



Notice is given that a Submissions Hearing meeting will be held on:

Date: Monday 28 July 2014
Time: 10.00 am
Venue: Fire Station Rooms, Takaka
and

Date: Wednesday 30 July 2014
Time: 1.00 pm
Venue: Tasman Council Chamber
189 Queen Street, Richmond

Submissions Hearing

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

MEMBERSHIP

Cr S G Bryant
Cr P L Canton
Cr B W Ensor

Cr M J Higgins
Cr P F Sangster

(Quorum 2 members)

Contact Katie Greer
Telephone: 03 5438 455
Email: katie.greer@tasman.govt.nz
Website: www.tasman.govt.nz

3 REPORTS

3.1 DOG CONTROL BYLAW REVIEW 2014 - SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

Decision Required

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Report To: | Submissions Hearing |
| Meeting Date: | 28 July 2014 |
| Report Author: | Ross Connochie, Administration Officer - Regulatory |
| Report Number: | SH14-07-10 |
| File Reference: | B955 |

1 Summary

- 1.1 At its meeting on the 22 May 2014 Council approved the public consultation process for the Draft Tasman District Council Consolidated Bylaw - Chapter 2 Dog Control Bylaw 2014.
- 1.2 Report SH14-07-09 provided the Hearing Committee with copies of all the submissions received and an agenda for the submissions hearings in both Takaka and Richmond.
- 1.3 A summary of these submissions including staff comment and recommendations is included in Appendix 1.

2 Draft Resolution

That the Submissions Hearing Committee

1. receives this report REP14-07-10 (Dog Control Bylaw Review 2014 - Supplementary Report) and;
2. recommends that the Full Council adopts the Dog Control Bylaw subject to amendments as directed; and
3. instructs staff to prepare a report to Full Council detailing the agreed content of the reviewed Dog Control Bylaw.

3 Purpose of the Report

- 3.1 This report provides the committee with a summary of all submissions received including staff comment and recommendations. This is intended to assist the committee in its deliberations and final decisions regarding the content of the reviewed Dog Control Bylaw.

4 Background and Discussion

- 4.1 The hearing of submissions and analysis of them leads to direction to Council on the final content of the bylaw, and is the next stage of the Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) which must be undertaken during Bylaw reviews.

5 Policy / Legal Requirements / Plan

- 5.1 This review has been carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002.

6 Conclusion

- 6.1 Consideration of all submissions received is a critical part of the SCP and must be completed in order to successfully conclude the review.

7 Next Steps / Timeline

- 7.1 Following the second hearing on the 30 July 2014 the hearing panel will instruct staff as to the contents of the reviewed bylaw and recommend an amended bylaw to the Council for adoption.

