



18 November 2020

POLICY & SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the **Policy & Services Committee Meeting of Council** will be held in the **Council Chambers, Stratford District Council, Miranda Street, Stratford** on **Tuesday 24 November 2020** at **2.00pm** to hear and consider submissions to the draft *Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw*.

Timetable for 24 November 2020 as follows:

9.00am	Workshop for Councillors - Pool introduction
12noon	Lunch for Councillors
12.30pm	Extraordinary meeting - Adoption of A&P Association Proposal Hearing Minutes
2.00pm	Policy & Services Committee Meeting – Hearing - To hear and consider submissions to the draft Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw
2.45pm	Afternoon tea for Councillors
3.00pm	Policy and Services Committee Meeting

Yours faithfully

Sven Hanne
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

2020 - Agenda - Hearing - Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw (24/11/2020)

Table of Contents:

Notice of Meeting	1
Agenda	2
Welcome	4
Attendance Schedule	5
Decision Report - Adoption Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Animals Bylaw	6

POLICY & SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY 24 NOVEMBER 2020 AT 2.00PM

TO HEAR AND CONSIDER SUBMISSIONS TO THE
KEEPING OF ANIMALS, POULTRY AND BEES BYLAW

A G E N D A

1. WELCOME

- Health & Safety Message

2. APOLOGIES

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Speakers to Submissions

The Chairman welcomes everyone to the Policy and Services Committee meeting. It is reinforced to Councillors that the purpose of this meeting is to hear submissions on the Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw. Councillors are asked to hear submissions with an open mind and to restrict their question time to the submitters to points of clarification or issues pertaining to subject matter. Councillors are requested not to get into direct dialogue with the submitter. Councillors may take notes whilst submitters are speaking.

4. DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTEREST

(No report)

Elected members to declare any real or perceived conflicts of interest relating to items on this agenda.

5. ATTENDANCE SCHEDULE

Page 5

Attendance schedule for Policy & Services Committee Meetings, including Hearings.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SUBMISSIONS

Submissions pages 21-50

Attached are the thirteen (13) submissions received.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT each of the thirteen (13) submissions to the Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw be received.
2. THAT each submitter be individually thanked for their submission, and a copy of the minutes of this Policy & Services Committee Meeting and subsequent meetings be provided to each submitter.

Recommended Reason

Each submission is formally received and the submitter provided with information on decisions made.

Moved/Seconded

7. SUBMITTERS TO BE HEARD

(No report)

There is one (1) submitter wishing to be heard.

Submitters are given 5 minutes to speak to the Committee. Five minutes is also allocated for questions from the Committee.

Name	Organisation	Submission No.	Page No.	Time
Amelia Geary	North & South Taranaki Branches - Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest and Bird)	4	25	2.05pm

8. DECISION REPORT - ADOPTION KEEPING OF ANIMALS, POULTRY AND ANIMALS BYLAW

D20/27273 (Pages 6-58)

Discussion

Council needs to consider submissions to the Dog Control Policy as part of the consultation process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the report be received.
2. THAT The council considers submissions received as part of the public consultation process of the bylaw and the subsequent adoption of the Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020 (attached).
3. THAT the commencement date of the Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020 be Wednesday 9 December 2020.

Recommended Reason

The *draft* Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020 has gone through the public consultation process, required by Sections 82 and 83 of the Local Government Act 2002. Five submissions were received as a result of the public consultation process.

Moved/Seconded



Health and Safety Message

In the event of an emergency, please follow the instructions of Council Staff.

Please exit through main entrance.

Once you reach the footpath outside please turn left and walk towards the Bell tower congregating on lawn outside the Council Building.

Staff will guide you to an alternative route if necessary.

If there is an earthquake – drop, cover and hold where possible. Stay indoors till the shaking stops and you are sure it is safe to exit or remain where you are until further instruction is given.

5. Attendance schedule for 2019 – 2020 Policy & Services Committee meetings, including hearings.

<u>Date</u>	26/11/19	26/11/19	28/01/20	25/02/20	24/03/20	14/04/20	28/04/20	28/04/20	26/05/20	26/05/20	23/06/20	14/07/20	28/07/20	25/08/20	22/09/20	27/10/20	17/11/20	24/11/20	24/11/20	
<u>Meeting</u>	H	P&S	P&S	P&S	H / P&S	H (AV)	H (AV)	P&S (AV)	H	P&S	P&S	H	P&S	P&S	P&S	P&S	H	H	P&S	
Neil Volzke	✓	✓	✓	✓	CANCELLED DUE TO COVID-19 LOCKDOWN	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
Grant Boyde	A	A	✓	A		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Rick Coplestone	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Peter Dalziel	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Jono Erwood	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Amanda Harris	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Alan Jamieson	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Vaughan Jones	✓	✓	A	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Min McKay	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
John Sandford	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Gloria Webby	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		

Key	
P&S	Policy & Services Committee Meeting
H	Hearing (heard by Policy & Services)
✓	Attended
A	Apology/Leave of Absence
AB	Absent
S	Sick
	Non Committee Member
(AV)	Meeting held by Audio Visual Link

DECISION REPORT



F19/13/04-D20/27273

TO: Policy & Services Committee
FROM: Environmental Health Manager
DATE: 24 November 2020
SUBJECT: **ADOPTION OF THE KEEPING OF ANIMALS, POULTRY AND BEES BYLAW 2020**

8

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the report be received.
2. THAT The council considers submissions received as part of the public consultation process of the bylaw and the subsequent adoption of the Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020 (attached).
3. THAT the commencement date of the Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020 be Wednesday 9 December 2020.

Recommended Reason

The *draft* Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020 has gone through the public consultation process, required by Sections 82 and 83 of the Local Government Act 2002. 13 submissions were received as a result of the public consultation process.

Moved/Seconded

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The council approved the release of the *draft* Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020 on 13 October 2020 for public consultation. The public consultation period is now complete.
- 1.2 The purpose of this report is for the council to consider the public submissions and recommend any amendments to the *draft* Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020 and its subsequent adoption.

2. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020 acknowledges that the keeping of animals, poultry or bees has benefits for the wellbeing of the owner and members of the household. However, the keeping of animals and poultry can have a direct negative and sometimes offensive effect on neighbouring properties, especially in the urban area. A bylaw setting standards of accommodation, minimum distances from neighbouring properties and maximum population, help control nuisance and offensive effects arising from the keeping of animals and poultry.

3. **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2002 - SECTION 10**

Under section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002, the Council’s purpose is to “enable democratic local decision making by and on behalf of communities; as well as promoting the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities now and into the future”			
Does the recommended option meet the purpose of the Local Government 4 well-beings? And which:		Yes	
Social	Economic	Environmental	Cultural
✓		✓	

This Bylaw is for the performance of a good quality regulatory function and public service.

4. **BACKGROUND**

4.1 The Stratford District Council’s Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2008 (“the current Bylaw”) lapsed in July 2018. The Local Government Act in Section 159 requires that the council review its bylaw no later than 10 years after it was last reviewed.

4.2 Section 160A allows a Bylaw to continue in its effect, no more than 2 years after the date on which the bylaw should have been reviewed. Therefore, the *draft* Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020 was required to be adopted by July 2020. However, due to Covid19, Local Government New Zealand suspended the provision that automatically revokes bylaws if they were not renewed within the required period. The provision by Local Government New Zealand to extend the timeframe will expire on 30 June 2021.

4.5 The bylaw has had no significant changes since its initial adoption.

- 4.6 The proposed changes to the bylaw that was approved and released for public consultation include:
- Minor amendments to wording of clauses for clarity.
 - Deletion of clauses considered no longer necessary.
 - The draft Bylaw proposes the addition of the keeping of cats and kittens that provides a tool to abate a nuisance or health risk.
 - The bylaw proposes additional provisions for the keeping of bees.
 - The bylaw is now clear on the keeping of roosters within the urban area.
 - The addition of a Stratford District map.
- 4.7 As a result of the bylaw review, the *draft* Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020 would become a stand-alone document, as opposed to its previous consolidation with the other council bylaws.

5. **CONSULTATIVE PROCESS**

5.1 **Public Consultation - Section 82**

The bylaw review was subject to the Special Consultative Procedure. Along with the public notification, external agencies were notified of the proposed bylaw.

Public consultation was first advertised in the Stratford Press on 14 October 2020. The submission period closed on 16 November 2020. The timeframes of the consultation period meet the requirements of section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002.

13 submissions were received as a result of the public consultation. The submissions received refer to the keeping of roosters, bees and the keeping of cats.

5.2 **Māori Consultation - Section 81**

There are no specific issues concerning Maori in the consideration of the bylaw review and therefore specific Iwi consultation was not undertaken.

5.3 **Summary of Submissions**

The following list provides a summary of the submitters' concerns and staff comments.

