

Online Further Submission

Further Submitters Name Stephanie Lane

Further Submitter Number FS88

Wish to be heard Yes

FS qualifier a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest (e.g. community group)

FS qualifier reason I represent the group of people in our community who share their lives (or would like to) with companion animals.

Joint presentation No

Attention: No one

Contact organisation

Address for service [REDACTED]

Telephone

Mobile [REDACTED]

Email stephanie.lane.nz@outlook.com

Online further submitter? Yes

Date raw FS lodged 04/09/2023 2:47pm

FS88

FS88.001-.088

Further submission points

Raw FS number	Original submitter	Related Submission Point	Plan section	Provision	OS Decision Requested	SupportOppose	FS Decision requested	Reasons
FS88.1	Heather Golley	S254.002	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	SUB-R3	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map – Support Document'.	Support	Allow	The submitter is correct. The human cost from all this banning, let alone the cost to dogs and cats, is too high. The full information is not available and leaves too much that can be slipped in surreptitiously.

FS88.2	Kapiro Conservation Trust	S444.001	Planning maps	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Amend the Rural Lifestyle zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (known as Tubbs farm) to either the Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone.	Support	Allow	It's very important for the food security of NZ that we don't waste good productive ground on residential properties.
FS88.3	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	S529.034	Rural production	RPROZ-S1	<p>Retain PDP rules/standards that specify crop protection structures and support structures must be set back at least 3m from all site boundaries, and amend PDP to provide additional specific rules/standards, as follows –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In locations where crop protection structures, cloth/fabric fences or agricultural support structures more than 1.5m high are erected near boundaries that adjoin a road, public land or residential property: those structures must not exceed 5m height and must be setback at least 3m from the boundary; suitable trees or tall hedging or vegetation must be planted between the structure and boundary to provide a landscaping screen and maintain visual amenity; netting or any other fabric must be black or very dark colour. • Breach of rules/standards relating to CPS and support structures must be a 'non-complying' activity (not discretionary, not restricted discretionary), and the local community must be given an opportunity to object if they wish. 	Support	Allow	Agree these large covers should be disguised from view of the public, and particularly from any homes existing that look out on to these structures, at least if homes were in existence before the covers erected.

FS88.4	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	S529.040	General	General / Process	Amend resource consent system to have a two-queue system, comprising one queue for applications for small simple minor works by the general public, and a separate queue for other larger or more complex applications.	Support	Allow	
FS88.5	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	S148.022	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-R4	Delete the requirement for a landowner to obtain an ecologist's report proving an area is not an SNA, or in the alternative establish a process whereby Council fully funds such reports when associated with primary production activity.	Support	Allow in part	
FS88.6	Northland Regional Council	S359.011	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Insert provisions signalling that high intensity development will not be enabled unless serviced by a supply network or adequate on-site storage is provided to cater for extended dry spells/droughts	Support	Allow	
FS88.7	The BOI Watchdogs	S354.008	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Instruct FNDC management to support dog owners who are tenants by encouraging the Northland Regional Council to remove advice on their website, or on any other documents, that landlords should not allow pets on tenancy agreements.	Support	Allow	It's so important for people to be allowed to have their animals with them. They offer friendship, security and love. Tenants deserve to benefit from animals as much as anyone and shouldn't be disadvantaged by arbitrary disallowing of pets in rental accomodation. In general, pets cause less damage than children and drug addicts. Most people with animals in their family would be happy to pay an extra "animal bond" to protect landlords. I certainly would!
FS88.8	Haigh Workman Limited	S215.054	Rural production	RPROZ-R2	Amend RPROZ-R2 impermeable surfaces permitted activity thresholds from 15% to 5% of the site area	Support in part	Allow in part	Agree that 15% too much. 5% may be overly restrictive.
FS88.9	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	S338.041	General	General / Process	Amend resource consent system to have a two-queue system, comprising one queue for applications for small simple minor works by the general public, and a	Support	Allow	

separate queue for other larger or more complex applications.

FS88.10	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	S338.033	Transport	Policies	Amend policies to address adverse effects of traffic on those in the neighbourhood and, where relevant, the wider community.	Support	Allow	
FS88.11	Kate Burdekin	S507.001	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend wording so that pets and pests are not used in the same breath. Rather than an overall ban on dogs, put covenants in place allowing ownership of companion animals under certain conditions – fenced garden, animals to be kept inside at night (this also ensures their safety), no dogs to be chained and must be adequately cared for, and encourage dog owners to get involved in protecting kiwis. Maybe a campaign with positive ideas how dogs and kiwi can live side by side.	Support	Allow	Agree 100%. Animal lovers are more likely to care for kiwi and more likely to have dogs. Let's work together to protect kiwi and not exacerbate the extreme unwanted dog (and cat) population and poor mental health by making people give up their family members to overcrowded pounds and rescues.
FS88.12	Heather Golley	S254.003	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-O2	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map – Support Document'.	Support	Allow	
FS88.13	Heather Golley	S254.004	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P7	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi	Support	Allow	

					Distribution Map – Support Document’.		
FS88.14	Heather Golley	S254.001	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The ‘Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna’, and the ‘Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map – Support Document’.	Support	Allow
FS88.15	Heather Golley	S254.005	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P10	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The ‘Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna’, and the ‘Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map – Support Document’.	Support	Allow
FS88.16	Heather Golley	S254.002	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	SUB-R3	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The ‘Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna’, and the ‘Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map – Support Document’.	Support	Allow
FS88.17	Heather Golley	S254.006	APP3 - Subdivision	Management Plan	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog	Support	Allow

			management plan criteria	Subdivision	ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map – Support Document'.		
FS88.18	Angela Caroline Morley	S469.001	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Amend Plan to give effect to relief sought in the 'Bay of Islands Watchdog' submission (354).	Support	Allow in part
FS88.19	Jillian Jane Kearney	S343.001	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Delete any objective, policy or rule that limits dog ownership in the district, and also dog ownership on land within Significant Natural Areas (inferred)	Support	Allow
FS88.20	Jillian Jane Kearney	S343.002	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Accept the decisions requested in the Bay of Islands Watch dog submission - 354 (inferred)	Support	Allow
FS88.21	Shirley Grant Murray	S460.001	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Supports recommended decisions in the 'Bay of Islands Watchdog' submission (354).	Support	Allow
FS88.22	Karen B Wilkinson	S566.001	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Amend PDP to address relief sought in the 'Bay of Islands Watchdog' submission (354).	Support	Allow

