# **Proposed Keeping of Animal Bylaw 2024: Results from Early Engagement**

## Experiencing nuisance

1. **Have you, or your organisation, experienced any problems relating to animals (excluding dogs) in the Waikato district?**

*Table 1: Number of responses to Q1.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 100 | 33% |
| No | 202 | 66% |
| No response | 4 | 1% |
| **Total** | **306** | **100%** |

1. **If you, or your organisation have experienced any problems relating to animals, please share details about the animal and type of problem you experienced.**

*Table 2: Summary of responses to Q2.*

| **Type of problem** | **Respondent/s (Total: 116)** | **Staff comment** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Cats (Total respondents: 37)** | | | |
| Defecating, spraying on neighbour’s property. | 7264, 7328, 7354, 7428, 7443, 7444, 7448, 7250, 7369, 7308, 7525, 7519, 7539 (Go Eco), 7396 | Staff response included in covering report. |
| Roaming outside of owner’s property. | 7360 (Pack Group), 7348, 7381, 7354, 7289, 7308, 7354, 7399, 7248, 7519, 7539 (Go Eco), 7560 |
| Feral and domestic cats fighting. | 7300, 7310, 7358, 7369, 7376, 7381, 7417, 7519, 7539 (Go Eco), 7553, 7560 |
| Feral or stray cats. | 7262 (Westwind Farm), 7296, 7248, 7361, 7362, 7369, 7339, 7436, 7444, 7263 |
| Damage to property (gardens, chickens, birds, fences). | 7264, 7354, 7323, 7348, 7262 (Westwind Farm), 7264, 7308, 7539 (Go Eco) |
| Request for rules around cat ownership, like dogs, such as a cat limit per household. | 7262 (Westwind Farm), 7361, 7519, 7525, 7539 (Go Eco) |
| Miscellaneous, including cats scaring stock, cat overpopulation and a request for a nighttime curfew for cats, animal abuse. | 7323, 7251, 7417, 7454 (Predator Free NZ Trust), 7263 |
| **Roosters (Total respondents: 25)** | | | |
| Excessive noise. | 7268, 7331, 7260, 7357, 7341, 7351, 7352, 7393, 7384, 7414, 7424, 7430, 7440, 7456, 7496, 7471, 7546, 7548, 7551 | Feedback indicates that roosters cause nuisance within the community, mainly due to excessive noise.  Under the proposed Bylaw roosters are not allowed in urban areas. Review and consider specific rules around roosters in country living/lifestyle areas. |
| Roaming/dumped. | 7351, 7533 (Rural NZ Post), 7564, 7452 |
| Roosters located in the Country Living Zone. | 7280 |
| Procreating with neighbour’s special breed chickens. | 7308 |
| Roosters dumped at respondent’s property. | 7491 |
| **Chickens (Total respondents: 23)** | | | |
| Roaming and causing damage to property in some cases. | 7294, 7308, 7260, 7357, 7377, 7378, 7351, 7417, 7386, 7434, 7447, 7517, 7533 (Rural NZ Post) | Feedback indicates that chickens cause nuisance within the community, due to reasons such as roaming and causing damage to other people’s properties as well as unpleasant smells and defecating on neighbour’s land.  General clause 5.6 already requires that individuals keep animals confined to their own property, and also addresses issues around excessive noise and nuisance. The bylaw also includes limits on the number of poultry and set-backs requirements. |
| Unpleasant smell. | 7269, 7307, 7357, 7391, 7440, 7502 |
| Defecating on neighbours’ land. | 7269, 7294, 7417, 7447 |
| Excessive noise. | 7268, 7352 |
| Chickens in urban areas attracting rats. | 7433 |
| Too many poultry for space available and poor living conditions. | 7430 |
| **Cows (livestock**) **(Total respondents: 11)** | | | |