Submission number	Name	
1	Romon Sargeson	Clause
<p>The submitter has requested the removal of clause 10.4 (no person shall keep a rooster or cockerel in an urban area and comments on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requests the council to treat complaints received for noise by roosters and cockerels to be treated the same way as dog complaints - The breeding of roosters is a wellbeing activity for the breeder - The number of complaints received by the Council <p>The submitter has requested a cap on the number of cats and notes in the submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Biodiversity - Taranaki is striving to become predator free - Damage to wildlife from cats is well documented - Requests a limit on the number cats per household <p>The submitter does not wish to speak on their submission.</p>		<p>10.4</p> <p>11</p>
<p>Staff comments</p> <p>Rooster noise:</p> <p>From 2009, the council has received approximately 10 complaints relating to roosters or cockerels. On researching the noise level of a rooster on various internet sites, a crowing rooster can have a crow that is upwards of 90 decibels. A rooster is often portrayed as crowing at the break of dawn. However, while many roosters crow shortly after waking up, a rooster can crow at any time of the day for any period of time. The Stratford District Plan recommends a continuous noise emission level of 50BA (leq) is not exceeded in the residential zone. The Dog Control Act has specific legislation and enforcement for dealing with barking dogs.</p> <p>The Dunedin City Council are currently reviewing their keeping of animals bylaw. The Otago Daily Times recently published comments from the Dunedin City Council meeting where the council addressed the keeping of roosters. It was commented that the council can issue an abatement notice or take the drastic step of going to court to control rooster noise. However, methods for dealing with rooster complaints are</p>		

often regarded as ineffective, tending to rely on owner compliance. The question was raised about the appropriateness of embarking on a "lengthy court process over a rooster". This is because of the high cost of court proceeding. Information provided from: <https://www.odt.co.nz/news/dunedin/cock-doodle-don%E2%80%99t-perhaps>

Several councils across the country have made bylaws that address the keeping of roosters, either by restricting the keeping of roosters in the Urban area, requiring a licence/permit or by the order of removal if the rooster is causing a nuisance.

Cats:

The submitter has recommended a cap on the number of cats to reduce biodiversity issues. There is a wealth of information on-line that indicates stray and pet cats contribute to problems relating to biodiversity. However, no study has robustly demonstrated that predation by pet cats reduces populations of prey species. Information provided from <https://newzealandecology.org/cats-and-biodiversity-nz-may-2019>. It is important to note that any control on the number of cats kept would only apply to pet cats. It would be very difficult to apply to stray cats because they are not owned as such.

The Morgan Foundation drafted the New Zealand Cat Management Strategy in 2016 <http://cdn.morganfoundation.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/NCMSG-Strategy-Implementation-Background-Document-Sept-2016.pdf> It is noted within the draft document that it is important that the Minister for the Environment and the New Zealand Government take steps to address cat management in a holistic manner which addresses both feral and domestic cat management and further comments that legislation is often viewed as the key to resolving cat management issues.

Currently the Council has limited evidence to indicate that pet cats are causing a nuisance or having a negative impact on biodiversity within the Stratford district.

The draft bylaw, if adopted, will allow Council officers to monitor and collect data relating to cat complaints which will provide evidence that can contribute to a national strategy or future legislation.

Submitter number	Name	
2	Rachel Payne	Clause
<p>The submitter has requested the removal of clause 10.4 (no person shall keep a rooster in an urban area) and comments on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The negative impact to heritage breeders - Local demographic - Suggests rewording of the bylaw <p>The submitter does not wish to speak to their submission.</p>		10.4
<p>Staff comments:</p> <p>Some of the submitter’s comments have been addressed in the staff comments above.</p> <p>Local demographic:</p> <p>The Stratford Rural/Residential zone areas have seen an increase in the number of subdivisions over the last few years, where the lot size of a section is reduced to accommodate urban style living. There have also been a number of urban subdivisions where sections have been subdivided into smaller lots.</p>		

Submitter number	Name	
3	Medical Officer of Health - Taranaki District Health Board	Clause
<p>The submitter has requested the rewording of clause 11.1 (Keeping of Cats and Kittens) and comments on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The keeping of animals can have both positive and negative impacts - Living in close proximity to animals - Supports the bylaw - Requests the amendment of clause 11.1 to: <p><i>There is no limit to the number of cats permitted to be kept on any premises provided the cats are sufficiently cared for and the keeping of such cats does no cause, or is likely to cause a health nuisance to the occupant or to visitors to the property or to neighbouring properties.</i></p>		11.1
<p>Staff comments:</p> <p>Staff support the rewording of clause 11.1, as the wording further clarifies the intent of the clause.</p>		
Submitter Number	Name	
4	Forest & Bird	Clause
<p>The submitter has commented on biodiversity concerns relating to cats and comments on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the bylaw - Domestic cats pose a significant risk to native wildlife - Domestic cats carry diseases - The impact of cats on neighbouring properties - Irresponsible cat owners - The number of councils in the North Island that currently limit the number of cats per household. - Microchipping of cats - Compulsory de-sexing of cats - Request to reword clause 11 		11

Staff comments

A number of the submitter's comments have been addressed in submission number 1 above.

North Island statistics:

There are 44 councils in the North Island
13 of these councils regulate the control of cats.
7 councils have set a number of 3 cats per property.

Microchipping and de-sexing:

There is no legislation that requires cat owners to microchip their cat. Currently owners who choose to microchip their cat, do so at a veterinary clinic who manage a local Companion Animal register. If the owner chooses to have the microchip recorded on the national Companion Animal register, where cat owner details will be accessible national wide, they are required to pay a fee. Council officers have no access to this register, unlike the National Dog Database managed by the Department of Internal Affairs. Council staff would be reliant on veterinary services to share information that will be subject to the Privacy Act.

If the council were to implement microchipping and de-sexing of cats internally, this would initiate a number of administration procedures, similar to that for dog registrations or the Council would be reliant on cat owners providing and updating information. This procedure would be subject the Privacy Act and would pose the question of whether an annual registration is required to compensate the rate payer for the additional cost of services required.

Council officers agree that it is likely stray and pet cats have an impact on biodiversity. The draft bylaw will address environmental health and nuisance issues relating to pet cats, which is the focus of the legislation that the Council can make the bylaw under. To clarify the sections are s.145 and s.146 (a)(v) of the Local Government Act 2002 and the Health Act 1956. It is the officer's opinion that the draft bylaw addresses the criteria of this legislation and that central government is better placed to deal with the control of cats relating to biodiversity issues.

Submitter Number	Name	
5	Apiculture New Zealand	Clause
<p>The submitter is in support of the bylaw The draft bylaw comes in-line with some of the objectives and aims of the Apiculture Code of Conduct. Council Officers will use the Code of Conduct as a best practice guide to provide to bee keepers.</p> <p>The submitter does not wish to speak to their submission.</p>		12
Submitter Number	Name	
6	John Driver	Clause
<p>The submitter has commented “keep the animals” and does not wish to speak to their submission.</p>		
Submitter Number	Name	
7	Adrian Candy	Clause
<p>The submission is incomplete.</p>		
Submitter Number	Name	
8	Cameron	Clause
<p>The submitter approves of the bylaw and does not wish to speak to their submission.</p>		
Submitter Number	Name	
9	Paul Fairbrother	Clause
<p>The submitter’s comments referred to the A & P Showgrounds and was forward to the appropriate hearing.</p>		

Submitter Number	Name	
10	Bart Jansma	Clause
<p>The submitter has noted the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The crowing of roosters should be removed from general provisions 8, and should be managed with specific provisions. - Section 10.5 is not clear and subject to misinterpretation - The submitter requests a limit to the number of cats per household <p>The submitter does not wish to speak to their submission</p>		<p>8.1 10.5 11</p>
Staff comments		
<p>The submitter's comments in relation to cats and roosters have been addressed in staff comments above.</p> <p>The submitter has commented on the keeping of chickens. Clause 10.5 refers to the relocation or the removal of chickens if the number of chickens or their location on a property is having an adverse effect on a neighbouring property. Clauses A to D provide guidance on how compliance will be measured in these situations.</p> <p>The submitter has commented on the keeping of cats and kittens and has requested the rewording of clause 11 where the clauses note to a health nuisance. As noted in submission 3 from the Taranaki District Health Board, staff support the re-wording of the clauses to meet their intent to address a health nuisance in relation to the keeping of cats and kittens.</p>		
Submitter Number	Name	
11	Jim Clarkson	Clause
<p>The submitter's submission refers the keeping of cats and kittens. The majority of the submitter's comments have been addressed in submission comments above. The intent of the clause is to address a health nuisance. As noted in submission 1 above, the microchipping, de-sexing and other mandatory compliance measures would better be addressed by central government.</p>		<p>11</p>

Submitter Number	Name	
12	Anne Collins	Clause
<p>The submitter's submission refers to the keeping of cats and kittens and requests a limit of two cats per property. The submitter's comments have been addressed in staff comments above.</p>		11
Submitter Number	Name	
13	Nicola Valintine	Clause
<p>The submitter has commented that neither the draft bylaw nor the Stratford District Plan address rules for intensive chicken farming. Currently, the Stratford District Plan refers to intensive farming and the definition of intensive farming within the plan includes to the raising and/or keeping of plants or animals for commercial purposes.</p> <p>The intensive farming of chickens would require a resource consent. The matters the submitter comments on would be addressed as part of the resource consent process.</p>		10

RISK ANALYSIS

Please refer to the Consequence and Impact Guidelines at the front of the reports in this agenda.

- Is there a:
 - financial risk;
 - human resources risk;
 - political risks; or
 - other potential risk?
- If there is a risk, consider the probability/likelihood of it occurring.
- Is there a legal opinion needed?

There is no risk associated with the *draft* Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020.

7. **DECISION MAKING PROCESS - SECTION 79**

7.1 **Direction**

	Explain
Is there a strong link to Council’s strategic direction, Long Term Plan/District Plan?	The Long Term Plan includes a commitment to performing regulatory services cost effectively. This bylaw would support that commitment and the affordable, quality services and infrastructure outcome.
What relationship does it have to the communities’ current and future needs for infrastructure, regulatory functions, or local public services?	The bylaw would support the community’s need for a well-resourced regulatory function relating to the control of animals.