FS88.23	Danielle Hookway	S309.008	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend IB-P9 so that it does not infer a blanket banning of pets in the Far North (inferred).	Support in part	Allow in part	Completely agree blanket bans are inappropriate and there are better options for keeping kiwi safe from dogs. A reduced registration fee for making efforts to do so is a good idea. I'm not sure about kiwi aversion training - I don't know enough about it's successfulness or humaness. I would, however, be willing to put my dog through it to keep kiwi safe and keep my dog.
FS88.24	Allen Hookway	S311.008	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend IB-P9 so that it does not infer a blanket banning of pets in the Far North (inferred).	Support in part	Allow in part	Same reasons as for submission 309.008
FS88.25	Lianne Kennedy	S310.008	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend IB-P9 so that it does not infer a blanket banning of pets in the Far North (inferred).	Support in part	Allow in part	Same reasons as for submission 309.008
FS88.26	Clare Williams	S457.001	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Delete any objective, policy or rule that limits dog ownership in the district, and also dog ownership on land within Significant Natural Areas (inferred)	Support	Allow	
FS88.27	Leah Frieling	S358.039	General approach	Approach to Integrated Management	Amend the provisions protecting significant natural areas to provide: - incentives for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - support and resources for landowners. The option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just the Reserves Act and QEII covenants. Make the significant natural areas mapping available publicly, as a resource, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Support in part	Allow in part	

FS88.28	Leah Frieling	S358.042	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	<p>Amend Policy IB-P9 as follows:</p> <p>Require Assist landowners to manage pets and pest species, including dogs, cats, possums, rats and mustelids, to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species, including avoiding the introduction of pets and pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas.</p> <p>OR if the word 'require' is retained, enforce this with DOC or help facilitate community groups (or perhaps a District wide organisation) to easily set up trapping programmes on DOC land.</p>	Support in part	Allow in part	<p>Agree to the change of "require" to "assist"</p> <p>Submit that "pets and" be removed from the following sentence. "...including avoiding the introduction of pets and pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas."</p>
FS88.29	Sean Frieling	S357.039	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	<p>Delete the word 'require' from this rule and insert the word 'assist'</p> <p>OR if the word 'require' is retained, enforce this with DOC or help facilitate community groups (or perhaps a District wide organisation) to easily set up trapping programmes on DOC land.</p>	Support	Allow	<p>Agree DOC must take better care of their land. I have Queen's Chain along one side of my property and it is the source of all the gorse, tobacco weed, taiwanese cherry, wild ginger, and likely mice and rats. I cannot barely keep up with control on my property due to DOC/Council land continuously re-instating pest species onto my property.</p>
FS88.30	Sean Frieling	S357.039	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	<p>Delete the word 'require' from this rule and insert the word 'assist'</p> <p>OR if the word 'require' is retained, enforce this with DOC or help facilitate community groups (or perhaps a District wide organisation) to easily set up trapping programmes on DOC land.</p>	Support	Allow	
FS88.31	Heather Golley	S254.003	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-O2	<p>Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note</p>	Support	Allow	

for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map – Support Document'.

FS88.32	Heather Golley	S254.004	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P7	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map – Support Document'.	Support	Allow
FS88.33	Heather Golley	S254.001	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map – Support Document'.	Support	Allow
FS88.34	Heather Golley	S254.005	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P10	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map – Support Document'.	Support	Allow

FS88.35	Heather Golley	S254.002	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	SUB-R3	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map – Support Document'.	Support	Allow	
FS88.36	Heather Golley	S254.006	APP3 - Subdivision management plan criteria	Management Plan Subdivision	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map – Support Document'.	Support	Allow	
FS88.37	Amber Hookway	S261.008	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Delete Policy (inferred). Stop the blanket banning of pets in the Far North. Every week people are trying to rehome their animals as they cannot get rentals with them.	Support in part	Allow in part	Same reason as for 309.008
FS88.38	Wilson Hookway	S264.008	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Delete Policy (inferred). Stop the blanket banning of pets in the Far North. Every week people are trying to rehome their animals as they cannot get rentals with them	Support in part	Allow in part	Same as for 309.008
FS88.39	Leonie Exel and Arthur Prentice	S466.001	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Delete any objective, policy or rule that limits dog ownership in the district, and also dog ownership on land within Significant Natural Areas (inferred)	Support	Allow	

FS88.40	Kate Burdekin	S507.001	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend wording so that pets and pests are not used in the same breath. Rather than an overall ban on dogs, put covenants in place allowing ownership of companion animals under certain conditions – fenced garden, animals to be kept inside at night (this also ensures their safety), no dogs to be chained and must be adequately cared for, and encourage dog owners to get involved in protecting kiwis. Maybe a campaign with positive ideas how dogs and kiwi can live side by side.	Support	Allow in part
---------	---------------	----------	---	-------	---	---------	---------------

1. Agree that it is difficult for ordinary people to match the long technical responses from the professional submission writers employed by entities such as DOC, Forest & Bird, Kiwis for Kiwis etc. Submit: That this is taken into account during consideration and decision making.

2. Variety of socio-economic groups. "Rather than the council concentrating on creating rules for controlling where the well looked after dogs can or can't live and walk... the council put its energy into helping improve the life of the neglected dogs in our community." Submit: I don't know how this affects the DP but makes a lot of sense. Submitter's "few ideas" are excellent. Submit that council consider putting some into action.

3. "A well run pound is required as a matter of urgency. One where animal welfare is paramount....People no longer leave their dogs in the garden when they go out for fear of their dog being stolen." Submit: The pound is still not being run humanely, even after all these years. This needs to be addressed urgently. I concur with not leaving dogs in the yard when I go out. I have a large lockable kennel with run but I never use it anymore. I crate my dogs inside to keep them safe when I'm away from home.