8 Attachments

1. Summary of Submissions 5

| Title | First Name | Last Name | Organisation | hearing? | location | Clause | Agree | Your comments (Some comments have been inserted by staff from submissions in an abridged form) | Staff Comment | Councillor Comments |
|-------|------------|------------|-------------------------------|----------|----------|------------|-------|---|---|---------------------|
| Ms | Anne | Webb | | No | Richmond | Schedule 1 | No | The area comprising the walkway from Hill Street up Jimmy Lee Creek , over Grassy Saddle connecting to and down Wills Gully to Hill Street by Harts Road and the Bush area above the reservoir in Reservoir Creek be made a Dog Prohibited area. | Jimmy Lee Track 1: Staff believe that making the walkway from Hill Street up Jimmy Lee Creek , over Grassy Saddle connecting to and down Wills Gully to Hill Street by Harts Road and the Bush area above the reservoir in Reservoir Creek area a leash control area is unwarranted and will raise expectations of an increased level of enforcement in this area. There is no credible evidence that dogs are causing any more or any less nuisance or danger to wildlife than in any other area in the district. Recorded complaints to Council since Jan 2010 are: Dog Not on Leash 2, Dog wandering 14, Dog Attack dog 3. There is evidence that the native bird population in this area has increased despite the alleged negative impact of dogs . | |
| Ms | Carolyn | Weston | | No | Richmond | Schedule 1 | No | The area comprising the walkway from Hill Street up Jimmy Lee Creek , over Grassy Saddle connecting to and down Wills Gully to Hill Street by Harts Road and the Bush area above the reservoir in Reservoir Creek be made a Dog Prohibited area. | Jimmy Lee Track 1 | |
| Mr | Alastair | Mackintosh | Native Bird Recovery Richmond | Yes | Richmond | Schedule 1 | No | Review "Dog on leash" requirement for Jimmy Lee track | Jimmy Lee Track 1 | |
| Mrs | Shirley | Jackson | | No | Richmond | Schedule 1 | No | The area comprising the walkway from Hill Street up Jimmy Lee Creek , over Grassy Saddle connecting to and down Wills Gully to Hill Street by Harts Road and the Bush area above the reservoir in Reservoir Creek be made a Dog Prohibited area. | Jimmy Lee Track 1 | |
| Mr | Ricky | Dasler | | Yes | Richmond | Schedule 1 | No | The Richmond hills area including but not limited to; the walkway from Hill Street up Jimmy Lee Creek , over Grassy Saddle connecting to and down Wills Gully to Hill Street by Harts Road and the Bush area above the reservoir in Reservoir Creek be made a Dog Prohibited area. | Jimmy Lee Track 1 | |
| Ms | Sue | Byrne | | No | Richmond | Schedule 1 | No | The area comprising the walkway from Hill Street up Jimmy Lee Creek , over Grassy Saddle connecting to and down Wills Gully to Hill Street by Harts Road and the Bush area above the reservoir in Reservoir Creek be made a Dog Prohibited area. | Jimmy Lee Track 1 | |
| Mrs | Val | Sadd | | No | Richmond | Schedule 1 | No | The area comprising the walkway from Hill Street up Jimmy Lee Creek , over Grassy Saddle connecting to and down Wills Gully to Hill Street by Harts Road and the Bush area above the reservoir in Reservoir Creek be made a Dog Prohibited area. | Jimmy Lee Track 1 | |
| Mrs | L.M | Higgit | | No | Richmond | Schedule 1 | No | The area comprising the walkway from Hill Street up Jimmy Lee Creek , over Grassy Saddle connecting to and down Wills Gully to Hill Street by Harts Road and the Bush area above the reservoir in Reservoir Creek be made a Dog Prohibited area. | Jimmy Lee Track 1 | |
| Mr | Des | Henry | | Yes | Richmond | 1 | Yes | The area comprising the walkway from Hill Street up Jimmy Lee Creek , over Grassy Saddle connecting to and down Wills Gully to Hill Street by Harts Road and the Bush area above the reservoir in Reservoir Creek be made a Dog Leash Control Area. | Jimmy Lee Track 1 | |
| Mrs | Deborah | Webb | | No | Richmond | 1 | Yes | The area comprising the walkway from Hill Street up Jimmy Lee Creek , over Grassy Saddle connecting to and down Wills Gully to Hill Street by Harts Road and the Bush area above the reservoir in Reservoir Creek be made a Dog Leash Control Area. | Jimmy Lee Track 1 | |
| Mr | Robert | Reynolds | | No | Richmond | 1 | Yes | The area comprising the walkway from Hill Street up Jimmy Lee Creek , over Grassy Saddle connecting to and down Wills Gully to Hill Street by Harts Road and the Bush area above the reservoir in Reservoir Creek be made a Dog Prohibited area. | Jimmy Lee Track 1 | |
| Mrs | Pernilla | Soderqvist | | No | Richmond | 1 | Yes | Support Dog on leash requirement for Jimmy Lee Track | Jimmy Lee Track 1 | |
| Mr | Eric | Strachan | | Yes | Richmond | Policy | No | I submit that dogs should continue to be allowed off leash in the Richmond foothills including Jimmy Lee Creek. The current law that states that dogs must be under control in the presence of native wildlife is sufficient. The statement made by the Richmond Native Bird Recovery Group, that unfettered access by dogs is affecting the recovery of native birdlife is emotive drivel. Weka are the only vulnerable species and there are more around the Richmond foothills currently than at anytime in the past 25 years! Many TDC residents currently walk their dogs off lead in the Richmond foothills. Most of these dogs are trained to leave weka alone. The odd dog is undoubtedly a problem as evidenced by the very occasional dead weka seen in these areas. Weka have also been accidentally killed in the pest control traps. Overall the weka population has increased from former levels in recent years and the impact of the odd death attributable to dogs is not adversely affecting the stability of the weka population. I have walked these hills for 2-3 hours most days with my dog and have found 5 dead weka probably killed by dogs in the past 15 years. Dogs need areas to run off leash to exercise adequately and the Richmond foothills are currently valued by many TDC ratepayers for this reason. Weka populations have cycled over the years and the population is currently on an upward part of this cycle in the Tasman region. Trapping of pests has probably assisted the rapid increase in weka populations as of late. But it will decline again if past