7.2 **Data**

- Do we have complete data, and relevant statistics, on the proposal(s)?
- Do we have reasonably reliable data on the proposals?
- What assumptions have had to be built in?

Data on the application of the current bylaw is based on Officer’s experience applying the current bylaw. Bylaws from other Councils are readily available and have informed recommendations about proposed amendments to their bylaws.

7.3 **Significance**

	Yes/No	Explain
Is the proposal significant according to the Significance Bylaw in the Long Term Plan?	No	
Is it:	No	
• considered a strategic asset; or	No	
• above the financial thresholds in the Significance Bylaw; or	No	
• impacting on a CCO stakeholding; or	No	
• a change in level of service; or	No	
• creating a high level of controversy; or	No	
• possible that it could have a high impact on the community?	No	
In terms of the Council’s Significance Bylaw, is this proposal of high, medium, or low significance?		
HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
		✓

7.4 **Options**

<p>An assessment of costs and benefits for each option must be completed. Use the criteria below in your assessment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What options are available? 2. For each option: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explain what the costs and benefits of each option are in terms of the present and future needs of the district; • outline if there are any sustainability issues; and • explain if the outcomes meet the current and future needs of communities for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions? 3. After completing these, consider which option you wish to recommend to Council, and explain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how this option is the most cost effective option for households and businesses; • if there are any trade-offs; and • what interdependencies exist.

Option 1:

The Council adopts the *draft* Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020, with recommended changes.

Option 2:

The Council adopts the current Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw with no changes.

7.5 **Financial**

- Is there an impact on funding and debt levels?
- Will work be undertaken within the current budget?
- What budget has expenditure come from?
- How will the proposal be funded? e.g. rates, reserves, grants etc.

The adoption of the Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020 has no impact on funding and debt levels.

7.6 **Prioritisation & Trade-off**

- Have you taken into consideration the:
- Council's capacity to deliver;
 - contractor's capacity to deliver; and
 - consequence of deferral?

There is no impact in the adoption of the draft bylaw to the current service provided by Council staff and contractors.

The Bylaw must be adopted before July 2021 or it will be automatically revoked.

7.7 **Legal Issues**

- Is there a legal opinion needed?
- Are there legal issues?

No legal opinion was obtained in the preparation of the Bylaw. The Bylaw has been written to align with the relevant legislation.

7.8 **Bylaw Issues - Section 80**

- Are there any Bylaw issues?
- Does your recommendation conflict with Council Policies?

There are no Policy issues.

Attachments:

Appendix A - Submissions

Appendix B – The *Draft* Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw – 2020

Appendix C – Urban and Rural/Residential zone map.



Rachael Otter
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH MANAGER



[Endorsed by]
Blair Sutherland
DIRECTOR ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES



[Approved by]
Sven Hanne
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

DATE 16 November 2020

APPENDIX A

SUBMISSION FORM

SurveyMonkey

Q2 Please type your submission here:

Answered: 2 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	<p>I am writing to make a submission on the bylaw, The keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees. Although I currently reside outside of the Stratford District I own property in Stratford and am a current ratepayer. I request that para 10.4 No person may keep a rooster or cockerel in an urban area. Be removed. I would like to see any noise complaints attributed to crowing roosters handled in the same way as barking dogs. I find it hypocritical that noise from one animal is somehow less offensive than noise from another. Allowing people to keep a rooster allows them the joy that comes with breeding your own animals it will allow people to ensure food security if they choose to breed and grow meat animals and it will allow children the joy and experience of having and raising baby chicks. I believe that the number of people in urban Stratford that would choose to own a rooster will be low and any complaints can be handled on a case by case basis. I note that the Dog Control Policy Report Year end 30 June 2020 had 2072 Registered dogs and 113 complaints from barking dogs. I doubt there will be anywhere near this number of roosters or complaints. I would also like to see a limit put on the number of cats in each household, Taranaki is striving to become predator free to achieve greater biodiversity I fail to see how that goal can be achieved when we allow an unlimited amount of cats to roam the district. The damage cats do is well documented and in the spirit of becoming predator free and taking care of our indigenous birdlife I propose putting a 2 cat per household limit into the bi law. I would also recommend mandatory microchipping of cats so that any future cat control can involve live trapping and any cat caught with a microchip can be returned to the owners and any without can be destroyed. Thank you for taking the time to consider my submission. Romon Sargeson</p>	<p>11/1/2020 5:55 PM</p> <p>Sub#1</p>
2	<p>I would like council to seriously consider whether '10.4 No person may keep a rooster or cockerel in an urban area.' is an accurate reflection of our local demographic and fair to the majority of our population. Stratford is made up of many property types, some more suitable to having a rooster than others. Imposing a blanket ban on roosters may have a negative impact on several responsible rooster owners (such as heritage breeders) who have never had a complaint made against them. The main issue with roosters is usually early morning noise. I would suggest council do some research around how many complaints they actually receive a year in relation to roosters before imposing a blanket ban. As long-time (10+ years) resident who lives on the very outskirts of town, i can honestly say I have never had any issues with noise from roosters. The speedway, however, regularly makes enough noise to be heard audibly inside my house. To further complicate things in Stratford, potentially because of how some areas are zoned, some properties couldn't keep roosters, but the properties on the other side of the street could. How would this be equitable? I would rather see Stratford respect its rural background and allow the responsible keeping of roosters. Perhaps, the council could consider alternatives, such as limiting the number of roosters on urban properties to two and keeping them housed to reduce their noise levels. A further option to reword this bylaw could be "10.4 No person may keep a rooster or cockerel in an urban area where it creates a nuisance".</p>	<p>10/25/2020 6:08 AM</p> <p>Sub#2</p>

8

SUBMISSION FORM

SurveyMonkey

Q1 Contact details

Answered: 2 Skipped: 0

ANSWER CHOICES

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Name	100.00%	2
Organisation	50.00%	1
Postal address	100.00%	2
Email	50.00%	1
Phone	100.00%	2

#	NAME	DATE
1	Romon Sargeson	11/1/2020 5:55 PM
2	Rachel Payne	10/25/2020 6:08 AM
#	ORGANISATION	DATE
1	Private Citizen	11/1/2020 5:55 PM
#	POSTAL ADDRESS	DATE
1		11/1/2020 5:55 PM
2		10/25/2020 6:08 AM
#	EMAIL	DATE
1		10/25/2020 6:08 AM
#	PHONE	DATE
1		11/1/2020 5:55 PM
2		10/25/2020 6:08 AM

8

Sub# 3



Director
Environmental Services
Stratford District Council
PO Box 320
Stratford 4352

Email:

6 November 2020

Submitter Details:

Taranaki Public Health Unit
Taranaki District Health Board
Private Bag 2016
New Plymouth 4620



Taranaki District Health Board
Private Bag 2016
New Plymouth 4342
New Zealand
Telephone 06 753 6139
Email: corporate@tdhb.org.nz
www.tdhn.org.nz

Taranaki Base Hospital
Private Bag 2016
New Plymouth 4342
New Zealand
Phone: 06 753 6139

Hāwera Hospital
Post Office Box 98
Hāwera
New Zealand
Phone: 06 753 6139

Stratford Health Centre
Phone: 06 765 7189

Ōpunakē Medical Centre
(CoastalCare)
Phone: 06 761 7324

Pātea Health Centre
Phone: 06 273 8456

Waitara Health Centre
Phone: 06 754 8119

Mōkau Health Centre
Phone: 06 752 9723

8

We do not wish to speak in support of our Submission.

The Taranaki Public Health Unit (Taranaki PHU) welcomes the opportunity to submit on the Draft Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020.

Taranaki PHU is one of 12 public health units providing public health services across Aotearoa/New Zealand. We provide a range of services with a focus on promoting health equity and protecting communities against public health hazards. Taranaki PHU is committed to creating a fairer society where everyone has the opportunity for good health, and where our societal systems consider the needs and aspirations of Māori as tangata whenua and work in partnership with Māori through the application of Te Tiriti o Waitangi articles and principles.

Keeping animals can have both positive and negative impacts on human health and wellbeing. Pets and other animals are recognised for their potential to not only improve owners' physical health but also mental health and wellbeing.¹²

Interactions with, or living in close proximity to animals can also have negative impacts on human health and wellbeing, either directly from injuries during interactions (eg bites), zoonotic diseases and allergies or the indirect impacts of odour, noise and other nuisances.³

The demand for keeping of animals in the urban environment is associated with the increasing popularity of keeping animals as part of home gardening, and urban farming/agriculture. This has potential positive

¹ Wells, D.I. (2009). The effects of animals on human health and wellbeing. *Journal of Social Issues*. Vol 65, No. 3; 523-545.

² Pollock, S.L., Stephen, C. & Skuridina, N. (2011). Raising chickens in city backyards: The public health role. *Community Health*. 37:734-742.

³ Butler, W.H. (2012). Welcoming animals back to the city: Navigating the tensions of urban livestock through municipal ordinances. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems and Community Development*. Vol 2, Issue 2; 193-215.



impacts on wellbeing including increasing connection to nature, food security, autonomy of choice, financial benefits, benefits to the ecosystem, reduced 'food miles' and a more connected and resilient community.⁴⁵

The Taranaki PHU supports the Stratford District Council regulating the conditions and the number/type of animals allowed to be kept in the Stratford District while providing options for those who wish to keep animals. The benefits of keeping animals should be balanced with the potential health risks associated with increased urban animal populations.

