.008	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend IB-P9 so that it does not infer a blanket banning of pets in the Far North (inferred).	Support	Disallow	<p>I support Lianne's submission to halt the dog bans and restrictions via sub-division.</p> <p>I do not support kiwi aversion training and the use of the electric shock collar has been banned overseas, for sound reasons.</p>
FS93.40	Clare Williams	S457.001	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Delete any objective, policy or rule that limits dog ownership in the district, and also dog ownership on land within Significant Natural Areas (inferred)	Support	Disallow	<p>Agree with this submission. Please! Allow our community to unite:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STOP the dog bans and restriction of numbers</li> <li>• INCREASE de-sexing</li> <li>• INCREASE animal management coverage in specific areas</li> <li>• INCREASE community education</li> </ul>
FS93.41	Clare Williams	S457.002	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Accept the decisions requested in the Bay of Islands Watch dog submission - 354 (inferred)	Support	Allow	



FS93.42	Leah Frieling	S358.042	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend Policy IB-P9 as follows:  <del>Require</del> Assist landowners to manage pets and pest species, including dogs, cats, possums, rats and mustelids, to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species, including avoiding the introduction of pets and pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas.  OR if the word 'require' is retained, enforce this with DOC or help facilitate community groups (or perhaps a District wide organisation) to easily set up trapping programmes on DOC land.	Support in part	Allow in part	Agree 100% that DOC needs to focus on getting 'their' land pest free before demanding others do likewise.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I DO NOT support dogs or cats ever being named in the same paragraph as 'pests.'</li> <li>• Cats in this context are feral cats. Domestic and colony/community cats, which are often dumped, need to be excluded from any provision referring to them. Kill traps MUST not be used for feral cats – they must be live traps, and taken to be checked for microchips at a vet.</li> <li>• I have had countless people express their horror at neighbours who shoot or trap cats, ignoring whether they are feral or domestic much-loved fur kids. This has happened in Russell, where zealots think they can get away with shooting cats. It is a terrible thing to do, to kill someone's family member.</li> <li>• I do not support the provision of rates relief for people who ban or restrict dogs and cats in perpetuity either via conservation covenants, or sub-division processes. My money should not go towards something I find repugnant, and something I have not had a chance to object to.</li> <li>• The cost of rates relief in the 20/21 year, for covenants which ban our pets, was \$79,000+ for NRC and \$584,000+ for FNDC. Think of all the extra Animal Management Officers we could hire for that, to work on community education, and monitoring areas of high wildlife density!</li> </ul>
FS93.43	Roxanne Drader	S307.001	Ngawha	Rules	Amend NIEP (inferred by requests)	Support	Allow	I support this submission.

Innovation  
and  
Enterprise  
Park

to include independent monitoring which includes mana whenua via hapū hui and mandated involvement. Include regular compliance of spray contents and amounts used and provide reports in laymans terms for affected households. NIEP should be responsible for monitoring neighbouring property's water quality. Access from employees should be off Wallis Road which should be sealed and speed limit reduced to 50km/hr. Incorporate hapū objectives and engage with hapū. When an RFS is responded to, sent a report advising of actions taken and remediation completed to the person who lodged RFS and keep public records.

I further recommend that in order for Far North Holdings to better understand the importance of honest consultation with hapu and iwi, that all staff and board undertake ongoing training, and that FNDC review the ethnic composition of the FNH staff and board to better reflect tangata whenua. More than half our district is Maori - why is that not the case at FNH? And in senior positions, too!

FS93.44	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	S148.017	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend IB-P9 to read "Support landowners to manage pets and pest species, including dogs, cats, possums, rats and mustelids, to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species, ...." Or words of like effect.	Oppose	Disallow
---------	--	----------	---	-------	---	--------	----------

• I DO NOT support dogs or cats

ever being named in the same paragraph as 'pests.'