trends are repeated regardless of dogs or trapping. An educative approach where dog owners are asked to take responsibility for training or controlling their dogs is in my opinion the best approach. Then dog owners will exert pressure on other dog owners to do the right thing, i.e. train their dogs to avoid weka or keep uncontrolled weka keen dogs on a leash. A punitive and regulatory approach will be resisted by many because it is an illogical and unnecessary knee jerk approach to the emotive rants of a vocal minority who exaggerate the problem. | Jimmy Lee Track 2: Staff concur. There is no credible evidence that dogs are causing any more or any less nuisance or danger to wildlife than in any other area in the district. Recorded complaints to Council since Jan 2010 are: Dog Not on Leash 2, Dog wandering 14, Dog Attack dog 3. There is evidence that the native bird population in this area has increased despite the alleged negative impact of dogs . | |
| Ms | Heather | Pene | | No | Richmond | Policy | No | The proposed change to the bylaw regarding Schedule 1, dogs permitted on a leash in Jimmy Lee Creek and Walkway should NOT be put into effect in the 2014 bylaw. No change to the existing controlled dog exercise area is required, as defined in 5.1 of the draft policy, "every dog shall be kept under effective control in a controlled dog exercise area" and "effective control means that the person in charge of the dog is able to obtain an immediate and desired response from the dog by the use of a leash, voice commands, hand signals, whistles, or other effective means." I note that the report stated that "investigation by staff found no credible evidence that birdlife had been adversely affected by dogs and that the existing controls worked effectively." Therefore no change required to the existing dog control bylaw 2003!! Preserve Jimmy Lee Creek and walkway as a controlled dog exercise area for the enjoyment of walkers and dogs. Thank you | Jimmy Lee Track 2 | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------|--------------|-----------|------------------------------------|-----|----------|------------|-----|---|---|
| Mrs | Julianne | Romer | | No | Richmond | 4 | No | I live directly beside the Hart Road end of the Jimmy Lee Creek and walkway loop. Firstly I would like to say that the retired gentleman who look after this track do an amazing job and it is a pleasure to walk this track with your dog and they have done a fabulous job at getting bird life back into the area. I believe it is unnecessary to have your dog on a leash at all times, as we have walked our dog for 11 years around this large area, without any issues of endangering or disturbing birds or their nests. This area is enjoyed by many people with dogs and one of the few places that you can let your dog walk near you, without being on a leash. Also my main reason for submitting this is I believe that dogs have not done damage to the bird population, it is cats, who hunt birds and climb trees. While it is admirable for these gentleman to trap rodents, dogs don't climb trees. I think one or two of these gentleman may be too obsessive with dogs not on leashes and berate anyone who hasn't got their dog on a lead. I think we need a real balance for this area and it's all about enjoying it, whilst protecting the bird life as well. It would be a unnecessary restriction to forbid dogs not on a leash and I do wonder where they have got their belief that dogs are affecting the bird life in this area. | Jimmy Lee Track 2 |
| Mr | Geoffrey (T) | Rayward | | No | Richmond | Schedule 1 | No | Oppose dog on leash proposal Jimmy Lee Creek | Jimmy Lee Track 2 |
| Mr | Colin | Mann | | Yes | Richmond | Schedule 1 | Yes | Support Dog on leash requirement for Jimmy Lee Track See attached | Jimmy Lee Track 1 |
| Mrs | Mary Ann | Mann | Protect our Disabled Safety (PODS) | Yes | Richmond | 1 | Yes | Support Dog on leash requirement for Jimmy Lee Track See attached | Jimmy Lee Track 1 |
| Mr | Niel | Page | Native Bird Recovery Richmond | Yes | Richmond | Schedule 1 | Yes | Support Dog on leash requirement for Jimmy Lee Track See attached | Jimmy Lee Track 1 |
| Mr | Gavin | Malcolm | | No | Richmond | Schedule 1 | No | Oppose leash control area on Jimmy Lee Track. See attached | Jimmy Lee Track 2 |
| Mr | Brian | Hurst | | Yes | Richmond | Schedule 1 | No | Oppose leash control area on Jimmy Lee Track. See attached | Jimmy Lee Track 2 |
| Mrs | Sue | Lindsay | | Yes | Richmond | Schedule 1 | No | Oppose dog on leash proposal Jimmy Lee Creek | Jimmy Lee Track 2 |
| Mrs | Mary Ann | Mann | | Yes | Richmond | Schedule 1 | Yes | Support Dog on leash requirement for Jimmy Lee Track See attached | Jimmy Lee Track 1 |
| Ms | Leanne | Schmidt | | No | Richmond | Schedule 1 | No | Oppose dog on leash proposal Jimmy Lee Creek | Jimmy Lee Track 2 |
| Ms | Leanne | Schmidt | | No | Richmond | Schedule 3 | No | Remove dog prohibited areas, Collingwood Camping Ground, Takaka CBD, Takaka Township, Ugar bay Beach, Onekaka Estuary, Pakawau Beach, Pohara Beach and Holiday park, Rototai to Waitapu estuary foreshore, Murchison motor camp, Kateriteri and Little Kateriteri Beach, rabbit island. | Not Supported bans in place for negating nuisance to public and wildlife |
| Mr | Greg | Sheppard | | No | Richmond | Schedule 1 | No | Oppose dog on leash proposal Jimmy Lee Creek | Jimmy Lee Track 2 |
| Mr | Greg | Sheppard | | No | Richmond | Schedule 3 | No | Consider making Rabbit Island west of conifer park a dog controlled area | Not supported. Adjacent Rough Island is a designated dog control area. Rabbit island is a popular area for runners, family groups and other members of the general public it also forms part of the Great Taste Tasman Trail. Nelson Airport has raised concerns regarding bird disturbance by dogs on the shell bank at the eastern end of Bells and Rabbit Islands. |
| Ms | Karina | Rasmussen | | No | Richmond | Schedule 1 | No | Dogs to be on leash at all times when off owners property | Not supported consider this too broad a restriction |
| Mrs | Mona | Randall | | Yes | Takaka | 3 | No | Complete 24 hour ban on dogs in Commercial Street from Riley street to Willow Street South of the Fresh Choice supermarket | Takaka 1: Staff consider the GB-CB proposal to be a reasonable compromise. |