4. FNDC encouraging people to take out conservation covenants, meaning no companion animals can be kept, in return for reduced rates. Submit: This stops immediately. It is sneaky tactics. It is giving people financial incentive to accept and aid the anti-dog agenda. Agree with reduced rates for

environmental protection efforts, but not when it bans companion animals.

Agree with reasonable measures required to protect kiwi while allowing our companion animals to live and visit there.

5. "Personally know people who have chosen to avoid Northland due to its dog unfriendliness."

These people will be the law abiding, productive members of society, and would be of great value to Northland but we lose them due to animal bans.

Submit: Allow - "rather than an overall ban, put covenants in place allowing ownership of companion animals under certain conditions.

Submit: This be taken into strong consideration while deciding on dog bans.

6." What controls are in place in the Council to ensure that a long term plan is for the good of the whole community rather than a small group's view?"

Submit: That this information be made public and easily accessible, as there seems to be a strong push for blanket pet banning that does not take into account the welfare of our own people.

7. "The council needs to work on accessing more walking tracks where dogs, and people, can get out for long walks. Rolands Wood is amazing but this is looked after by a Trust not the Council. The track between Opuia & Paihia is a perfect example of how well it can work.

There are numerous DOC tracks that would be perfect dog walking tracks. There are many areas in New Zealand where DOC allow access to dogs – just seems in the too hard basket for the Far North DOC department. Can

FS88.41	Marianna Fenn	S542.001	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-O2	Amend by replacing with indigenous biodiversity is managed to maintain its extent and diversity in a way that provides for the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities. The extent and diversity of indigenous biodiversity across the district is maintained, protected, and where possible enhanced	Oppose	Disallow	the Council liaise with DOC to identify tracks that could be opened up for dog walkers?" Ignored for far too long. I strongly support conservation efforts but the impact on the people affected and kiwi should be considered and a win-win solution found. More people should be able to access and enjoy our natural places. They belong to us all. People who enjoy nature are far more likely to care about nature, and therefore contribute to its protection. When they don't know it exists, or don't understand it, or haven't experienced it, they will not value it.
FS88.42	Marianna Fenn	S542.002	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	Objectives	Insert new objective Landowners, land occupiers, and kaitiaki/guardians are encouraged and supported to protect and enhance the biodiversity values of the land they have an interest in.	Support	Allow	8. "Dog tourism - BOI cafes that welcome dogs on a Sunday morning – they are packed" Submit: Support in part. I don't know that dog tourism is necessarily right for Northland, but I do know that simply allowing and welcoming dogs will increase our tourism (and therefore revenue), so I submit we make Northland accessible to dog tourism even if we don't aim for it specifically. Remember, people who bring their dogs on holiday with them love and care for their dogs. They don't just let them run wild to kill kiwi.
FS88.43	Marianna Fenn	S542.003	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	Objectives	Insert new objective The ecosystem services provided by areas of indigenous biodiversity are recognized and enhanced. These services include increased resilience to the effects of climate change, maintaining fresh water quality, and enabling resilient food production systems.	Support	Allow in part	Good signage and education on how to behave with dogs in kiwi areas would work for these people.
FS88.44	Marianna Fenn	S542.004	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	Policies	Add new policy Identify areas of significant indigenous biodiversity that are particularly vulnerable and/or likely to change in their location and extent due to the effects of climate change and, where appropriate, establish buffer zones to ensure that these areas are able to move and persist	Support	Allow in part	9. Kiwi conservation "There seems to be a misconception that you can either be a conservationist or a dog owner, but not both. This is so wrong. Many dog owners care for all animals / birds and love nature. If you look at the statistics, there are very few kiwi deaths by dogs yet dogs are portrayed as the main killer of kiwis. There are so many kiwi deaths by being run over but little is being done to reduce traffic speed or warn drivers in high kiwi population areas. The Council themselves are a major
FS88.45	Marianna Fenn	S542.005	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P1	Amend to reflect district wide mapping and rules applicable to SNAs. If SNAs based solely on the presence of regenerating manuka / kanuka are included, these areas should be separately identified and	Support	Allow in part	

clearly distinguished from other SNAs. These manuka / kanuka SNAs could also be subject to a separate, slightly more permissive, rule regime. A large percentage of our property at 903B Kohumaru Rd is identified as SNA and, subject to the boundaries of those SNA areas being refined, I support that designation

disruption of the kiwi population by allowing big subdivisions to happen, thus clearing the habitat where the kiwi's live. The oxymoron being that the houses on that subdivision will then have a no dog clause in order to protect the kiwis!"

Submit: 100% agree. I am a dog owner and a conservationist, and always have been.

As said in this submission, there is no actual reason dogs are being targeted while the other causes of kiwi deaths ignored. This smacks of one-sided lobbying and lazy council politics.

It is wrong to make bans that negatively affect half of the people living here while ignoring the other issues around kiwi conservation.

10. "Encourage dog owners to join rat & stoat trapping programs – currently put off as dogs are demonised as being a pest. The council needs to look at its own attitude to encourage this change in mind set. The wording in the Long Term Plan refers to pets and pests in the same breath. Maybe a campaign with positive ideas how dogs & kiwi can live side by side."

Submit: Collaboration would be so much more effective than division. Dog walkers could easily help out with trapping programs while exercising their dogs. Using pets and pests in the same breath contributes to the abhorrent attitude to animals rife in Northland. We have a shocking animal welfare crisis in Northland and council should be trying to resolve this, not contribute to it.