There is one particular type of animal keeping that at times has directly involved the staff of Stratford District Council as well as the Medical Officer of Health, SPCA and other agencies. People who hoard possessions and live in squalid conditions also often hoard animals such as cats. These may be kept inside and not allowed to go outside. In one example the Stratford District Council environmental health officer notified the Taranaki Hoarding and Squalor Interagency Panel in 2013 about a woman in Stratford who kept more than 15 cats inside her house. The urine and faeces had rotted the floor boards. An environmental health officer was so affected by ammonia smells following an inspection of the property that he needed to take a week off work. No helping agency was prepared to go inside the house. It was very difficult to resolve the problem and it required a multi-agency response to help the woman.

We suggest an amendment to section 11.1 of the Draft Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw which states:

There is no limit to the number of cats permitted to be kept on any Premises provided the cats are sufficiently cared for and the keeping of such cats does not cause, or is likely to cause a health nuisance to the occupant or to visitors to property or to neighbouring properties.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jonathan Jarman". The signature is fluid and cursive.

Dr Jonathan Jarman
MEDICAL OFFICER OF HEALTH

⁴ Butler, W.H. (2012). Welcoming animals back to the city: Navigating the tensions of urban livestock through municipal ordinances. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems and Community Development*. Vol 2, Issue 2; 193-215.
5 Lal, R. (2020). Home gardening and urban agriculture for advancing food and nutritional security in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Food Security* 2020, Jun 23:1-6 (Nature Public Health Emergency Collection)

Sub# 4



Forest & Bird

TE REO O TE TAIAO | *Giving Nature a Voice*

8

11 November 2020

Submission on Draft Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020

To: Director, Environmental Services
Stratford District Council
bsutherland@stratford.govt.nz

From: North & South Taranaki Branches

of the
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (Forest & Bird)

Attn: Amelia Geary – Regional Conservation Manager

Introduction

1. Forest & Bird is New Zealand's largest independent conservation organisation. Our mission is to protect New Zealand's unique flora and fauna and its habitat.
2. We congratulate Stratford District Council for its review of the Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw and attempts to better manage cats in the District. Forest & Bird encourages councils to adopt meaningful cat management policies and regulations to support responsible domestic cat ownership, to minimise risk to human health and to protect areas of high biodiversity value from the impact of domestic, stray and feral cats. Our submission relates to the management of cats in Stratford District.
3. We would like to speak in support of our submission.

Submission

4. Cats are predators. Domestic cats pose a significant risk to native and endemic birds, lizards, and insects throughout New Zealand. The detrimental direct effect of cats on populations of native species has been widely recognised and documented^{1,2} and include devastating examples such as a recent case where a single domestic cat decimated the breeding attempts of native banded dotterels breeding on a beach in Wellington harbour, for the second season in a row.³
5. Domestic cats are also carriers of zoonotic diseases. This includes toxoplasmosis said to now be present in a high percentage of New Zealanders⁴ and a contributing factor in the death of a number of native species^{5,6,7}. Recent research from Australia has shown that the costs associated with diseases transmitted by cats cost the Australian economy more than A\$6 billion annually through their impact on human health and the agricultural sector⁸.
6. Domestic cats do not respect property boundaries. They are the cause of many cases of nuisance such as defecating in peoples' gardens as well as having the potential to kill the beloved pets (birds, guinea pigs etc) of those who have no control over the unwanted movements of others' free-ranging cats. Furthermore, cats (particularly entire toms) pose a significant threat to other cats and can cause innocent families large vet bills after a fight.
7. When poorly managed, irresponsible owners of domestic cats contribute to the growth of stray and feral cats, which have even more devastating impacts.⁹
8. Forest & Bird acknowledges the position cats hold as a valued companion animal to loving owners. As a loved animal, these owners also need to take responsibility for their cat's behaviour. Limiting the number of cats on a property and ensuring all cats are de-sexed and microchipped is the bare minimum of this responsibility.

Forest & Bird proposes a limit of three cats per household

9. Forest & Bird is supportive of policies in Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaws that reflect the need to better manage the negative impacts of cats. We are very concerned, however, that the proposed amendments to this bylaw do not go far enough to address cat management in Stratford District, particularly given the high numbers of feral cats in the eastern hill country¹⁰.
10. New Zealanders show a high level (>65%) of support for limits to be placed on the number of cats owned per household¹¹. In the absence of any survey done locally, we would suggest there

¹ <https://zslpublications.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1017/S095283690200328X>

² <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0006320709004133>

³ <https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/117263362/lone-tabby-on-its-way-to-wiping-out-second-generation-of-dotterels>

⁴ <http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/10056562/Cats-will-damage-your-mind-Morgan>

⁵ <https://www.doc.govt.nz/nature/pests-and-threats/diseases/toxoplasmosis-and-hectors-and-maui-dolphin/>

⁶ https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261836844_Four_Cases_of_Fatal_Toxoplasmosis_in_Three_Species_of_Endemic_New_Zealand_Birds

⁷ <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00480169.2016.1230526>

⁸ <https://www.rnz.co.nz/national/programmes/sunday/audio/2018770798/cats-costing-billions-each-year-by-spreading-diseases>

⁹ <https://www.doc.govt.nz/nature/pests-and-threats/animal-pests/feral-cats/>

¹⁰ <https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/311897/feral-cats-reaching-%27plague-proportions%27>

¹¹ Walker, J.K., Bruce, S.J., Dale, A.R. 2017. A Survey of Public Opinion on Cat (*Felis catus*) Predation and the Future Direction of Cat Management in New Zealand. *Animals* (Basel). 7(7): 49. Accessed: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5532564/>

would be majority support for limiting cat numbers in Stratford District. In Whanganui this year, as part of its Animal Bylaw review, Council staff undertook an online survey of residents. When asked to consider the most appropriate number of cats per premises, 48% of respondents considered two cats or fewer were the most appropriate while 34% considered that four cats was the most appropriate number¹².

11. Forest & Bird requests a limit on the number of cats per household across the District to three. Over fifty percent of councils that regulate cat numbers in the North Island have set the limit to three (Table 1.). Whanganui District Council amended its draft Bylaw from a limit of four to three cats per household. As currently written, Stratford's draft Bylaw gives no certainty or direction for Council Officers to impose a limit on cat numbers when a complaint is received. It opens the Council up to complaints if cat limits are imposed arbitrarily and on a case by case basis. We suggest it is out of step with best practice to not impose a firm cat limit.

Table 1. Territorial Authorities in the North Island that currently limit cat numbers in their bylaws.

Cat limits per household	Council
Three cats	Carterton District Council ¹³ Masterton District Council ¹⁴ Palmerston North City Council ¹⁵ Rangitikei District Council ¹⁶
Four cats	Hastings District Council ²⁰ Manawatū District Council ²¹
Five cats	Far North District Council ²³ New Plymouth District Council ²⁴

¹² <https://www.whanganui.govt.nz/files/assets/public/consultations/keeping-of-animals-poultry-and-bees-bylaw/keeping-of-animals-poultry-and-bees-bylaw-2020-statement-of-proposal-and-bylaw.pdf>

¹³ https://www.swdc.govt.nz/sites/default/files/Part%206%20Keeping%20of%20Animals%20Poultry%20and%20Bees%20Bylaw_Current_0.pdf

¹⁴ https://www.swdc.govt.nz/sites/default/files/Part%206%20Keeping%20of%20Animals%20Poultry%20and%20Bees%20Bylaw_Current_0.pdf

¹⁵ <https://www.pncc.govt.nz/media/3130963/animals-and-bees-bylaw-2018.pdf>

¹⁶ <https://www.rangitikei.govt.nz/files/forms/Animal-Control-Bylaw-2019.pdf>

¹⁷ https://www.swdc.govt.nz/sites/default/files/Part%206%20Keeping%20of%20Animals%20Poultry%20and%20Bees%20Bylaw_Current_0.pdf

¹⁸ <https://www.tararua.govt.nz/Publications/Policies-Bylaws>

¹⁹ <https://www.whanganui.govt.nz/files/assets/public/bylaws/keeping-of-animals-poultry-and-bees-bylaw-2020.pdf>

²⁰ <https://www.hastingsdc.govt.nz/assets/Document-Library/Bylaws/Hastings-District-Council-Consolidated-Bylaw/hastings-district-council-consolidated-bylaws-october-2016.pdf>

²¹ <https://www.mdc.govt.nz/Documents/Bylaws>

²² <https://www.ruapehudc.govt.nz/SiteCollectionDocuments/Policies%20and%20Bylaws/Bylaws/The%20Ruapehu%20Bylaw/The%20Ruapehu%20Bylaw%202018.pdf>

²³ <https://www.fndc.govt.nz/files/assets/public/objectivedocuments/governance-and-executive-management-gem/bylaws/keeping-animals-poultry-and-bees/keeping-of-animals-poultry-and-bees-2007.pdf>

²⁴ <https://www.newplymouthnz.com/-/media/NPDC/Documents/Council/Council%20Documents/Bylaws/Bylaw%202008%20Part%202%20Animals.a.shx>