| Miss | Pamela | Nelson | | No | Takaka | 1 | No | As a dog and business owner in the CBD, I firmly oppose this dog by law, why can't we be like the rest of nz, and our district with dog bowls outside cafes, why does Takaka have to be so up tight about a dog, we are responsible dog owners, those who are irresponsible fine them! Even the dog control officers who only come over once a month think this dog ban is ridiculous and would like to see it changed too, as they waste a lot of time, telling people to not walk their dog to the shop! Having my business in town, I see many tourists with their beautiful well behaved dog on a lead with poo bag attached wondering thru town, its normal where their from, I luv seeing it too. And now you want to extend the ban to the super market, can these townys with dogs go any where? Geez you tie your dog outside the super market, what is the problem, can't they take them for a walk to get some groceries!? Absurd, would love to have this bylaw reviewed so our dogs can go for a walk! | Takaka 1 |
| Miss | Pamela | Nelson | | Yes | Takaka | 1 | No | Hi ya this is my 2nd submission I just want to present it in person at the hearing as I feel very passionate about this and have done for a very long time. I know we started the petition a few years ago and actually went around all the businesses in town and 80% of them were fine about dogs in town. To be honest their really won't be much of a difference as every tourist brings their dog in any way, very well behaved dogs too. I think you should try it for a summer and see how it goes, I really don't think dogs should sit in hot cars waiting for owners to shop and eat, and nor do the owners. Fine those who are irresponsible which is pretty much ferals who don't have dogs on leads and don't register them and let them poo where ever its them that have ruined it for us responsible dog owners. I love taking my dog with me to work and will continue to do so, the only complaints I have had in 5 years is from those who work at the council. | Takaka 1 |
| Mr | Scott | Mieras | | No | Takaka | 1 | No | I propose that the existing ban on dogs in Commercial Street Takaka be lifted entirely for well behaved dogs and fines be issued to the owners of any disruptive dogs. | Takaka 1 |
| Mrs | Nancy | Hayes | | No | Takaka | Schedule 3 | Yes | I would like to support the proposed changes to Schedule 3: Proposed Change: The area covered by the dog ban in Takaka is proposed to be increased as shown in Schedule 3 of the proposed bylaw on Page 29. Access will be permitted for dog owners to these areas outside of normal business hours i.e. 9am - 5pm on weekdays. (I do not wish to speak to my submission. In the boxes above there needs to be a "N/A" option for those who do not wish to speak.) | Takaka 1 |
| Ms | Karen | Brookes | | Yes | Takaka | Policy | No | The limiting of dogs from the CBD of Takaka as proposed by the Golden Bay Community Board is well thought out, apart from the permitting of dog through the CBD after shop hours, for the reasons presently to follow The Board proposal for shop operating hours gives opportunity for Dog owners to take their pooches around the outskirts of Takaka township by using Riley and Junction Streets and by crossing by the chemist shop to Motupipi Street without the necessity of bringing them through the town in order to continue on around in a circuit I think the present bylaw prohibiting dogs from the CBD at all times should continue. Although our CBD is small, it has a number of grassy areas which are used on fine days and on nights for events attended by adults and children alike, for sitting on the grass to eat and socialise. The population values this pleasant and informal option. Because our CBD is small it wouldn't take many dogs to make this present social practice unhygienic. Although some dog turds may be removable, not all are and no one can tell where a dog has weed. Not everyone likes dogs and some people are scared by them. If you asked a dog if it would rather go down Riley Street to the river for a walk or go shopping I should think the river would win out every time. In addition it has been brought to my attention that there has been a noticeable increase in the number of dogs being exercised without a leash on beaches where dogs have been banned because of the resulting disturbance to nesting or resting birds. | Takaka 1 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|--------|---|-----|---|---|
| Ms | Charlotte | Squire | | No | Takaka | 1 | Yes | <p>While I appreciate that some compromise is being made and dog owners may soon be able to walk their dogs through the CBD after hours, I feel a low level of irritation at the lack of areas we could take them as is proposed here.</p> <p>As the population of dog owners increases in Golden Bay, I would like to know, where are we allowed to take our dogs?</p> <p>I think it's unwise to extend the no-dog zone to include the information centre car park as many dog owners are forced to retreat to that area, once they discover they can't take their dogs into town. Many visitors don't realise there are other carparks in the CBD.</p> <p>I would also like to know what recognition is being accorded to the many dog owners in Golden Bay, as valuable members of the community? We all contribute in various ways, and research suggests that our canine friends do to. Yet to me it feels as if I'm nearly committing a crime in owning a dog.</p> <p>Looking through this map of dog prohibited areas is a rather depressing experience, as it's all about where we can't take our dogs. I would like to see a map of Golden Bay with green areas highlighted, because it appears that we're hardly allowed to take them anywhere.</p> <p>Given that the culture of dog management in urban areas is becoming more liberal world-wide, I think it's unrealistic to expand dog prohibited areas and not expect a lash back from tourists who have taken their dogs to Golden Bay.</p> <p>After all, we are the top of the South Island and we rely on 'sunshine hours'. I've met many tourists in Takaka who are shocked that they shouldn't be walking their precious dogs, who are members of their family, through the CBD.</p> <p>I've met business owners who are making dog friendly policies to compensate because Golden Bay is becoming a very un-dog friendly place. I think this negative approach to dogs is an antiquated, unintelligent move in the long term.</p> <p>I think it's actually time to get creative about ways to cater for dog owners and dog loving tourists in Golden Bay. There's an opportunity for you to turn this into a positive experience by saying - we have created several dog friendly parks, zones and beaches for you! Here</p> | Takaka 1 |