FS88.46	Marianna Fenn	S542.009	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P7	Amend to include reference to potential incentives that could be provided	Support in part	Disallow in part	<p>I agree with rates relief and other incentives to encourage landowners to control weeds and some pests on their land.</p> <p>I do NOT support paying people to kill or ban our pets on their properties.</p> <p>Kill traps should not be used on any animal who could be a family member. This applies mostly in relation to cats. You cannot tell if a cat is "owned", stray or feral while it is in a trap. There must be a law that states all need to be checked by a vet (or someone else qualified who is not involved in pest control) and scanned for a microchip before he/she is killed.</p> <p>Research has shown that trap, neuter and released colony cats keep feral cats from moving into that space. Killing them creates a vacuum that will be filled by feral cats (the same as possum removal does). Better that these cats are let to live and keep sentinel in these spaces. They are fed and not reproducing, and therefore less likely to cause problems than feral cats.</p> <p>I've been horrified at the attitude of some people in Northland who think it is ok to kill people's loved family members. I've not come across this attitude before, and it makes me fearful for my cats.</p> <p>I don't support people gaining financial benefit through rates relief for banning and killing pets, who in my opinion are essential to the mental health of so many people, including myself, and who deserve far better in their own right.</p>
---------	---------------	----------	--	-------	---	-----------------	------------------	--

FS88.47	Marianna Fenn	S542.011	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	<p>Amend to require management and (where appropriate) limits on the numbers of domestic pets and livestock for landowners and land occupiers; and</p> <p>Amend to clarify that further limits and pest and weed control will be considered when possible and appropriate</p>	Oppose	Disallow	<p>Strongly disagree.</p> <p>The Dog Control Act 1999 is the means to control troublesome dogs, not the District Plan or the RMA. The numbers of dogs on a property is irrelevant. It is how they are managed by their "owners" that creates either a nuisance or not. The authorities (FNDC Animal Management, SPCA, MPI, and police) have the power to manage nuisance animals of any species. Avoiding this task by simply banning animals is lazy and very unfair to law abiding, animal loving people, and to the animals themselves.</p> <p>There is no need to punish people (and animals) by disallowing them to love and care for as many animals as they are willing to.</p>
FS88.48	Pacific Eco-Logic	S451.011	General	General / Process	<p>Insert a package of non-regulatory methods to promote and assist landowners to protect significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna. This could include</p> <p>1. Rate relief/ postponement for areas under permanent/ long-term protection</p> <p>2. Grants for plant and animal pest control, fencing and wetland restoration</p>	Support in part	Allow in part	<p>1. Do not support rates relief when bans of companion animals are placed on properties. Support rates relief for other (reasonable and effective) means of protecting ecologically important spaces on private property.</p> <p>2. Support, provided pets are not included in the category of "pests".</p>

FS88.49	Pacific Eco-Logic	S451.005	Subdivision	Policies	<p>Insert policies that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarify that significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, (including the balance lot) are to be protected as part of a subdivision 2. Require cat and/or dog-free subdivision in areas of particular importance for vulnerable indigenous wildlife (e.g., kiwi, matuku, shorebirds) 3. Require sewage and stormwater management to prevent nutrients and sediment from reaching natural waterways, including natural wetlands 4. Identify priorities where riparian fencing and planting should be a condition of subdivision 	Support in part	Allow in part	<p>1. Do not support banning of companion animals in these properties.</p> <p>2. Strongly do NOT agree. This encroaches on our human rights to share our own homes with who we want on our own property. We paid for the property and we pay rates yearly on those properties. We should have the right to live there with our families (including our animals). There is the Animal Management Act to deal with breaches.</p> <p>If this extends to shorelines as, the amount of properties available to families with pets will be even more significantly reduced. Already over 53,000 hectares is designated as where kiwi are present.</p> <p>Council are over-regulating responsible animal guardians and under-regulating irresponsible ones. It's time to address the core issues (lack of desexing of companion animals, wandering dogs, insufficient feeding of dogs, animal abuse, etc) which will decrease a lot of dogs and cats causing problems without impinging responsible peoples rights.</p> <p>Companion animals and kiwi can co-exist with appropriate measures taken.</p> <p>4. Support</p>
---------	-------------------	----------	-------------	----------	---	-----------------	---------------	--

FS88.50	Pacific Eco-Logic	S451.006	Subdivision	SUB-P11	<p>Insert the following to the list of matters to be considered when Council assesses land use and subdivision consent applications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The quality and extent of the indigenous ecosystems and elements present 2. The potential impact of the proposed activity on the biodiversity values of the native vegetation present on, and in the vicinity of, the property 3. The type and extent of legal and practical protection being provided to protect indigenous ecosystems and elements 4. The type and scale of ecological restoration and protective management being proposed (e.g., pest control) 5. The potential hazards posed by the construction and ongoing new activities on at-risk wildlife 6. Controls on pet ownership to protect at-risk wildlife 	Support	Allow in part	<p>6. Controls on pet ownership to protect at risk wildlife</p> <p>Support - BUT: This should not include banning or limiting numbers of companion animals.</p> <p>Fencing, training and other means that do not impinge on our right to live with our animals can produce the result of wildlife protection.</p>
FS88.51	Pacific Eco-Logic	S451.007	Subdivision	Rules	<p>Insert additional rules for subdivisions, other than environmental benefit lots, to address the protection of indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna.</p> <p>These rules should include</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (including the balance lot) as part of a subdivision 2. The requirement for cat and/or dog-free subdivision in areas of particular importance for vulnerable indigenous wildlife (e.g., kiwi, matuku, shorebirds) 	Support in part	Disallow in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support 2. Strongly oppose

FS88.52	Pacific Eco-Logic	S451.015	Coastal environment	CE-P10	<p>Insert the following to the list of matters to be considered when Council assesses land use and subdivision consent applications:</p> <p>7. The quality and extent of the indigenous ecosystems and elements present</p> <p>8. The potential impact of the proposed activity on the natural character values of the native vegetation present on, and in the vicinity of, the property</p> <p>9. The type and extent of legal and practical protection being provided to protect indigenous ecosystems and elements</p> <p>10. The type and scale of ecological restoration and protective management being proposed (e.g., pest control)</p> <p>11. The potential hazards posed by the construction and ongoing new activities on at-risk wildlife</p> <p>12. Controls on pet ownership to protect at-risk wildlife</p> <p>13. The level of anthropogenic sound that is likely during construction and with the ongoing new activities</p> <p>14. The level of anthropogenic night lighting proposed and its potential effect on indigenous species.</p> <p>15. The impact of the proposed development on the experiences of low-impact recreationists using public lands (including unformed legal roads) and the coastal marine area.</p> <p>16. The impacts of construction and long-term vehicle use on natural character</p>	Support in part	Disallow in part	<p>11. Support</p> <p>12. Oppose - for the same reasons as my other submissions.</p>
---------	-------------------	----------	---------------------	--------	---	-----------------	------------------	--