- Cats in this context are feral cats. Domestic and colony/community cats, which are often dumped, need to be excluded from any provision referring to them. Kill traps MUST not be used for feral cats – they must be live traps, and taken to be checked for microchips at a vet.
- I have had countless people express their horror at neighbours who shoot or trap cats, ignoring whether they are feral or domestic much-loved fur kids. This has happened in Russell, where zealots think they can get away with shooting cats. It is a terrible thing to do, to kill someone's family member.
- I do not support the provision of rates relief for people who ban or restrict dogs and cats in perpetuity either via conservation covenants, or sub-division processes. My money should not go towards something I find repugnant, and something I have not had a chance to object to.
- The cost of rates relief in the 20/21 year, for covenants which ban our pets, was \$79,000+ for NRC and \$584,000+ for FNDC. Think of all the extra Animal Management Officers we could hire for that, to work on community education, and monitoring areas of high wildlife density!

FS93.45	New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporated	S518.001	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend IB-P9 as follows: 'Require landowners to manage pets and pest species <b>on their own land</b> , including dogs, cats, possums, rats and mustelids, to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species, including avoiding the introduction	Support in part	Disallow in part	• I DO NOT support dogs or cats
---------	--	----------	--	-------	--	-----------------	------------------	---------------------------------

of pets and pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas.'

ever being named in the same paragraph as 'pests.'

- Cats in this context are feral cats. Domestic and colony/community cats, which are often dumped, need to be excluded from any provision referring to them. Kill traps MUST not be used for feral cats – they must be live traps, and taken to be checked for microchips at a vet.
- I have had countless people express their horror at neighbours who shoot or trap cats, ignoring whether they are feral or domestic much-loved fur kids. This has happened in Russell, where zealots think they can get away with shooting cats. It is a terrible thing to do, to kill someone's family member.
- Please use evidence-driven methods to reduce wandering dog populations. The dog loving community is likely to support these strongly.
- The methods known to reduce wandering dogs best are - de-sex dogs, educate the community, and effectively police the owners of wandering dogs.
- When kiwi are killed by dogs, they are most often dogs who are wandering without their owners being 'in control' of them at the time.
- These dog and cat bans and restrictions have been going for over two decades, and yet this month multiple kiwi have been killed in Opuia forest by just two 'wandering dogs.' The dog bans clearly don't work!

FS93.46	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	S529.040	General	General / Process	Amend resource consent system to have a two-queue system,	Support	Allow	I agree with any approach which
---------	-------------------------	----------	---------	-------------------	---	---------	-------	---------------------------------

					comprising one queue for applications for small simple minor works by the general public, and a separate queue for other larger or more complex applications.			speeds up consents fairly.
								I would like FNDC to assess whether the delays in resource consents for properties which wish to have resident dogs and cats are fair. Anecdotal, developers tell us that they avoid allowing pets on land they are developing as this would slow down the consent process significantly, given the anti-dog and cat bias at FNDC. This is in effect another way in which responsible pet owners are being disadvantaged, even though we KNOW that the sub-division bans on dogs and cats have not worked as they were intended. This is a massive waste of time and money, which could be better spent on animal control, de-sexing and community education, all of which are proven to reduce the wandering of our pets.
FS93.47	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	S529.130	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	Notes	Insert an appendix to the PDP to include, or refer to, a protocol that sets out guiding principles and procedures for protection of kiwi or indigenous species	Support in part	Allow	I support kiwi protection. I support any rational, evidence-driven solution to limiting the number of kiwi run over by cars, the main killer in Northland. I do not support any 'solution' which may involve banning or restricting the number of dogs and cats on a property, via the sub-division consent process. These are means which have not worked over the last two decades. Sane solutions include ensuring that dog owners living in kiwi areas register, micro-chip, de-sex their dogs, keep them in at night, and have fenced properties.
FS93.48	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri	S522.007	General	General / Plan Content /	Amend to include provisions that support urban design principles for	Support	Allow in part	I agree that urban planning and