| Mrs | Selena | Serra | | No | Takaka | 1 | No | <p>times have changed a lot of people have dogs and what is the harm of them walking thru town on a lead, if the owner is responsible and there are a lot of responsible dog owners, I don't see the harm, dogs are FAMILY pets, we like to take our family every where, why should they have to sit in a hot car. I thought Takaka was forward thinking, this bylaw seems very old school.</p> | |
| Mr | Joshua | Hawkins | Joshua Tree | No | Takaka | 1 | No | <p>I believe there is no harm in dog owners walking their dogs in and around town. It causes no harm to the public and only adds to the nice environment and culture that we have here.</p> <p>It doesn't make sense that people are unable to venture through town on their dog walk to do simple things like pickup the paper or grab a coffee. Businesses in the area are missing out as both local and tourist customers unnecessarily avoid town for this reason.</p> <p>The law seems dated as so many families have dogs these days and really they are our best friends so why would we not allow them in town?</p> <p>Looking forward to seeing a change in this law that actually suits the people in our community and fits in with our values.</p> | Takaka 1 |
| Mrs | Susanne | Toder | | No | Takaka | 1 | No | <p>According to the survey that was done by a group of dog supporters about 2 years ago, 80% of the shop owners in the Takaka CBD do not object dogs on the streets, even though they are supposed to be the reason for the ban.</p> <p>I think dogs should not be banned but owners taken responsible for their dogs. Dogs should be kept on leashes and their "doors" disposed off. This seems to be working nearly everywhere, why not in Takaka.</p> | Takaka 1 |
| Mrs | Lynne | Etheredge | | No | Takaka | 1 | Yes | <p>I believe dogs should continue to be excluded from the business area in Takaka.</p> <p>I feel this bylaw is a compromise for dog owners as long as the dogs are on a lead and the owners clean up any mess.</p> | Takaka 1 |
| Mrs | Fleur | Murray | | No | Takaka | 1 | Yes | <p>In summary please extend the dogs prohibited area of the Takaka central business area to include Saturdays and the library and supermarket car parks.</p> | Takaka 1 (Supermarket car parks are outside of Council control) |
| Ms | Helen | Mead | | Yes | Takaka | 1 | No | <p>In 2011 I was involved in the survey conducted in Takaka which showed a clear preference for dogs to be permitted in Commercial St on a lead. I find the proposal by council unsatisfactory and the wishes expressed by respondents ought to be given more weight.</p> <p>Some of my reasons are as follows:</p> <p>It is possible for dog owners to behave in a considerate and responsible manner when it comes to the care of dogs and the wider public and property, and such owners ought not be penalised based on an assumption that dogs in town will constitute a problem.</p> <p>Many visitors to Golden Bay travel with their dogs and the prohibition in Takaka is inconsistent with controls in other towns creating confusion, frustration and an unwillingness to return.</p> <p>Ratepayers time and money would be better spent on more crucial matters, especially that of the Dog Control Officers.</p> <p>Such a by-law ought to be based on experience rather than opinion, and to look to the experience of towns such as Motueka, Collingwood, Tapawera and Murchison where there is no prohibition, would be more enlightened.</p> <p>Lastly, I have heard people speak of the 'unique' nature of Golden Bay, and much as I love the place, I suggest all of Tasm an to be pretty 'unique' and special, and believe in the possibility of a harmonious existence which includes me and my dog (as well as other well behaved creatures).</p> <p>Thank you Helen Mead</p> | Takaka 1 |
| Mrs | Joy | Warren | private | No | Takaka | 1 | No | <p>sorry I don't know which clause I am speaking on.</p> <p>I think the extension of the area that I am allowed to have my dog on a leash in Takaka is unfair, if I return from Richmond [where I am allowed to go anywhere with my dog on a leash] and wish to let my dog out of the car to give her a drink, as I want to do some shopping I am unable to do so.</p> <p>my daughter travelled from Wellington with her children, bought some food to give them lunch and was told off for letting the dog out of the car a rule she was unaware of and there was no signs visible. I think if these rules apply there should be signs everywhere advising of the barbaric rule which only applies in Takaka.</p> | Takaka 1 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------|---------|------------|----------------------------|-----|----------|------------|-----|--|--|
| Mr | Mik | Symons | | No | Takaka | 1 | No | In general I support the bylaw however I would like the Takaka CBD to remain dog free. Whilst the intention to allow dog owners to walk their dogs through the CBD after business hours is good I don't believe that it will be used just for dog exercising, but will be seen by some as a "licence" to hang out in town with their dogs, especially on the Village green and out side the Takeaway/Dangerous Kitchen/ Wholemeal cafe area. This is a narrow bit of footpath with outdoor seating and is very busy after business hours especially in the summer. I support dog owners being able to walk dogs on leads around the block via Rilly St and Junction St but keep them out of the centre of town. | Takaka 1 |
| Mr | John | J McLellan | | No | Takaka | Schedule 3 | Yes | I support the dog prohibited area in the Takaka township from 9am -5pm as described in the Proposed Dog Bylaw but would like this to be extended to include Sat and Sun 9am-5pm, as this would cover all business hours and the market, and avoid confusion over whether a business may be open or not. | Takaka 1 |