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

FS88.53	Pacific Eco-Logic	S451.026	Planning maps	Natural Open Space Zone	Amend the zoning for ecological restoration projects in areas such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pipiroa wetland on the Russell Peninsula,• Wairoro Park QE11 covenant on the Russell Peninsula,• Tangatapu wetlands and hillside FNDC covenant at the start of the walkway to Whangamumu from 717 Rawhiti Road	Oppose	Disallow	I don't have time to look through this extensively, however the Russell peninsular has been subject to dog bans through stealth (covenant/subdivision) and I'm worried. Such significant banning should be done in the open, via public consultation. This sneaky method will mean the bans happen without the people's knowledge and suddenly the locals will find they can no longer live in their own area. I absolutely do not want my rates to go towards banning companion animals through rates relief, especially when it happens via quiet, underhanded methods. I do not support dog/cat banning.
---------	-------------------	----------	---------------	-------------------------	---	--------	----------	--

FS88.54	Russell Landcare Trust	S276.001	General	General / Process	Not stated	Support	Allow in part
---------	------------------------	----------	---------	-------------------	------------	---------	---------------

100% agree. It took me hours to understand and get familiar with the process. Most people won't take that time and therefore their voices can't be heard.

I'm sure this huge document took years of full time work to create and we're given a mere 12 weeks to respond? I know I've missed important things and have only been able to address some issues that are of importance to me. I've had to take a day off work to work on this and that costs me my income.

I don't know what is in the practice notes and fear they contain yet more negative plans for our companion animals ... but I don't know and therefore can't respond.

This is a conversation I've been having with someone just now regarding trying to make a submission. She's had to go out now, having tried and failed to have her voice heard:

Her:these submissions confuse me. I want to support ... and have registered FNDC submissions but cant find the part you click on 😞 when I search the submission number it just gives me the whole content.....

Me: They confused the heck out of us too until we'd spent a few hours on it.

Are you in the summary area or the original submissions?

You need to be in the summary list, search, and then click the Make A Submission box at the right of each clause.

Her: I have no idea where I am 🤔 this is a screenshot am I even close (Screenshot of Original Submissions)

FS88.55	Russell Landcare Trust	S276.013	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	Policies	Insert policy to ban cats and dogs from 'new subdivisions' in high density kiwi areas (as per the Council's practice note) and from other areas with threatened species where cats and/or dogs are a significant threat (e.g. some shore bird areas).	Oppose	Disallow	I oppose banning of cats and dogs. There are better ways to protect kiwi without impinging on rate payers' and landowners' rights, and those of renters.
FS88.56	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	S511.054	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-O2	Amend IB-O2 The extent and diversity of Indigenous biodiversity across the district is managed to maintained its extent and diversity in a way that provides for the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities.	Oppose	Disallow	I do not support the deletion of "social well-being". It is the people who pay for the protection of SNAs and wild-life (via rates, taxes, rents, resource consent fees?). Surely we should be considered when making decisions that affect us. I'm personally am about to be an empty-nester. My children are all grown and leaving. My only company and security will be my animals. Depriving me of them would cause me huge distress. Banning them (and therefore me) is cruel and unnecessary. If it happens, I will leave Northland before I give up my family. I contribute to Northland: I obey the law I pick up rubbish from the side of the road I cut down noxious weeds (coming from the Queen's chain beside me) I pay rates and fuel tax I do voluntary work - for both people and animals I spend my money locally I plant native plants and grow flowers for the bees I'm pretty sure I do a lot more good for Northland than my dogs do harm. Why ban us?

FS88.57	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	S511.062	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P6	Amend IB-P6 to reflect introduction of district wide mapping and rules for SNAs in addition to non-regulatory methods. Amend to include reference to consideration of nature based solutions to mitigating the effects of climate change e.g wetlands and afforestation to mitigate drought and flood effects. Amend to include potential for a reduction or waiver of rates where there is good pest and weed control in place or where maintenance/enhancement of indigenous biodiversity will provide significant ecosystem services e.g. wetland establishment to mitigate flood risk to the wider area.	Support in part	Allow in part	Agree in principle. Do not agree to a waiver of rates, only a reduction. Do not agree to banning of companion animals or rate relief to those who do. Support protection of areas which provide significant ecosystem services, especially around mitigating flood risk which is clearly an increasing risk.
FS88.58	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	S511.064	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend to clarify that restrictions on pet ownership and pest/weed control will be considered as conditions of consent for subdivision and development	Oppose	Disallow	
FS88.59	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	S364.002	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Insert SNAs in the plan using the report prepared for Council titled "Significant Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats of the Far North District - Volume 1" prepared by Wildlands Consultants (Contract Report No. 4899d, December 2019) to include SNAs in the Proposed District Plan.	Oppose	Disallow	How can we submit on a report that we've never seen or heard of?

FS88.60	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	S364.006	Planning maps	General / Miscellaneous	Insert overlays that identify locations of 'kiwi present' or 'high-density kiwi areas', with a mechanism for updating these maps.	Support in part	Allow in part	<p>We need accurate data on the presence of our indigenous species, so I support this.</p> <p>However, there needs to be integrity and transparency as to how this data is collected. We all know that statistics can be manipulated to paint whatever picture is wanted.</p> <p>A few years ago, at the instigation of DOC, "High Density Kiwi" was reduced from 7 to 5 calls per night. "Kiwi Absent" became called "Data Deficient". It's pretty clear these changes were made to twist data to further push an agenda. The changes made by DOC are always tend towards their own goals at the cost of other parties.</p>
---------	--	----------	---------------	-------------------------	---	-----------------	---------------	--