²⁵ <https://www.southwaikato.govt.nz/repository/libraries/id:24rtvarkd17q9s3wxfnn/hierarchy/our-council/strategies-plans-policies-bylaws/bylaws/documents/Keeping%20of%20Animals%20Poultry%20and%20Bees%20Bylaw%202017.pdf>

Forest & Bird proposes that microchipping and registering is compulsory

12. Forest & Bird believes that microchipping and registering cats should be required of all cat owners. Requiring individuals to microchip and register their cats allows for a clear delineation between stray, feral and free-roaming owned cats. Identification of cats is paramount to ensuring that effective strategies for control of un-owned cats, that Council may wish to undertake, can progress.
13. In this context, catching microchipped cats allows not only the return of someone's beloved pet, like the cat trapped in Inglewood and returned to its family six years after it went missing,²⁶ but also presents an opportunity to educate that cat owner who may have previously been oblivious to the negative impact their cat was having in the local community. Furthermore, compulsory microchipping would bring Stratford District Council in line with recent bylaws enacted by Whanganui, Palmerston North and Wellington City²⁷ Councils.
14. Microchipping is a well-supported management tool for cats in New Zealand, with almost 80% of the general public is in favour of a national requirement for mandatory microchipping (in addition to restriction of cat numbers and mandatory desexing)²⁸. The Ministry for Primary Industry's Code of Welfare: Companion Cats 2018's Recommended Best Practice is that cats should be identified with a microchip²⁹. Given microchipping is compulsory for dog owners, few truly loving cat owners will be put off by the imposition of the cost of microchipping to ensure the protection of their companion animal.
15. Furthermore, compulsory microchipping and registration of cats would support Council to enforce proposed Clause 11.4 below regarding Nuisance cats. If Nuisance cats are identified and not compliant with proposed identification measures then it will be easier for Council to take precautions to reduce the Nuisance effect.

Forest & Bird proposes the compulsory requirement to de-sex cats

16. Forest & Bird suggests Stratford District Council would be lagging behind other councils if it didn't include the requirement to de-sex cats in this bylaw review. Taranaki, Palmerston North and Whanganui District Councils all included de-sexing in their recent Keeping of Animals Bylaw review.
17. The reproductive potential of a single female cat is estimated at 300 kittens in her reproductive lifetime. The potential for a male cat is far beyond that. MPI's Code of Welfare states puberty can occur from four months of age. Responsible cat ownership includes having cats desexed at or before puberty. Forest & Bird would support the provision of targeted funding towards voluntary de-sexing and the establishment of an education programme teaching responsible cat ownership
18. We have suggested wording to strengthen the proposed regulation, presented below.

²⁶ <https://www.nzherald.co.nz/stratford-press/news/hundreds-of-kittens-and-cats-rescued-this-year-alone-by-taranaki-animal-protection-trust/SGLHEBF4GHSTZNGIDWCIXCNMGU/>

²⁷ https://wellington.govt.nz/your-council/plans-policies-and-bylaws/bylaws/wellington-consolidated-bylaw-2008/part-2_-_animals#four4

²⁸ Walker, J.K., Bruce, S.J., Dale, A.R. 2017. A Survey of Public Opinion on Cat (*Felis catus*) Predation and the Future Direction of Cat Management in New Zealand. *Animals (Basel)*. 7(7): 49. Accessed: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5532564/>

²⁹ <https://www.agriculture.govt.nz/dmsdocument/1413-Companion-Cats-Animal-Welfare-Code-of-Welfare>

11 **Keeping of Cats and Kittens**

~~11.1 There is no limit to the number of cats permitted to be kept on any Premises provided the cats are sufficiently cared for and the keeping of such cats does not cause, or is likely to cause a health nuisance.~~

Except with the approval of Council, no person shall keep more than three (3) cats over the age of three months on premises within Stratford District.

~~11.2 An Authorised Officer may impose a limit on the number of cats and kittens which may be kept on private land, where:~~

~~(a) The Council has received a complaint about the number of cats kept on the private land; and~~

~~(b) The Authorised Officer considers the number of cats is creating a nuisance or is likely to create a public health nuisance; and~~

~~(b) The person keeping those cats fails to comply with any reasonable request of an Authorised Officer to abate or prevent the nuisance.~~

Any cat over four (4) months must be:

(a) microchipped and the cat's microchip registered with the New Zealand Companion Animal Register;

and

(b) de-sexed unless:

(i) the cat is kept for breeding purposes; and registered with a nationally recognised cat breeders body;

or

(ii) the owner provides a certificate from a veterinarian stating that the de-sexing of the cat will adversely affect its health and/or welfare.

11.3 Clauses 11.1 and 11.2 do not apply to lawfully established:

(a) vets; or

(b) SPCA or similar charity; or

(c) cat boarding premises.

11.4 If, in the opinion of Council, the keeping of cats on a premises is or is likely to cause or become a Nuisance, Council may in writing require all or any of the following:

(a) reduce the number of cats kept on the premises; or

(b) take other such precautions as may be considered by Council to reduce the Nuisance effects.

Submission ends.



Sub# 5

SUBMISSION

TO: Stratford District Council
FROM: Apiculture New Zealand

SUBMISSION ON: Draft Keeping Animals, Poultry and Bees bylaw 2020

DATE: 12 November 2020

CONTACT DETAILS: Apiculture New Zealand

Email:

info@apiculture.co.nz



Submission on Draft Keeping Animals, Poultry and Bees bylaw 2020

Apiculture New Zealand (ApiNZ) welcomes the opportunity to make this submission

ApiNZ is the national body representing the honey and bee industry in New Zealand. ApiNZ aims to support and deliver benefit to the New Zealand apiculture industry by creating a positive industry profile, business environment and opportunities for members, as well as ensuring good bee health and beekeeping practices.

ApiNZ position

ApiNZ supports the Draft bylaw for Beekeeping, and recognition that the Council has identified the benefit of bees to the community as a whole.

ApiNZ supports the intent of sections 12.2 – 12.4 with the Council enabling flexibility in it's the way it responds to any infringements.

Please see below the Apiculture NZ member Code of Conduct for your reference. Other local authorities have used aspects of our Code as a guide when considering responses to public concerns around beekeeping practices.

Apiculture New Zealand Beekeeper Code of Conduct

Aims

To allow the keeping of bees in a manner compatible with the environment they are located in, and to encourage the keeping of bees in such a way as to be acceptable to the relevant regulatory authorities, the general public, the landowner(s) concerned and other apiarists.

Objectives

To ensure:

1. The sustainability of the bees and the environment that supports them
2. Public safety and social amenity
3. Good beekeeping practice in line with proven and ethical standards in working with bees and any activity associated with apiculture
4. The maintenance of good relations among all stakeholders

Definitions



Beekeeping Business means the transporting, placing and servicing, and maintenance of beehives on apiary sites for farm and orchard pollination activities, honey and bee products production, and any other activity as reasonably necessary for the support of healthy bees.

Sites means the location of apiaries.

Apiary/apiaries means a grouping of beehives.

An Apiary site is defined as a group of beehives which sits within a maximum span of 200 metres; that being 100 metres from a centre point.

Achieving the aims and objectives

Beekeepers will hereby undertake as follows:

1. To site hives and apiaries away from places frequented by the public where they are likely to cause nuisance to people, livestock, residences, businesses or those in the vicinity, and to ensure the general public are not impacted or impeded from undertaking general activities.
2. To ensure apiary sites are not close to areas where bloodstock are worked, trained or exercised, or on laneways and gate entrances where stock movement occurs.
3. To ensure as far as possible their bees are of docile and manageable temperament and to work towards this by eliminating bees that show undesirable characteristics, and to take all reasonable steps to control swarming.
4. To manipulate bees in a responsible manner and in suitable weather conditions, especially in urban areas, so that no nuisance is caused to people, livestock, residences, businesses or those in the vicinity, and especially at the time of removing the honey crop.
5. To ensure the honey crop is removed in a responsible manner at suitable locations, extracted and stored in suitable food grade approved containers, new or reconditioned, free from all contaminants especially moisture, odours and chemicals.
6. To present honey for sale in a proper clean food grade approved container free from all foreign debris and bee matter and labelled in accordance with current legal requirements.
7. To participate as an active member of the local ApiNZ Hub or Regional Beekeeping Club where beekeepers can acquire the skills and knowledge to become competent and responsible beekeepers and to encourage other beekeepers to do likewise.
8. To strive to ensure good neighbourly relations at all times.

Conduct of Apiculture NZ members

1. All members of the Association are expected to:
 - 1.1. Adhere to the Association's rules and Constitution.
 - 1.2. Positively contribute to ApiNZ and its membership.
 - 1.3. Promote the Code of Conduct nationally.
 - 1.4. Practice proven and ethical standards in working and managing their bees or any activity associated with apiculture, including the removal of swarms and any aspect of research and development in apiculture.