| Mr | Barry | Cashman | private person | Yes | Takaka | 3 | Yes | I agree with most parts of the proposed change to the area of Takaka township. I believe that the 9am time should be earlier say 7-30 very few dogs are walked through the C & D after this by regulars. It does not appear that the old library site or the playground are included these in my opinion should be. With the changes should come more policing during the hours of business, as I work in town I often see dogs large and small in town owned by local people who must be aware of the rules but flout them. I am also concerned and stated this some time ago that staff outside of Golden Bay should not be over influential in their opinion as has been the case on some previous occasions This is a G.B. matter that affects local business. | Takaka 1 |
| Miss | Sarah | Crowther | | No | Takaka | 1 | No | This is a ridiculous clause. Dog owners are so restricted already where they can take their dogs. Most owners would have a dog well under control near a busy road like commercial street on a lead to keep them safe from traffic, and also are responsible for any clean up required. Its hard in Takaka in the summer leaving your dog in the car while you do a few chores, its hot and uncomfortable for them. Most dogs don't even like to use toilets where its concrete and would wait for appropriate places to go to the toilet. Please let our gorgeous pets be integrated into the heart of the town too- so many of us dog owners already feel discriminated against by the restrictions imposed on us. Thanks Sarah | Takaka 1 |
| Mrs | Wendy | W McLellan | | No | Takaka | Schedule 3 | No | Complete ban on dogs in Takaka CBD | Takaka 1 |
| Mrs | Carolyn | McLellan | Golden Bay Community Board | Yes | Takaka | Schedule 3 | Yes | Support partial (3-5) ban on dogs in Takaka CBD | Takaka 1 |
| Mrs | Carolyn | McLellan | Golden Bay Community Board | Yes | Takaka | Schedule 3 | Yes | Include protection of wildlife in Dog Control Policy | Whereas one of the objectives of the Dog control Act(DCA) is to impose obligations on owners of dogs to ensure that dogs do not injure, endanger, or cause distress to protected wildlife the DCA is silent in regards to territorial authorities including any reference to wildlife in their Dog Policy. |
| Mrs | Carolyn | McLellan | Golden Bay Community Board | Yes | Takaka | Schedule 3 | Yes | Introduce a "Responsible Dog Owner" category for dog registration | Unless there was a radical change to the dog registration pricing structure the administrative burden of operating such a scheme would not be financially viable. |
| Mrs | Carolyn | McLellan | Golden Bay Community Board | Yes | Takaka | Schedule 3 | Yes | Raise dog registration to more effectively monitor breaches of dog control policy | Council would need to reconsider what is an appropriate level of enforcement in regards to dog control. Current dog control services in Golden Bay include: Richmond based Animal Control Officers (ACO) who respond to dog incidents and issues within a given time frame, a local on call ACO who deals with stock and dogs wandering/at large which are reported to be of an aggressive nature, a full time local ACO for a 6 to 8 week period mid Dec to mid Feb each year. In 2013 there were 76 dog related service request raised for Golden Bay (excluding doglost/dog found). |
| Mrs | Jenna | Bowden | | No | Takaka | Schedule 3 | No | I am a dog owner, I would love to walk my dog when I do the "block walk" from kindergarten at the bottom of town around through the main street after dropping the kids off in the morning. It's a routine that currently he does not get to enjoy with me. I don't have the ability to do it early in the morning before business opens or after business hours which your proposed bylaw states, as I have 4 young children and a husband who works 50+ hours a week. As a responsible dog owner I would have him on his leash and have a few doggie doo bags at the ready if any accidents occur, as I do on other favoured walks. Most towns allow dog owners this access and it has not caused problems. We are just asking to extend us the same privileges as the other towns in our district and around our country already have. | Takaka 1 |
| Mr | Leigh | Gamby | | Yes | Takaka | Schedule 3 | No | Complete dog ban in Takaka township | Takaka 1 |
| Ms | Chris | Watson | N/A | No | Takaka | Policy | No | I disagree with the policy of dogs being prohibited in Commercial Street, Takaka. I disagree with the proposal for the extension of the dog prohibited zone in Takaka to include Motopipi street. Considering Takaka is the only Tasman township prohibiting dogs I wonder who is the driving force behind the latest proposal for Takaka. I am astounded and very disappointed. I know that the most recent petition put forward to the Council was signed by 380 persons and 80% of these persons disagreed with the ban of dogs in Commercial Street, so where is the democracy? Yours Sincerely Chris Watson | Takaka 1 |
| Mrs | S.J | Bensemam | | No | Richmond | Policy | Yes | I feel strongly that the dog ban in Takaka CBD is too restrictive and not good for Our Tourism Industry. This area should be a leash control area at all times. People with dogs on a leash will also have doggy doo bags with them. I have encountered 3 separate cases of Tourists over summer who had just arrived in town and had their dogs on a leash for a breather after coming over the Takaka Hill. They had instantly been targeted by people telling them this was a dog ban area and to leave immediately. Not a good introduction into Our Tourist driven economy. The rest of the world is becoming More dog friendly (My sisters dog in London has His own passport and travels with them on Public transport to and from Europe) We need to go forwards with policy not backwards. Many people like to walk around Our 45m in 'block' (Commercial st-Mehana st-Motupipi st) This is impossible with the existing ban I personally think this is an archaic policy and needs updating. Thanks Sue | Takaka 1 |
| Ms | Erma | Trethewey | | No | Takaka | 1 | No | I don't agree with the plan to extend the area in Takaka central that prohibits dogs. | Takaka 1 |