FS88.61	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	S364.007	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Insert framework into the District Plan to promote pet-free subdivisions in high-density kiwi areas.	Oppose	Disallow	<p>OPPOSE! OPPOSE! OPPOSE!</p> <p>Enough already. Dogs are not the problem here. Subdivision is.</p> <p>If kiwi are so important, why are we allowing subdivision in high-density kiwi areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reducing their habitat - Cutting through kiwi corridors - Increasing the number of cars (which kill more kiwi than dogs or cats) - Adding lighting that affects wildlife - Human and construction noise pollution that affects wildlife <p>If you care about kiwi, stop destroying their habitat.</p> <p>And stop hiding behind banning companion animals!</p> <p>(It's not the well cared for and managed dogs that are usually the culprits of dog-related kiwi deaths anyway. Addressing wandering dogs and population management in areas known for stray and neglected dogs would be far more effective than arbitrarily banning dogs and cats.)</p>
FS88.62	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	S364.041	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P6	<p>Amend Policy IB-P6 as follows:</p> <p>Require landowners to manage pets and pest species, including dogs, cats, possums, rats and mustelids, to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species At Risk or Threatened indigenous fauna, including avoiding the introduction of pets and pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas.</p>	Support in part	Allow in part	<p>Support the change in wording to "fauna".</p> <p>Submit: Remove "and pets" from the following sentence and add "wild" to read: "including avoiding the introduction of wild pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas."</p>

FS88.63	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	S364.041	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P6	Amend Policy IB-P6 as follows: Require landowners to manage pets and pest species, including dogs, cats, possums, rats and mustelids, to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species At Risk or Threatened indigenous fauna , including avoiding the introduction of pets and pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas.	Oppose	Disallow	Highly productive land IS of national importance. It is essential for New Zealand's food security.
FS88.64	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	S523.019	Public access	Objectives	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Support in part	Allow in part	Please ensure these areas can also be used by people with dogs. A "dogs on leash" rule would be sufficient to keep fauna and flora safe.
FS88.65	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	S523.020	Public access	Policies	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Support in part	Allow in part	Please ensure these areas can also be used by people with dogs. A "dogs on leash" rule would be sufficient to keep fauna and flora safe.
FS88.66	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	S523.021	Subdivision	SUB-O4	Amend SUB-O4 (inferred) relating to esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Support in part	Allow in part	Please ensure these areas can also be used by people with dogs. A "dogs on leash" rule would be sufficient to keep fauna and flora safe.
FS88.67	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	S523.022	Subdivision	SUB-P1	Amend SUB-P1 (inferred) relating to esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Support in part	Allow in part	Please ensure these areas can also be used by people with dogs. A "dogs on leash" rule would be sufficient to keep fauna and flora safe.

FS88.68	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	S523.023	Subdivision	SUB-P7	Amend SUB-P7 (inferred) relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Support in part	Allow in part	Please ensure these areas can also be used by people with dogs. A "dogs on leash" rule would be sufficient to keep fauna and flora safe.
FS88.69	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	S523.024	Subdivision	SUB-S8	Amend SUB-S8 (inferred) relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Support in part	Allow in part	Please ensure these areas can also be used by people with dogs. A "dogs on leash" rule would be sufficient to keep fauna and flora safe.
FS88.70	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	S524.022	Subdivision	SUB-O4	Amend SUB-O4. Subdivision is accessible, connected, and integrated with the surrounding environment including providing for: A. future connectivity for pedestrians, cyclist B. new, and connection to existing, public open spaces; C. esplanade where land adjoins the coastal marine area; and D. esplanade where land adjoins other qualifying waterbodies	Support in part	Allow in part	Ensure pedestrians walking dogs are able to use these connecting walkways. (ie Don't ban dogs from using the walkways)
FS88.71	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	S524.036	Mixed use	MUZ-P5	Amend MUZ-P5 (MUZ-P8 inferred) Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a. consistency with the scale, density, design, amenity and character of the surrounding mixed use environment, and with the urban design guidelines;	Support in part	Allow in part	Submit: Allow for dogs and their people to enjoy good urban design.

b. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, outdoor storage areas, parking and internal roading;

c. at zone interfaces:

i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts;

ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zones;

d. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; including:

i. opportunities for low impact design principles;

ii. management of three waters infrastructure and trade waste;

e. managing natural hazards;

f. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;

g. alignment with any strategic or spatial document;

h. provisions made to ensure connectivity;

i. any adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes or indigenous biodiversity, and

j. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.

FS88.72	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	S524.024	Natural open space	Rules	Amend rules to enable tracks for cycling and walking	Support in part	Allow in part	Ensure dog walkers are able to enjoy these walkways too.
---------	---	----------	-----------------------	-------	---	-----------------	---------------	---

FS88.73	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	S527.009	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Amend the PDP to actively protect areas where kiwi or indigenous species classed as threatened or at risk (under NZ Threat Classification System) are present. For example, landowners should be required to contact DOC for a trained detection dog or other investigation, and agree with DOC a clear plan to protect vulnerable species, before any vegetation clearance starts. Where appropriate, clearance should be staggered over time, so that indigenous species are able to move to shelter. Insert an appendix to the PDP to include, or refer to, a protocol that sets out guiding principles and procedures.	Support	Allow	
FS88.74	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	S527.014	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Insert a provision similar to Policy 12.2.4.10 of the Operative DP but with the aim of protecting not just kiwi, dotterel and brown teal, but also other indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk (under NZTCS) and vulnerable to predation.	Support in part	Allow in part	All threatened species should be protected. This should include good dog management, not bans.
FS88.75	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	S527.037	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Amend the PDP to take on board the changes proposed in the Forest & Bird submission.	Oppose	Allow in part	As per my submissions on Forest & Birds submissions.
FS88.76	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	S148.017	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend IB-P9 to read "Support landowners to manage pets and pest species, including dogs, cats, possums, rats and mustelids, to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species," Or words of like effect.	Support in part	Allow in part	Support, but submit that distinction between pets and pests be made, and ensure no bans on companion animals are involved.