APICULTURE NEW ZEALAND

- 1.5. Behave in proper, lawful and responsible manner in all activities associated with beekeeping business.
 - 1.6. Behave in a responsible manner in all dealings with the general public on beekeeping matters.
 - 1.7. Acknowledge and respect the views of fellow beekeepers without derogatory or disparaging comment whilst maintaining their right to express their own views in any forum of the Association.
 - 1.8. Respect appropriate distances between his/her hives/apiaries and another beekeeper's hives.
 - 1.9. In keeping bees, apply good beekeeping husbandry that involves appropriate pest and disease management and good farming practices.
 - 1.10. Maintain the highest standards in their honey production and handling facilities and use only approved compounds, as labelled, to avoid the introduction of contaminants into honey in the hive or during collection, processing and packaging.
 - 1.11. Ensure full compliance to the American Foulbrood Pest Management Plan and other husbandry practices that may be developed.
- 2. Landowners and the general public**
- 2.1. Any beekeeper who keeps bees on property which is not his/her own must have the permission of the landowner to keep his/her bees on that property.
 - 2.2. Must comply with the requirements of the Health & Safety at Work Act 2015.
 - 2.3. The beekeeper will at all times act in an environmentally and socially responsible manner while working with his/her bees on any site.
 - 2.4. The beekeeper must work safely and responsibly at all times understanding the risks that the property presents.
 - 2.5. The beekeeper should at all times keep the area in which he/she keeps his/her bees in a tidy and clean environment, must safely dispose of redundant materials such as Varroa strips and avoid any damage to landowner's property.
 - 2.6. The beekeeper should maintain regular contact with the landowner and adhere to reasonable requests made by the landowner and general public regarding the keeping of bees on the property.
 - 2.7. The beekeeper must ensure the interests of the general public are observed when working on his/her bees or transporting bees in any vehicle.
 - 2.8. Foster the best possible relations with the general public and conduct their beekeeping operations to minimise the unnecessary exposure of the public to honey bees.
 - 2.9. Respect pre-existing relationships between other beekeepers and landowners.



2.10. If a Land Use Agreement is in place between the beekeeper and the landowner, both parties must adhere to the rules and guidelines stipulated in the agreement.

2.11. If purchased through ApiNZ, the ApiNZ Land Use Agreement terms of use must be honoured.

3. Misconduct

3.1. Clause 5.2 of the Constitution states all members shall promote the interest and the objects of the Association and shall do nothing to bring the Association into disrepute. (Refer to Clause 7.4, see below)

3.2. In the event that any member brings the name of the Association or the industry into disrepute or conducts themselves in any manner deemed irresponsible or unethical, the Board of the Association may act in terms of the rules of the Association in dealing with the matter.

3.3. ApiNZ Constitution Clause 7.4: Before the Board may suspend or remove a Member from the Register of Members for conduct prejudicial to the interests of the Association, wilful breach of any Rule or such other misconduct as determined by the Board:

- a. The Board will provide to the Member concerned a statement of its reasons for considering the Member to be guilty of misconduct meriting suspension or expulsion;
- b. The Member will be afforded a reasonable opportunity, in person or in writing, to respond to that statement.

3.4. Clause 7.5: If, after considering the response (if any) from the member, the Board proposes to remove or suspend that member, a motion to that effect will be put for consideration at the next Board meeting.

4. Conduct in respect of swarm collection

4.1. Any member of the Association who carries out the removal of swarms must be competent to do so. The beekeeper responsible must know his/her limitations and must not endanger the safety of other persons, livestock, pets or other animals.

4.2. Swarms have the potential to carry bee pests and diseases, such as American Foulbrood, care should be taken to quarantine the new hive until it has had time to become established and a thorough hive health inspection can be completed.

5. Conduct in respect of Transportation of Hives

5.1. Health and Safety prior to, during loading and unloading of hives is a paramount responsibility at all times.



APICULTURE NEW ZEALAND

- 5.2.** Hive dump sites, for loading or unloading, must be a suitable and safe distance away from residential housing, businesses and public amenities including the sides of roads and other public access ways.
- 5.3.** Hives should be strapped to their individual pallet - single, double or four.
- 5.4.** Hives must be stacked and strapped to the truck bed securely at all times during transport.
- 5.5.** Hives should be transported in cool weather conditions or during late evening or night time hours, wherever possible.
- 5.6.** Trucks should be fueled before hives are loaded to avoid the requirement to stop in transit where possible.
- 5.7.** Safe driving principles must be adhered to at all times.
- 5.8.** Fatigue issues must be monitored and appropriate action taken when required.
- 5.9** For every vehicle operated, and for any possible identification verification purposes, carry a copy of your Beekeeper Summary as found in the National Apiary Register on the APIWEB SYSTEM or other relevant ID.

Sub# 6

SurveyMonkey

SUBMISSION FORM

#3

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, November 03, 2020 8:30:39 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, November 03, 2020 8:32:55 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:16
IP Address: 119.224.38.55

8

Page 2: Draft Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020

Q1

Contact details

Name **John**
Organisation **Driver**
Postal address
Email
Phone

Q2

Please type your submission here:

Keep the animals

Q3

Would you like to have the opportunity to speak to Council on your submission?

No I do not wish to speak to my submission at the hearing and ask that this written submission be considered.

Sub# 7

SUBMISSION FORM

SurveyMonkey

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, November 03, 2020 2:43:06 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, November 03, 2020 2:48:28 PM
Time Spent: 00:05:22
IP Address: 115.189.80.21

8

Page 2: Draft Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020

Q1

Contact details

Name **Adrian Candy**
Organisation **Kiwi**
Postal address
Email
Phone

Q2

Please type your submission here:

Inglewood New Plymouth

Q3

Would you like to have the opportunity to speak to Council on your submission?

No I do not wish to speak to my submission at the hearing and ask that this written submission be considered.

Sub# 8

SurveyMonkey

SUBMISSION FORM

#

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, November 03, 2020 3:33:45 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, November 03, 2020 3:36:06 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:21
IP Address: 115.189.86.186

8

Page 2: Draft Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020

Q1

Contact details

Name **Cameron**
 Postal address
 Email
 Phone

Q2

Please type your submission here:

I approve

Q3

Would you like to have the opportunity to speak to Council on your submission?

No I do not wish to speak to my submission at the hearing and ask that this written submission be considered.

Sub# 9
SurveyMonkey

SUBMISSION FORM

#6

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, November 03, 2020 8:22:21 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, November 03, 2020 8:25:00 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:39
IP Address: 101.53.216.105

8

Page 2: Draft Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020

Q1

Contact details

Name **Paul Fairbrother**
Organisation **Wellington Speedway Society**
Postal address
Email
Phone

Q2

Please type your submission here:

I support the sale of the a & p Showgrounds for on going public use for speedway and a & p shows

Q3

Would you like to have the opportunity to speak to Council on your submission?

No I do not wish to speak to my submission at the hearing and ask that this written submission be considered.

Sub# 10

SUBMISSION FORM

SurveyMonkey

#

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 12:35:34 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 1:14:54 PM
Time Spent: 00:39:20
IP Address: 115.189.133.198

8

Page 2: Draft Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020

Q1

Contact details

Name **Bart Jansma**

Postal address

Email

Phone

SUBMISSION FORM

SurveyMonkey

Q2

Please type your submission here:

General provision 8.1 – normal behaviours of animals e.g. crowing, should be excluded from this general provision and be managed within the specific provisions. The effects that can be reasonably expected should be clearly controlled by the rules, and not be left to the discretion of individual officers or subject to discussion by (for example) disgruntled neighbours. Note that odour and dust is also governed by the Regional Council.

Section 10.5 is structured in a way that is not clear, with regards to the inclusion of 'or' & 'and' in different parts. For example, does 10.5 still apply if (a), (c) and (d) apply but not (b)? I also believe that this section is too general and subject to interpretation. It should not apply where 10.1 to 10.4 have been complied with. However, this may require an additional rule that restricts the head of poultry that can be kept in a rural zone. There is also no mention of reverse sensitivity. The current drafting would facilitate someone who has recently moved to a location to complain about poultry that have been there for years, and potentially have them removed, depending on the discretion of the authorised officer.

Section 11 is very permissive. Not limiting the number of cats has the potential to impact on the success of the predator free movement in Taranaki through direct predation by domestic cats and helping maintain a feral cat population. It is requested that the number of cats per household is limited to two, with a grace period for those households that currently have more than two cats (i.e. existing cats can remain, but cannot be replaced until the number of cats has reduced to the maximum set by the bylaw).

Furthermore, it is requested that all domesticated cats are to be microchipped, to assist in the identification of feral cats.

11.1 refers to cats not causing "a health nuisance" while section 11.2 refers to a "nuisance" or "public health nuisance". This is inconsistent, and 11.1 should also include the term 'nuisance' in addition to 'health nuisance'. Cats preying on domestic and wild animals, defecating on neighbouring properties and their territorial behaviours (fighting etc) are all non-health related nuisances that need adequate controls.

Although it would be ideal for all domestic cats to be either fixed (again to minimise the number of feral cats), or are required to be contained within the home property, I realise that this may receive significant push back. They should be managed in a manner that is consistent to the management of dogs.

Q3

Would you like to have the opportunity to speak to Council on your submission?

No I do not wish to speak to my submission at the hearing and ask that this written submission be considered.

Sub# 11

SUBMISSION FORM

SurveyMonkey

#

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 10:35:13 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, November 12, 2020 1:19:37 PM
Time Spent: Over a day
IP Address: 125.238.120.120

Page 2: Draft Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020

Q1

Contact details

Name	Jim Clarkson
Organisation	Resident
Postal address	
Email	
Phone	

8

SUBMISSION FORM

SurveyMonkey

Q2

Please type your submission here:

SUBMISSION FORM

SurveyMonkey

Submission For Draft Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020

Thanks for the opportunity to provide this submission

I have read the draft bylaw and the present bylaw (Chapter 11, The Keeping of Animals and Poultry) and note the changes.