| Roaming/loose on road. | 7287, 7308, 7370, 7354, 7248, 7360 (Pack Group), 7426, 7530 | Noted. General clause 5.6 already requires that individuals keep animals confined to their own property. |
| Eating hedging planted on neighbouring property or damaging fences. | 7460, 7347 |
| Excessive noise. | 7568 |
| **Pigs (livestock) (Total respondents: 8)** | | | |
| Roaming or wandering from owner’s property, causing damage to other properties in some cases. | 7248, 7400, 7489, 7555, 7557 | Noted. General clause 5.6 already requires that individuals keep animals confined to their own property, including pigs. |
| Unpleasant smell. | 7357 |
| Killing neighbour’s chickens. | 7400 |
| Not being kept in appropriate areas. | 7430 |
| Wild pigs in bush behind property, they come up to house paddock and cause a big mess. | 7520 (Chipperfield Alpacas) |
| **Sheep (livestock) (Total respondents: 7)** | | | |
| Roaming, loose on road. | 7289, 7308, 7370, 7390, 7248, 7557 | No change to the proposed Bylaw. Staff do not recommend including additional clauses specifically for sheep in the proposed bylaw. |
| Kept in too small a space. | 7331 |
| Excessive noise. | 7390 |
| **Ducks (Total respondents: 7)** | | | |
| Roaming. | 7260, 7517, 7533 (Rural NZ Post) | No change to the proposed Bylaw. Staff do not recommend including additional clauses specifically for ducks in the proposed bylaw. |
| Defecating on neighbour’s land. | 7269, 7438 |
| Unpleasant smell. | 7269, 7331 |
| Neighbour encouraging wild ducks. | 7438 |
| **Goats (livestock) (Total respondents: 6)** | | | |
| Roaming. | 7289, 7308, 7354, 7399, 7311 | No change to the proposed Bylaw. Staff do not recommend including additional clauses specifically for goats in the proposed bylaw. |
| Excessive noise. | 7266 |
| Feral goats. | 7308 |
| Defecating on neighbours’ land. | 7308 |
| Aggressive behaviour. | 7308 |
| Destroying property, i.e. fences. | 7308 |
| **Horses (Total respondents: 5)** | | | |
| Defecating on public roads/footpaths. | 7266, 7252, 7489 | There are rules prohibiting horse deposits to be left on roads in the Public Places Bylaw 2023. The proposed Bylaw includes a rule requiring horse deposits to be removed and disposed of immediately (Clause 9.2).  Additional change proposed in covering report  No change to the proposed Bylaw. |
| Dangerous riding of horses on roads. | 7266 |
| Roaming/wandering on roads. | 7248 |
| The keeping of horses over Guy Fawkes causes neighbourly disputes as fireworks scare horses. | 7358 |
| **Bulls (livestock) (Total respondents: 2)** | | | |
| Roaming. | 7348 | Noted. |
| Excessive noise. | 7568 |
| **Wild birds (incl. pigeons, quail, puukeko, pheasant (Total respondents: 2)** | | | |
| Eating neighbours plant seeds/vegetable gardens. | 7476, 7480 | Noted. |
| **Peacocks (Total respondents: 1)** | | | |
| Excessive noise. | 7280 | Noted. |
| **Rabbits \*(Total respondents: 1)** | | | |
| Eating neighbour’s vegetables and flower plants. | 7443 | Noted. |
| Defecating on properties. | 7443 |
| **Unspecified animal (Total respondents: 1)** | | | |
| Roaming. | 7420 | Noted. |
| **Guinea fowl (Total respondents: 1)** | | | |
| Roaming and digging up gardens. | 7510 | Noted. |
| **Bees (Total respondents: 1)** | | | |
| Swarming around horse feed bowls. | 7572 | Noted. |
| **Positive comments or requests (Total respondents: 2)** | | | |
| Roosters should be able to be kept in good conditions in country living and poultry should be permitted to be kept in a movable coop or tractor. | 7327 | Noted. |
| Roosters are beneficial as they keep chickens from roaming. | 7319 | Noted. |