FS88.77	Scrumptious Fruit Trust	S568.002	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P2	amend IB-P2 to gave an express requirement that any domestic, non indigenous animal, is generally not permitted, and if permitted , rules and by laws will promote strict direct controls - eg if dogs permitted in some foreshore areas must be on a leash	Oppose	Allow in part	Agree pet animals should be managed to avoid risk to wildlife. Disagree on banning dogs or other pet animals. Where shorebirds are nesting, a dogs-on-leads rule should be made, but only during nesting season. There is no need to ban our family pets, only to keep them from causing damage.
FS88.78	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	S529.101	Mixed use	MUZ-P5	<p>Amend MUZ-P5 (MUZ-P8 inferred)</p> <p>Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application:</p> <p>a. consistency with the scale, density, design, amenity and character of the surrounding mixed use environment, and with the urban design guidelines;</p> <p>b. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, outdoor storage areas, parking and internal roading;</p> <p>c. at zone interfaces:</p> <p>i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts;</p> <p>ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zones;</p> <p>d. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; including:</p> <p>i. opportunities for low impact design principles;</p> <p>ii. management of three waters infrastructure and trade waste;</p>	Support in part	Allow in part	Do this without dog bans

e. managing natural hazards;

f. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;

g. alignment with any strategic or spatial document;

h. provisions made to ensure connectivity;

i. any adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes or indigenous biodiversity, and

j. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.

FS88.79	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	S529.102	Light industrial	LIZ-P6	Amend LIZ-P6	Support in part	Allow in part	Do this without banning dogs.
					Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application:			
					a. consistency with the scale, density, design and character of the light industrial environment and purpose of the zone;			
					b. alignment with any strategic or spatial document;			
					c. provisions made to ensure connectivity;			
					d. the location, scale and design of buildings or structures, outdoor storage areas, parking and internal roading;			
					e. for non-industrial activities:			
					i. scale and compatibility with industrial activities;			

ii. potential reverse sensitivity effects on industrial activities.

f. at zone interfaces:

i. any setbacks, fencing, screening or landscaping required to address potential conflicts;

ii. any adverse effects on the character and amenity of adjacent zones.

g. the adequacy and capacity of available or programmed development infrastructure to accommodate the proposed activity; including:

i. opportunities for low impact design principles;

ii. management of three waters infrastructure and trade waste such as industrial by-products.

h. managing natural hazards;

i. the adequacy of roading infrastructure to service the proposed activity;

j. any adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values, natural features and landscapes or indigenous biodiversity; and

k. any historical, spiritual, or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6.

FS88.80	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	S529.057	Subdivision	SUB-O4	Retain SUB-O4	Support in part	Allow in part	Protect wildlife without banning companion animals
---------	-------------------------	----------	-------------	--------	---------------	-----------------	---------------	--

FS88.81	New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporated	S518.001	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	IB-P9	Amend IB-P9 as follows: 'Require landowners to manage pets and pest species on their own land , including dogs, cats, possums, rats and mustelids, to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species, including avoiding the introduction of pets and pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas.'	Oppose	Disallow	<p>I disagree that most residents see dogs and cats as a real threat to kiwi. Some do, most understand that dogs and cats are not the only, or even main, threat to kiwi. Cars and subdivisions are.</p> <p>The numbers of kiwi known by DOC to have been killed in Northland, over a 2.5 year period: 2019: car - 21; dog - 20; cat - 0; cat or stoat - 1 2020: car - 20; dog - 13; cat - 0; cat or stoat - 0 2021 (to June): car - 12; dog - 9; cat - 0; cat or stoat or unknown - 2</p> <p>Of the dogs who have killed kiwi, few if any were under supervision at the time.</p> <p>Comparing the number of dogs in Northland to the few (though clearly not insignificant) numbers of kiwi, shows that most dogs live here without killing kiwi and banning them is not the answer.</p> <p>Submit: No dog bans</p>
FS88.82	John Andrew Riddell	S431.095	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	Policies	<p>Insert the following policy:</p> <p>That adverse effects on areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are avoided, remedied or mitigated by:</p> <p>(a) seeking alternatives to the disturbance of habitats where practicable;</p> <p>(b) managing the scale, intensity, type and location of subdivision, use and development in a way that avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse ecological effects;</p> <p>(c) ensuring that where any disturbance occurs it is</p>	Support in part	Allow in part	<p>Support most of this. Don't support requiring people to do pest management on their properties. It doesn't state in the summary, but if there is a suggestion of banning companion animals, I do not support that.</p>

undertaken in a way that, as far as practicable:

(i) minimises any edge effects;

(ii) avoids the removal of specimen trees;

(iii) does not result in linkages with other areas being lost;

(iv) avoids adverse effects on threatened species;

(v) minimises disturbance of root systems of remaining vegetation;

(vi) does not result in the introduction of exotic weed species or pest animals;

(d) encouraging, and where appropriate, requiring active pest control and avoiding the grazing of such areas

FS88.83	John Andrew Riddell	S431.097	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	Policies	Insert the following policy: In order to protect areas of significant indigenous fauna: (a) that dogs (excluding working dogs), cats, possums, rats, mustelids and other pest species are not introduced into areas with populations of kiwi, dotterel and brown teal; (b) in areas where dogs, cats, possums, rats, mustelids and other pest species are having adverse effects on indigenous fauna their removal is promoted	Oppose	Disallow	1. Oppose strongly. Where these animals are pets and not wild, they should be allowed (under careful management) in these areas.
---------	---------------------	----------	--	----------	--	--------	----------	--

FS88.84	John Andrew Riddell	S431.098	Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity	Policies	<p>Insert the following policy:</p> <p>That when considering resource consent applications in areas identified as known high density kiwi habitat, the Council may impose conditions, in order to protect kiwi and their habitat.</p>	Support in part	Allow in part	<p>Support reasonable and research based requirements for kiwi and other wildlife protection. Do not support unreasonable requirements.</p> <p>Definitely do not support bans on companion animals.</p> <p>If the area is important to kiwi or other creatures, then don't allow subdivision. Minor dwellings, sheds, etc, that will have little effect should not require masses of red tape so the owner had to do councils/DOCs job for them.</p>
FS88.85	John Andrew Riddell	S431.065	Subdivision	Policies	<p>Insert the following as a new policy:</p> <p>Subdivision, use and development shall preserve and where possible enhance, restore and rehabilitate the character of the applicable zone in regards to s6 matters. In addition subdivision, use and development shall avoid adverse effects as far as practicable by using techniques including:</p> <p>(a) clustering or grouping development within areas where there is the least impact on natural character and its elements such as indigenous vegetation, landforms, rivers, streams and wetlands, and coherent natural patterns;</p> <p>(b) minimising the visual impact of buildings, development, and associated vegetation clearance and earthworks, particularly as seen from public land and the coastal marine area;</p> <p>(c) providing for, through siting of buildings and development and design of subdivisions, legal public right of access to and use of the foreshore and any esplanade areas;</p>	Support	Allow	