My submission is concerned only to Clause 11, the "Keeping of Cats and Kittens". My submission refers to what is commonly defined as both stray cats and companion cats. I feel the draft bylaw is too brief, and does not reflect any contemporary thinking or controls with regard to a possible future restored environment and native species biodiversity within both our urban and rural areas.

The draft bylaw lacks any attempt to resolve the issues of nuisance and destruction caused by cats particularly in, but not confined to, urban areas. In brief summary the issues are:

- Roaming cats that move over a wide area and away from their home property. They impact on property owners, who feel cats are a nuisance, limiting residents the ability to successfully garden and provide safe habitat for native species. Preying cats kill native species of birds, reptiles etc. The Forest and Bird Society estimate that 1.12 million birds are killed by cats each year.
- Soiling and spraying in gardens, vegetable gardens, doorways etc. This mostly occurs in the adjacent properties from where the cats should be located. Campylobacteriosis, cat scratch disease, cat tapeworm, cryptosporidiosis, giardiasis, hookworm, methicillin-resistant staphylococcus (MRSA), rabies, roundworm, ringworm, salmonellosis, sporotrichosis and toxoplasmosis are all diseases that can be transmitted from cats to humans. These diseases can be a major issue for children and people with weakened immune systems.

I have completed some brief research to see what other local authorities are doing to alleviate these problems and I suggest some rules for inclusion in the bylaws and/or recommendations/guidelines for cat owners as listed below for inclusion into council policy. These rules/recommendations are not uncommon in other areas. In some cases guidelines are provided by local authorities outside of the bylaw process to educate cat/pet owners to be more responsible and have some respect for their neighbour's, community and local environmental well-being.

1. Limit the number of cats for each property (N.P.D.C =3) as is required for other animals, rather than have no limit and then be left with subjective decision making about what is a nuisance number.
2. Cats to be desexed and microchipped.
Example: All cats over the age of twelve weeks must be microchipped and the cat's microchip registered with New Zealand Companion Animal Register (Wellington Consolidated Bylaw 2008)
3. Recommend companion cats wear bells to scare off potential prey.
4. Recommend keeping cats indoors at night between 7 p.m. and 7 .a. m.
5. Recommend cat runs (enclosures) that keep cats on the properties where their owners reside.
6. Generally promote responsible pet ownership or share information similar to:
<https://www.forestandbird.org.nz/resources/responsible-pet-ownership-guide>

Presently it is estimated there are over 1.1 million companion cats in NZ. It would be much appreciated if the Stratford District Council could take urgent action to help alleviate the issues as raised. There are a number of measures available and all will eventually be required. Early steps towards resolving these issues will make a transition over time easier and more achievable.

Thank you
Jim Clarkson

SUBMISSION FORM

SurveyMonkey

Q3

Would you like to have the opportunity to speak to Council on your submission?

No I do not wish to speak to my submission at the hearing and ask that this written submission be considered.

Sub# 12

SUBMISSION FORM

SurveyMonkey

#

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, November 03, 2020 1:16:54 PM
Last Modified: Friday, November 13, 2020 2:21:40 PM
Time Spent: Over a week
IP Address: 121.99.208.156

Page 2: Draft Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020

Q1

Contact details

Name

Anne Collins

Postal address

Email

Phone

8

SUBMISSION FORM

SurveyMonkey

Q2

Please type your submission here:

I wish to make a submission regarding the keeping of cats and kittens in the Stratford district.

I strongly urge the Council to consider a limit to the number of cats that can be kept on any Premises.

Reasons:

- ☐ Cats are currently uncontrolled and are free to come and go wherever and whenever they wish. This includes being a nuisance to those people who do not want to have any cat able to access their property. I believe this is a right, not just a want.
- ☐ Cats defaecate anywhere they want, and it is most unpleasant to be digging or weeding and having to deal with the faeces of someone else's cat.
- ☐ Secondly, cats are known spreaders of a dangerous incurable disease, Toxoplasmosis gondii (T. gondii). This organism has been implemented in the development of schizophrenia. One of my cousins lost eyesight in one eye from this infection. Infected birds display bizarre behaviour and make easy prey to cats. Kittens and unwell cats are the worst spreaders of this disease by T. gondii oocysts (eggs) in their faeces. Other animals become infected by ingesting these. This article gives a good outline: <https://www.mz.co.nz/national/programmes/sunday/audio/2018770798/cats-costing-billions-each-year-by-spreading-diseases> When the oocysts then enter waterways it is quite possible they can infect our marine native species including the near extinct Maui's Dolphin and other sea mammals and wildlife. There have been documented cases of deaths to marine mammals and birds from toxoplasmosis. These animals are protected under the Wildlife Act.
- ☐ Uncontrolled cats enter uninvited other people's properties and prey on wildlife. This includes our native and protected, lizards and birds, but also introduced birds and insects such as weta. It is very distressing to have to witness a cat catching a bird on your own property and run off with it. To rescue the bird is also problematic because once a bird has cat saliva on its feathers it is pretty well doomed to a slow death from septicaemia. Bacteria from the cat's saliva is preened off and ingested by the bird or enters via a cat bite.
- ☐ Allowing unlimited numbers of cats, encourages owners to keep more than they can afford to care for. This could lead to them being dumped in native bush areas. This is an act of cruelty to both the cats and the wildlife they would then depend on to survive. Organisations such as Rotokare Scenic Reserve spend a lot of resources in time and money controlling cats to limit the predation on spill over from their predator free fenced area. Likewise other conservation organisations in Taranaki actively have to trap cats to prevent predation on species such as kiwi. Nobody likes having to kill a cat, so controlling their numbers in the first place is proactive.
- ☐ The Council depending on complaints to control the numbers of cats on a property, is plainly a retroactive approach. It is inviting abuse of friendship and goodwill between neighbours. The complainant would then become the 'bad guy', and could easily lead to bad feelings on both sides.
- ☐ I believe many other Councils in New Zealand already have a limit on the numbers of cats per household, and that this is supported by the majority of the public.

Proposal -

1. The Stratford District Council limit the number of adult cats per household to two. These should be both de-sexed and microchipped.
2. The Council introduces an education programme, highlighting the benefits to cat owners of containing their cats to their own property. At the very least to keep them inside before dusk and till after dawn. This not only helps protect wildlife but also benefits cats as they have less risk of injury from fighting or being run over. Neighbours would remain on good terms.

Q3

Would you like to have the opportunity to speak to Council on your submission?

No I do not wish to speak to my submission at the hearing and ask that this written submission be considered.

Sub# 13

SUBMISSION FORM

SurveyMonkey

#

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, November 15, 2020 6:21:05 PM
Last Modified: Sunday, November 15, 2020 6:24:42 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:37
IP Address: 115.189.134.179

8

Page 2: Draft Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020

Q1

Contact details

Name

Nicola Valintine

Postal address

Email

Phone

SUBMISSION FORM

SurveyMonkey

Q2

Please type your submission here:

A recent resource consent for an intensive chicken farm brought to our attention that intensive poultry farming is currently not covered in either the district plan or bylaws, for the simple fact that this is a new activity for the area. The local legislation needs updated for several reasons;

1. Unlike Pig Keeping, the District Plan does not provide rules for the control of intensive chicken farming.
2. Paragraph 10.2 – distances are not scaled to allow for the difference in effects of a shed of say 12 chickens to multiple sheds of 65,000. Under existing rules how close could an intensive farm be built to a dwelling, new subdivision or sensitive areas like schools and rest homes.
3. Distances to adjoining property boundaries and dwellings should specifically state where the measurements are taken from, as the difference between the furthest and nearest points to an adjoining dwelling can be quite significant. It should be the nearest part of the shed/site to the nearest part any adjoining dwellings for all relevant distances in this bylaw. Using nearest point measurement, our house is 490m from the site but the Assessment of Odour Affects in the consent application had our house as being 800m from the site, (The distances to the town water intake had similar measurement issues).
4. New sheds are heavily reliant on automation and alarms, so we need to factor in the noise effects when setting the distance from dwellings, as well as the obvious odour issue.
5. If a local contractor gets a contract to clean out chicken sheds and they need to stockpile the material for later use as fertiliser on crop paddocks, is there any rules around site suitability?
6. The closer you go to the mountain the more households use the local rivers and streams for their domestic/drinking water, yet they only have to be notified if they will be affected by odour, not that their drinking water could be contaminated with bacteria from stormwater run-off or waste water irrigation.
7. Should reflect the Ministry of Primary Industries "Poultry Code of Practice" so that things like planting of trees and shrubs (to help alleviate visual and odour issues), don't actually end up creating biosecurity issues.

I personally would not like to live any closer than 2km to an intensive pig or poultry farm as the separation distance reduces the effects of odour, dust, bioaerosols, noise and biosecurity issues, (even poultry farms are not allowed to be closer than 1km to each other) – so what is a realistic distance? Queensland proposed 576m to 874+ as its separation distances depending on number of birds and the positioning of sheds in relation to odour modelling.

It is generally accepted that it is unreasonable for urban folk moving into the countryside to complain about rural odours from a cowshed. The same is not true for people living in the country being adversely impacted by industrial levels of odour from poultry farming, as was found to be the case in Craddock Farms Ltd v Auckland Council in 2016.

I hope this provides some points to consider when you review the Bylaw.

Q3

Would you like to have the opportunity to speak to Council on your submission?

No I do not wish to speak to my submission at the hearing and ask that this written submission be considered.