	and Environs, VKK)			Miscellaneous	quality and innovative developments that cater for mixed use, mixed dwellings and mixed income levels, whilst protecting and preserving the characteristics of respective townships and the things that communities value.			design is critical. One element often missed in such design is the inclusion of features which assist dog and cat owners - between 40-50% of our district - to live happily with their furry family members. T Pet-inclusive urban design is a given overseas, and we need to consider it in Northland in particular. That may include for example, housing providers having 'catios' on balconies of apartments in various areas, or planners ensuring that where apartment blocks are erected, there are areas where dogs can be walked by the owners safely nearby, and toileted in the apartment grounds in a place where it does not offend others.
FS93.49	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	S527.014	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Insert a provision similar to Policy 12.2.4.10 of the Operative DP but with the aim of protecting not just kiwi, dotterel and brown teal, but also other indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk (under NZTCS) and vulnerable to predation.	Support	Allow in part	<p>I support the inclusion of any and all wildlife, as long as that inclusion does not lead to dogs or cats being banned from living on any property in perpetuity.</p> <p>The bans don't work, and force us into an either/or position. Please think inclusively, stop the dog bans, and use evidence -driven means to reduce wandering dogs.</p>
FS93.50	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	S524.023	Transport	TRAN-P5	<p>Encourage new land uses <b>and development</b> to support an integrated <b>and well connected</b> <del>and diverse</del> <b>multi modal</b> transport network by:</p> <p>a. <b>Requiring consideration of promoting</b> alternative transport modes <b>at the time of land use and development;</b></p> <p>b. <b>Ensuring that the construction of new transportation</b></p>	Support in part	Allow in part	I support any additional means of

**infrastructure aligns with relevant spatial or strategic document**

c. **Encouraging** the provision of safe and secure parking facilities for bicycles and associated changing or showering facilities for staff;

d. **Requiring** allocation of parking facilities for motorcycles, mobility scooters, car share vehicles, pick up/drop off areas for ride share services and charging stations for electric vehicles; and

e. supporting the establishment and operation of accommodation and tourism related activities in close proximity to the Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail, provided reverse sensitivity effects can be avoided.

transport for those needing to travel with their pets.

Please consider how far dog owners must walk to get to the nearest area where their dog can run freely - a requirement for a happy dog life. Add dog parks, allow dogs on a lead and cats in carry cages onto buses. Think about pet owners when you think about transport.

FS93.51	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	S525.001	Signs	SIGN-P1	Amend and replace the term 'across a range of zones' to 'in appropriate locations only'	Support in part	Allow in part
---------	---	----------	-------	---------	---	-----------------	---------------

Please note that signage is really

important for dog owners.  
 The signage relating to the Dog Management Bylaw is now correct across our district, which helps dog owners understand where and when they can walk their dogs off-lead.  
 However non-profit groups have been fundraising recently for signage in kiwi areas including 'dogs on lead', and 'no dogs' signs. It is not the role of these groups to determine where dogs can and cannot be off-lead, and FNDC DP needs to make it clear that their bylaw is the document which all must obey.

FS93.52	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	S272.018	Subdivision	SUB-O4	Amend SUB-O4 (inferred) relating to esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Oppose	Disallow in part	<p>The majority of members of the BOI Watchdogs live in Kerikeri. They are supportive of measures to protect wildlife, but not supportive of illogical measures, such as the banning of dogs from sub-divisions or restriction of household dog numbers via the RMA and sub-division rules at FNDC.</p> <p>You will unite dog owners and conservationists if you stop the dog bans and restrictions, and instead use proven methods to reduce wandering dogs, which reduces predation on wildlife. That is - community education, effective policing, and de-sexing.</p> <p>I feel that the dog owners of Kerikeri need to be heard by local organisations who 'represent' them in a broader capacity. It will be hard to find dog lovers who think dog bans are acceptable.</p>
---------	---	----------	-------------	--------	--	--------	------------------	--