7/07/2014 16:00

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-----------|---------|------------|----------|------------|-----|--|--|-----------------|
| Ms | Iona | Jeff | | Yes | Takaka | Schedule 3 | No | To ban dogs in Takaka's CBD is very controversial. I understand that some dog owners have allowed and will allow their dogs to pee on or foul the street without cleaning up. The effective way to deal with this is not to penalise responsible dog owners by forbidding them to have their dogs in town on a leash; it is to penalise the irresponsible dog owners (you mention this in a previous point of the draft bylaw). I'm sure that there are responsible dog owners who would be keen to take on the responsibility of policing this. I spoke with many tourists with their dogs on leads on Commercial Street this summer, and their response to me telling them that this new bylaw was on the horizon, was consistently, "Well we wouldn't come to Takaka (Golden Bay) if we couldn't bring our dog with us". On a hot summer day and with the lack of shaded parking available in Takaka, being out of a vehicle on a lead is by far the most humane option for dogs. If council does decide to have restrictions on dogs in the CBD then it needs to exclude the i-site, Motupipi and Library car parks. There are plenty of bushes around all of those car parks where dogs can get temporary relief from the intense heat of a vehicle on a hot summer's day and relieve themselves. Again, the vast majority of dog owners are responsible about where their dogs pee and about removing faeces. I'm sure there would be dog owners motivated to police this if it meant that their dog was allowed in the CBD. My son's dog is elderly now; he has less heat tolerance and needs to pee more frequently. When my son is in | Takaka 1 | 7/07/2014 16:24 |
| Mr | Rory | Jeff | | No | Richmond | Schedule 3 | No | My dog is old and needs to pee a lot. He can't handle the heat either. I need to be able to let him out of the car when I'm in town. | Takaka 1 | 7/07/2014 16:29 |
| Mr | Graeme | Wells | | not stated | Takaka | Schedule 3 | No | Oppose dog prohibited area in Takaka | Takaka 1 | |
| Mr | Graeme | Wells | | not stated | Takaka | Schedule 4 | | Include missing Pohara mags Sched 2&3 | Noted | |
| Mrs | Nancy | Wakelin | | No | Takaka | Schedule 3 | No | Oppose dog prohibited area in Takaka | Takaka 1 | |
| Mrs | Jenny | Habberd | | No | Takaka | Schedule 3 | Yes | Agree with Takaka dog ban proposal | Takaka 1 | |
| Mrs | Katie | Lavers | | No | Takaka | | 2 | No As a dog owner I know there are already very few places where dogs can run free. There is no-where I can walk my dog around Takaka in the summer, so I don't go there. Not just the CBD, also the beaches, Paynes Ford etc. are no go dog areas. I would say it would be good on balance if you looked at the angle from the dogs perspective also. Is there a place nearby where they can be let off the leash? I am very concerned about the Richmond clause, it seems very unfair on the dogs because you are being brow-beaten by the bird-lovers. I have chosen to live in the West of Golden Bay because I am able to walk my dog in Milnthorpe and on Collingwood Beach. I shall become militant if there are any proposals to change this! Please think of the dogs rights to exercise. Big dogs especially need to run for at least half an hour twice a day. It is ones who are cooped up and not walked that creates frustrated, angry dogs. Richmond is a built up area and I am sure there are a lot of dogs there who need walking. What are their options? There are more bird advocates than dog advocates. I don't think they are getting a fair trial! | Jimmy Lee Track 2 | |
| Dr | Helen | Kingston | | Yes | Takaka | Schedule 3 | Yes | Re Tata Beach and Ligar Bay - I fully agree with the current bylaw as shown on the maps and accompanying text. For Tata Beach in particular, total ban for daylight saving time and the specific timing of the ban during the months when there is no daylight saving protects the spotted shags. These birds breed and roost on the Tata Islands and elsewhere nearby, and which assemble on the beach at dawn. They stay for about an hour, until after sunrise. Their numbers fluctuate from season to season and from year to year. Numbers have declined somewhat in recent years but appear to be building up again, so their protection now is crucial. | No Comment | |
| Dr | Helen | Kingston | | Yes | Takaka | Schedule 1 | Yes | Re Ligar Bay Inlet (estuary) and adjacent sandspit. I believe that this inlet should have a 'dogs on leash' policy for the whole year. The reason is that the inlet is a breeding habitat and foraging area for banded rail and variable oyster catcher, and there have been fernbird sightings around the edges. Little blue penguins breed near the sandspit and rocks on the other side. The Dec 2011 floods and their sequelae caused a great deal of extra silting of the inlet bed, and it has taken time for the natural life there (which the birds need for food) to recover. I have seen banded rail in the past two years, including chicks. Banded rail footprints have been in evidence also. More recently the eucalypts on the road reserve opposite 1204 Abel Tasman Drive where I live have been appropriately felled as they were becoming a hazard and some had fallen in the Easter gales. However this has caused further exposure of the banded rail habitat meaning less undergrowth where they can escape. At least one pair of variable oystercatchers inhabit the inlet and adjacent sandspit. They attempt to breed but this is seldom successful. There is a dog ban on the sandspit during summer months. I submit that dogs should be on a leash on the sandspit during the rest of the year, and also leashed on the rocky area on the other side of the inlet (where the boats are moored). Little blue penguins inhabit that | No Comment | |
| Dr | Helen | Kingston | | Yes | Takaka | Schedule 2 | Yes | Re Pohara Beach I believe that the area marked between Pohara Valley Road and the eastern end of the Pohara Camp as a dog control area should become a Schedule 1 (dogs on leash) area, when the Eastern bar-tailed godwits are present between September and March. These amazing birds have flown non-stop from Alaska and need to feed, to moult and to rest. There is now a population which frequents Pohara Beach during these months. Dogs, not on a leash, even when 'under control', disturb the birds by their presence. | Area is designated dog prohibited | |
| Mrs | Jo-Anne | Vaughan | | Yes | Takaka | Schedule 3 | No | Review Bylaw with a focus on wildlife protection see attached | considered too broad and restrictive to be reasonable | |
| Mr | David | Riley | private | No | Takaka | | 1 | Yes NB - Pakawau Beach, from Totara Avenue to Pakawau Hill especially Tamatea Point - all dogs to be leashed at all times when in this locality. | considered too broad and restrictive | |
| Mr | Niel | Murray | | No | Takaka | | 1 | Yes I'm looking at the dog policy for Tasman. It doesn't have clauses 1-12 so I will comment on what I am looking at. Objectives: 1-4 I generally agree with all these objectives especially those that refer to the safety of the public and children from dogs, but I also support dog owners having reasonable access to public places. As a general opinion though many dog owners have an unrealistic idea that their lovely animals cause no distress to non dog owners and their idea of suitable control is often miles off what is appropriate. For this reason I would like to comment specifically on the dog control areas in the Takaka CBD (Schedule 3). I support the proposal to ban dogs during weekly business hours while still allowing dog owners to walk their dogs outside of this time. I also support the playgrounds being no go areas at all times. However I don't think this proposal goes quite far enough in not including weekends in the 9-5 limits. The other area where I think the policy is a little short is the library car park. As this is the most common social area in a weekend - especially market weekends, and is immediately adjacent to the playgrounds I believe there will be far too much of a blurred line between what is permitted and what is not. This area I also think should have a full time ban on dogs so that the general public and especially children should not have to encounter dogs in this area. | Takaka 1 | |