SUBMISSION FORM

Blank

SurveyMonkey

#7

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, November 09, 2020 7:44:30 PM
Last Modified: Monday, November 09, 2020 7:46:17 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:46
IP Address: 125.238.120.120

Page 2: Draft Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020

Q1

Respondent skipped this question

Contact details

Q2

Please type your submission here:

A

Q3

Would you like to have the opportunity to speak to Council on your submission?

No I do not wish to speak to my submission at the hearing and ask that this written submission be considered.

APPENDIX B



DRAFT KEEPING OF ANIMALS, POULTRY AND BEES BYLAW 2020

Date in force:

Purpose: The Stratford District Council acknowledges that the keeping of animals, poultry or bees has benefits for the wellbeing of the owner and members of the household. This bylaw regulates the keeping of animals (including pigs, poultry, bees, livestock and cats) within the district to ensure they do not create a nuisance or endanger health.

Review date:

1 **Title**

1.1 This bylaw is made pursuant to section 145 of the Local Government Act and shall be known as the Stratford District Council, the Keeping of Animals, Poultry and Bees Bylaw 2020.

2 **Commencement**

2.1 This Bylaw shall come into force on

] 3 **Repeal**

3.1 As from the day this Bylaw comes into force, the previous Keeping of Animals and Poultry Bylaw 2008 shall be repealed.

4 **Application of Bylaw**

4.1 This Bylaw shall apply to the Stratford District.

5 **Scope**

5.1 This bylaw is made pursuant to section 145 of the Local Government Act 2002, which gives authority to the Council to adopt bylaws for the following general purposes:

- (a) Protecting the public from nuisance;
- (b) Protecting, promoting, and maintaining public health and safety;
- (c) Minimising the potential for offensive behaviour in public places.

And any other authority enabling the Council to make bylaws and regulate the keeping of animals, bees and poultry makes this Bylaw.

6 **Exclusions**

6.1 This Bylaw does not apply to dogs. This Bylaw does not address Animal Welfare matters. Animal welfare is dealt with by the Ministry of Primary Industries and the SPCA.

7 **Interpretation:**

7.1 In this Bylaw, unless the context otherwise requires:

“Authorised Officer” means any person authorised by Council to carry out or exercise any powers, duties or functions under this Bylaw or any part thereof and includes any Police Officer.

“Animal” means any live member of the animal kingdom (excluding dogs) that is a mammal, a bird or any other member of the animal kingdom which is declared from time to time by the Governor-General, by Order of Council, to be an animal for the purposes of the Animal Welfare Act 1999.

“Hive” means a box or container for the keeping or housing of bees.

“Keep or Keeping” means:

- (a) in respect of all animals, the owning, looking after, caring for, being in charge of, a custodian or in possession of any Animal and includes their young; and
- (b) in respect of bees, the keeping of one or more occupied hives.

“Kitten” means any cat less than six months of age.

“Livestock” means farm and herd animals, including but not limited to, cattle, horses, goats, and sheep.

“Nuisance” shall have the meaning assigned to it by the Health Act 1956 and any amendments to it and includes a person, animal, thing or circumstance causing unreasonable interference with the peace, comfort or convenience of another person, whether or not that person is in a public place.

“Person” includes a natural person, a corporation sole, and a body or persons whether incorporated or not.

“Pigsty” means a pen or enclosure for a pig or pigs.

“Public Place” means a place that is:

- (a) Under the control of the Council; and
- (b) Open to, or being used by, the public whether or not there is a charge for admission; and includes:
 - (i) Any part of a public place; and
 - (ii) Any reserve; or
- (c) A road, whether or not the road is under the control of the Council;

“Noise” means any noise of such a nature as to unreasonably interfere with the peace, comfort, and convenience of any person (other than a person in or at the place from which the noise is being emitted).

“Tethering” means the action of tying an animal with a rope, or chain or similar object, so as to restrict its movement.

“Urban area” means an area used mainly for residential or commercial purposes. The current Stratford District Urban area map is attached. Boundaries within the Stratford District are subject to change by resolution of the Council.

8 **General Provisions**

- 8.1 No person shall keep any animal, poultry, birds or bees, which causes, a nuisance or threat to public health by, but not limited to, noise, odour, and dust or through the attraction of flies or vermin.

9 **Pig Keeping**

- 9.1 Pigs shall be permitted in areas zoned Rural where they can be kept in accordance with all other applicable clauses in this bylaw. The Council may permit the keeping of pigs in areas zoned Rural/Residential. This will be determined on a case by case basis upon the receipt of a written application.
- 9.2 No person shall keep any pigs or offensive matter from pigsties in such a manner, where it is likely to create a nuisance, or be injurious to health.
- 9.3 Except with the approval of the Council, no person shall:
- (a) Construct or allow to remain any pigsty within 50 metres of a Public Place or any place used for the preparation, storage or sale of food for human consumption; and
 - (b) Place a pigsty, pig swill or manure within 50 metres of an adjoining property boundary.
- 9.4 All pigs must be controlled by way of fencing so as to contain the pigs from any roadway or other property. The fencing of pigs must be adequate to prevent any pigs from wandering.
- 9.5 An Authorised Officer may order the relocation or removal of pigs or a pigsty, where:
- (a) The Council has received a complaint about the location of the pigs or pigsty; and
 - (b) The Authorised Officer is satisfied that the location or number of the pigs or location of the pigsty has resulted in a nuisance being caused on any neighbouring property.

Note: The Stratford District Plan provides rules for the control of intensive pig farming.

10 **Poultry Keeping**

- 10.1 No person shall keep any poultry on any private land in an urban area except in a properly constructed poultry house or secure enclosure. Further, no person shall keep any poultry on any land unless they have the means to contain them within that property.

- 10.2 No person shall construct or maintain any poultry house, poultry run, aviary or pigeon coop within two metres of any adjoining property boundary or within 10m of any dwelling on any adjoining property.
- 10.3 No person shall keep more than 12 head of poultry in any poultry house or poultry run without the prior consent of an Authorised Officer, except in a Rural Zone.
- 10.4 No person may keep a rooster or cockerel in an urban area.
- 10.5 An Authorised Officer may order the relocation or removal of poultry or a poultry house, where:
 - (a) The Council has received a complaint about the location of the poultry or poultry house and;
 - (b) The Authorised Officer is satisfied that the location or number of the poultry or location of the poultry house has resulted in a nuisance being caused on any neighbouring property or;
 - (c) The Council has received a complaint regarding the number of poultry creating a nuisance and
 - (d) The person keeping the poultry fails to comply with any reasonable request of an Authorised Officer to abate or prevent the nuisance.

11 **Keeping of Cats and Kittens**

- 11.1 There is no limit to the number of cats permitted to be kept on any Premises provided the cats are sufficiently cared for and the keeping of such cats does not cause, or is likely to cause a health nuisance.
- 11.2 An Authorised Officer may impose a limit on the number of cats and kittens which may be kept on private land, where:
 - (a) The Council has received a complaint about the number of cats kept on the private land; and
 - (b) The Authorised Officer considers the number of cats is creating a nuisance or is likely to create a public health nuisance; and
 - (b) The person keeping those cats fails to comply with any reasonable request of an Authorised Officer to abate or prevent the nuisance.

12 **Beekeeping**

- 12.1 The Council recognises the benefit of bees to the community as a whole.
- 12.2 No person shall continue to keep bees in an urban area, if the keeping of such bees is, or is likely to become dangerous, injurious to health or a nuisance to any person.

- 12.3 An Authorised Officer may prescribe conditions limiting the number of hives kept and prescribe the location of such hives on private land.
- 12.4 An Authorised Officer may order the relocation or removal of a hive or hives, where:
- (a) The Council has received a complaint about the location of a hive or hives and;
 - (b) An Authorised Officer is satisfied that the location of the hive or hives has resulted in bees causing a nuisance on any property in the vicinity of the hives.
- 12.5 No person shall keep any bees on any road or road reserve that is under the control of the Stratford District Council without written approval from an Authorised Officer.
- 12.6 No person shall keep any bees, on, adjacent to, or in close proximity to any parks or reserves that is under the control of Stratford District Council without written approval from an Authorised Officer.

Please note – If you keep bees in New Zealand it is a legal requirement that you register your hive(s).

13 **Keeping of Livestock**

- 13.1 An Authorised Officer may impose a limit on the number of livestock which may be kept on private land, where:
- (a) The Council has received a complaint about the livestock being kept on the private land and;
 - (b) The keeping of livestock is creating a nuisance or is likely to create a nuisance; and
 - (c) The person keeping the livestock fails to comply with any reasonable request of an Authorised Officer to abate or prevent the nuisance.
- 13.2 The fencing or tethering of animals along any road reserve or on private land must be adequate to prevent all livestock from wandering into a public place, carriageway or neighbouring property.
- 13.3 All road gates to paddocks must be able to be securely closed to prevent all livestock from wandering.

14 **Slaughter of Animals**

- 14.1 No person shall slaughter an Animal or dismember, handle, process or dispose of the carcass or remains of an Animal, on any premises so as to cause or be likely to cause:
- (a) A Nuisance;

- (b) Be a threat to public health and safety; or
- (c) Be offensive.

15 **Leaving Dead Animals or Depositing Offensive Matter**

- 15.1 No person shall fail to dispose of in a proper manner or leave any dead animal, or animal remains, or offensive matter of any kind, in any public place.

APPENDIX C