(d) through siting of buildings and development, design of subdivisions, and provision of access that recognise and provide for the relationship of Maori with their culture, traditions and taonga including concepts of mauri, tapu, mana, wehi and karakia and the important contribution Maori culture makes to the character of the District (refer Chapter 2 and in particular Section 2.5 and Council's "Tangata Whenua Values and Perspectives" (2004);

(e) providing planting of indigenous vegetation in a way that links existing habitats of indigenous fauna and provides the opportunity for the extension, enhancement or creation of habitats for indigenous fauna, including mechanisms to exclude pests;

(f) protecting historic heritage through the siting of buildings and development and design of subdivisions.

(g) achieving hydraulic neutrality and ensuring that natural hazards will not be exacerbated or induced through the siting and design of buildings and development

FS88.86

John Andrew
Riddell

S431.038

Coastal
environment

Policies

Insert a new policy as per Policy 10.6.4.3 of the Operative District Plan, as follows:

Support

Allow

Subdivision, use and development shall preserve and where possible enhance, restore and rehabilitate the character of the zone in regards to s6 matters, and shall avoid adverse effects as far as practicable by using techniques including:

(a) clustering or grouping development within areas where there is the least impact on natural character and its elements such as indigenous vegetation, landforms, rivers, streams and wetlands, and coherent natural patterns;

(b) minimising the visual impact of buildings, development, and associated vegetation clearance and earthworks, particularly as seen from public land and the coastal marine area;

(c) providing for, through siting of buildings and development and design of subdivisions, legal public right of access to and use of the foreshore and any esplanade areas;

(d) through siting of buildings and development, design of subdivisions and provision of access, that recognise and provide for the relationship of Maori with their culture, traditions and taonga including concepts of mauri, tapu, mana, wehi and karakia and the important contribution Maori culture makes to the character of the District;

(e) providing planting of indigenous vegetation in a way that links existing habitats of indigenous fauna and provides the opportunity for the extension, enhancement or creation of habitats for indigenous fauna, including mechanisms to exclude pests;

(f) protecting historic heritage through the siting of buildings and development and design of subdivisions.

FS88.87	Stephanie Lane	S468.002	General	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Accept the decisions requested in the Bay of Islands Watch dog submission - 354 (inferred)	Support	Allow
---------	----------------	----------	---------	---	--	---------	-------

I'm supporting my own submission! I appreciate there being a brief summary here of my original submission but it is hard to see and easily missed by others, being at the bottom of a generic BOI Watchdogs "reasons" summary.

I'd also like to note, that because it is generic, it wasn't taken from my actual submission. There are words in this that I did not use.

I would just like to add that as a personal recipient of FNDC anti-dog laws, I (and therefore others like me) am negatively impacted on an on-going, daily basis:

- My mental health suffers from having to fix other people's stuff ups. I personally (and all the other rescuers and fosterers) pick up the pieces of people dumping their animals due to lack of rental homes that they can bring their animals with them to. I have to see the constant rehoming posts due to not being able to take their animals with them. It breaks my heart just as it breaks theirs.

- I have troubled dogs living with me as a result of inadequate animal management (ie not desexing, abuse, neglect). This costs me (and other fosterers) my peace, time and money.

- I have limited time and cannot afford to take the time to go for a walk without responsibly exercising my dogs at the same time, so due to dog bans on most public walks I am unable to enjoy the fantastic backyard of the Bay of Islands which is so unfair. I'd happily keep my dogs on leads where they couldn't possibly hurt kiwi. Heck, I'd even muzzle them! (Though that would be

								unnecessary).
FS88.88	The BOI Watchdogs	S354.001	General	General / Process	Prepares a motherhood/policy statement/vision which makes it clear to FNDC management that responsible pet ownership is positive for our community, and enhances community wellbeing.This should also make it clear that complete transparency around dog bans or restrictions is required.	Support	Allow	<p>I support all of the BOI Watchdogs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exercised and enriched dogs are happy dogs. Happy dogs don't cause as much destruction as unhappy bored dogs. We can't enrich our dogs' lives and our own with healthy safe walks in our own local bush areas with all these "No Dogs" rules. This reduces the physical and mental health of dog-loving people, and creates frustrated dogs who are much more likely to kill kiwi. • Having fostered a troubled teenage boy from a local family from Moerewa, I've seen close up his attitude to dogs and heard about his family's treatment of dogs. This boy has been damaged by family violence and has not been taught empathy, to animals or to humans. Under my care, he learned both to a degree. He started to learn how to understand/read dogs having lived with them in a non-violent home. Had he had the opportunity to learn this while young, he would have learned empathy. Our young people need this to turn into good adults. I reiterate my point about the link of animal violence to domestic violence. • I want to tour Northland in my campervan. My dogs come for security and company. I could support tourism and local businesses while doing it. But I can't because my dogs can't come. • My choices to find a new home are getting less and less. I support certain genuine high kiwi zones, such as Doves Bay, having dog and cat free areas, but these should be minimised and not creep to cover more and more land. Some people are happy to live without dogs and cats and this can work well for them. I simply don't consider anything in

Simply don't consider anything in that area and that's ok. Just don't make the majority of Northland excluded to me and everyone else who shares their home and family with animals.

If kiwi are our priority, outright banning of dogs will not protect them. Other measures will, such as reducing subdivision in kiwi dense areas, keeping dogs on leads in kiwi present walkways, requiring homes in kiwi present areas to have adequate fencing, dogs inside at night (except when toileting), etc, mandatory desexing, will. We all want to protect our native icon and it can be done without taking away the rights of animal lovers and their animals.