| Mr | John | JMcLellan | | No | Takaka | Schedule 3 | Yes | I submit that Parapara beach should be added to the Dog Prohibited areas in Schedule 3 as it is the only populated beach not on the list of prohibited areas. This is probably the reason why there is a proliferation of dogs in the summer months. | No indication that dogs are an issue on this beach only 1 complaint received (from CM) in last 4 years regarding dogs on this beach. | |
| Mr | Trevor | Polglase | | Yes | Takaka | Schedule 3 | Yes | Clause 6. 6.1 Rototai to Waitapu Estuary The dog prohibited area is directly adjacent to the dog exercise area. There is no signage or map to show the different areas. Visitors and many locals have no idea where the prohibited area is. We live adjacent to the prohibited area and have to continually tell people with dogs that they are not allowed to be there. This area is so important as a bird feeding, roosting and nesting area. | Noted signage will be updated post review | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|----------------|---|-----|----------|------------|-----|---|--|
| Mr | Trevor | Polglase | | Yes | Takaka | Schedule 2 | Yes | I have no objection to this exercise except it needs clarifying. The area is directly adjacent to a dog prohibited area but there are no signs or maps at the areas to identify the prohibited and exercise areas. We live directly adjacent to the prohibited area and continually have to tell people they are not allowed to be there. Dog exercise areas with no signage are hopeless as far as visitors and some locals are concerned. | Noted signage will be updated post review |
| Dr | Donald | Mead | Friends of Golden Bay (Inc) | Yes | Takaka | 6 | No | All eight sites of national or international importance and offshore sand bars be dog prohibited areas. (Westhaven Inlet, Farewell spit, Pakawau, Collingwood, Rototai, Motueka Sand Spit West Waimea Inlet East Waimea Inlet) All dogs to be leashed in the presence of shore birds. | Total ban considered too broad and restrictive |
| Ms | Gaya | Seider | | Yes | Takaka | 1 | No | Dogs are part of a wider and integrated community and should be considered as part of a holistic norm. Community members consist of people who love these animals eg cats, horses and dogs and have them as companions and see them as members of their wider..... | No Comment |
| Dr | Helen | English & Kemp | | No | Takaka | Schedule 3 | No | Pohara Beach from the sign at the western end of the golf course to the mouth of the Motupipi Estuary: Dogs should not be banned but kept on a leash. Pohara Beach: From Selwyn St car park to West end of golf course must remain a dog exercise area, even in the summer months. Pohara Beach Top 10: Dogs should only be banned in the summer months (1st Dec - 1st Mar) Tata Beach: Dogs should only be banned during the summer months (1st Dec- 1st March). They should be allowed on the beach during the winter months since there is hardly anyone about during this period (a lot of the houses are empty). A ban is ridiculous. | No comment |
| Mr | Lionel | Soily | Department of Conservation | No | Richmond | 1 | Yes | See attached | Generally in accord with Administrative amendments these will be considered. Bell Island shell bank concur due to airport bird strike hazard. Onahau estuary need to be convinced of dog nuisance. Pakawau and Taupata point not feasible to ban for periods stated DOC better off erecting signage. |
| Mr | Mike | Geraghty | | No | Takaka | Schedule 3 | No | Extend dog prohibited area Parapara Inlet to end of Bishop Road / Miles reserve | No comment |
| Mrs | Celia | Butler | | No | Takaka | 4 | Yes | Dogs under leash control on beaches with shore birds | No comment |
| Mr | | Kennedy | Forest & Bird | Yes | Takaka | 1 | Yes | All eight sites of national or international importance and offshore sand bars be dog prohibited areas. (Westhaven Inlet, Farewell spit, Pakawau, Collingwood, Rototai, Motueka Sand Spit West Waimea Inlet East Waimea Inlet) All dogs to be leashed in the presence of shore birds. | Total ban considered too broad and restrictive |
| Mr | Ricky | Cosslett | | No | Takaka | Schedule 3 | No | All eight sites of national or international importance be dog prohibited areas. Westhaven Inlet, Farewell spit, Pakawau, Collingwood, Rototai, Motueka Sand Spit West Waimea Inlet East Waimea Inlet | Total ban considered too broad and restrictive |
| Ms | Heather | Wallace | | No | Takaka | Schedule 3 | No | All eight sites of national or international importance be dog prohibited areas. Westhaven Inlet, Farewell spit, Pakawau, Collingwood, Rototai, Motueka Sand Spit West Waimea Inlet East Waimea Inlet | Total ban considered too broad and restrictive |
| Mrs | Helen | Campbell | Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay | Yes | Richmond | Schedule 3 | No | All eight sites of national or international importance be dog prohibited areas. Westhaven Inlet, Farewell spit, Pakawau, Collingwood, Rototai, Motueka Sand Spit West Waimea Inlet East Waimea Inlet. | Total ban considered too broad and restrictive |
| Mr | Lawson | Davey | Fish & Game | Yes | Richmond | Schedule 3 | | Reinstate dog prohibited areas hunting dogs allowed while engaged on legitimate hunting activities during recognised hunting season. | Concur, the exemption for hunting dogs engaged in legitimate hunting activities during the recognised hunting season in dog prohibited areas was omitted in error from schedule 3. |
| Mr | Lawson | Davey | | Yes | Richmond | | | Rabbit Island agree dogs prohibited eastern end and beach area, question need for ban on dogs throughout the rest of the island | Not supported. Adjacent Rough Island is a designated dog control area. Rabbit Island is a popular area for runners, family groups and other members of the general public it also forms part of the Great Taste Tasman Trail. Nelson Airport has raised concerns regarding bird disturbance by dogs on the shell bank at the eastern end of Bell Island and Rabbit Island. |
| Mr | Lawson | Davey | | Yes | Richmond | | | Great taste Trail question the need to ban dogs from the trail at Riwaka Reserve. | Disagree. The Great taste trail at this point was constructed within the Riwaka Reserve, this area being a dog prohibited area. |
| Mr | Lawson | Davey | | Yes | Richmond | | | Patons Rock beach extend dogs control area to include access way via public reserve at western end of dog prohibited area | Concur |
| Mr | Martyn | Fisher | | No | Richmond | Schedule 3 | No | Oppose dog prohibited area in Takaka information centre- Top Town dairy car park | Takaka 1 |
| Mr | Martyn | Fisher | | No | Richmond | | | Rabbit Island oppose dog prohibited area extend for the whole island beach area | Not supported. Adjacent Rough Island is a designated dog control area. Rabbit Island is a popular area for runners, family groups and other members of the general public it also forms part of the Great Taste Tasman Trail. Nelson Airport has raised concerns regarding bird disturbance by dogs on the shell bank at the eastern end of Bell Island and Rabbit Island. |
| Mr | Martyn | Fisher | | No | Richmond | | | Consideration of Cat Control Bylaw | Outside of Bylaw review |
| Mrs | Kaye | McNabb | Nelson Airport | No | Richmond | Schedule 3 | Yes | Bird strike on aircraft hazard. Agree on Sand Island being dog prohibited. Support continued ban of dogs on Rabbit Island and motueka Sandpit. | Concur plus shell bar eastern end of Bell Island |
| Mr | David | Melville | The Ornithological Society of New Zealand | Yes | Richmond | Policy | No | See attached, include ref to protection to wildlife wildlife sect 2,3&4 | Whereas one of the objectives of the Dog control Act(DCA) is to impose on owners of dogs obligations designed to ensure that dogs do not injure, endanger, or cause distress to protected wildlife the DCA is silent in regards to territorial authorities including any reference to wildlife in their Dog Policy. |
| Mr | David | Melville | | Yes | Richmond | Schedule 3 | | Encourage Wet sand walking on Pakawau, Collingwood, and northern end of Motueka Sand Spit | Worthy of consideration in conjunction with DOC |
| Mr | David | Melville | | Yes | Richmond | Schedule 3 | | Support retention of current dog ban areas | Concur |