Table 3: Out of scope issues raised in Q2.

| **Type of problem (Total respondents: 4)** | **Respondent** |
| --- | --- |
| People using fireworks with no consideration for animals. | 7297 |
| No clear fine for breach of this Bylaw. It’s not clear what law gives us the right to remove an animal that is contrary to the Bylaw. | 7258 |
| People driving on metal roads. | 7314 |
| Honesty boxes help with inflated price of eggs. | 7319 |

## Property Sizes and Zones

We are considering using both property size and zones from the Proposed District Plan (PDP) to help define the terms; urban, lifestyle, and rural for the purposes of this Bylaw.

**3. Do you support this approach?**

Table 4: Responses to Q3

| **Level of support** | **Count** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** (Low level of support) | 53 | 17% |
| **2** | 22 | 7% |
| **3** | 49 | 16% |
| **4** | 42 | 14% |
| **5** (High level of support) | 43 | 14% |
| **No selection made** | 97 | 32% |
| **Total** | **306** | **100%** |

**4. Please tell us why:**

Table 5: Responses to Q4 in support of using both property size and PDP to define urban, lifestyle, and rural.

| **Comments in support (Total respondents: 63)** | **Respondent/s** | **Staff comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. The proposed approach is:  * reasonable, makes sense * clear flow-chart * support for district-wide property size rules * feels that 2,500m2 is a good cut off point. | 7262 (Westwind Farm), 7280, 7286, 7287, 7300, 7248, 7305, 7250, 7313, 7330, 7251, 7252, 7259, 7357, 7358, 7377, 7349 (Dickenson Family Trust), 7395, 7400, 7410, 7416, 7417, 7433, 7443, 7444, 7445, 7442, 7276, 7304, 7335, 7341, 7452, 7455, 7456, 7460, 7489, 7490, 7494, 7500, 7503, 7510, 7511, 7516, 7470, 7471, 7526, 7531, 7522, 7539 (Go Eco), 7544, 7558 | Noted. |
| 1. Respondents support different areas of the district (such as urban and rural) having different rules. Urban and lifestyle properties are closer together. | 7351, 7448, 7331, 7260, 7369, 7301, 7429, 7435, 7536 | Noted. |
| 1. Respondents support smaller properties in rural areas having different animal limits or rules, compared to larger rural properties. | 7301, 7429, 7435 | Noted. |
| 1. Miscellaneous comments, include:  * supporting the approach when considering what type of poultry can be kept in different areas because respondent’s property is located within Onewhero rural village zone. * there needs to be maps attached to support understanding. | 7273, 7386, 7535 | Noted. |

Table 6: Responses to Q4 in opposition of using both property size and PDP to defines urban, lifestyle and rural.

| **Comments in opposition (Total respondents: 98)** | **Respondent/s** | **Staff comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Respondents find the current district plan zone approach simpler and satisfactory. | 7275, 7281, 7298, 7321, 7364, 7342, 7388, 7258, 7396, 7406, 7425, 7254, 7281, 7453, 7472, 7473, 7474, 7479, 7491, 7495, 7505, 7543, 7559 | A majority of those opposed to using both property size and PDP zones are opposed because they are happy with the current approach/ |
| 1. A 2,500m2 property is too large to be considered urban and should be considered lifestyle. E.g. properties between 800m2-1200m2/1500m2 and below would be more suitable for urban.   This size limit puts a lot of divergent properties into urban category. | 7281, 7295, 7312, 7374, 7378, 7380, 7394 (Rship), 7402, 7409, 7426, 7450, 7487, 7249, 7538, 7545, 7574 (Tamahere Community Committee) | Feedback also suggests that some respondents were not happy with the section size of 2,500m2, this is too large and should be considered lifestyle. Staff propose this side is decreased to 1,500 square metres. |
| 1. Respondents oppose a new bylaw, arguing that existing laws are sufficient. They oppose more limitations, Council overreach, or express concerns that Council will profit from a new Bylaw. | 7306, 7383, 7413, 7419, 7422, 7437, 7477, 7480, 7485, 7486, 7493, 7501, 7512, 7515, 7337, 7529, 7523, 7542, 7563 | Noted. |
| 1. The proposed approach is unfair for rural properties smaller than 2,500m2 and are located far from other houses. | 7267, 7274, 7318, 7320, 7272, 7247, 7382, 7356, 7396, 7255, 7506 | Noted. |
| 1. Respondents oppose having their zoning changed if it would force them to remove their animals and advocate instead for retaining existing rights to keep their animals. | 7297, 7308, 7257, 7348, 7432, 7431 | Noted. |
| 1. Regulations for animals on lifestyle blocks is excessive or lifestyle blocks should be considered rural. | 7319, 7327, 7336, 7391, 7502, 7447, 7401 | Noted. |
| 1. A different approach to defining areas should be considered by Council. Examples of different approaches include:  * considering how much of the property is covered with buildings * using property size only * case by case basis only * considering if neighbours are happy. | 7307, 7387, 7379, 7271, 7520 (Chipperfield Alpacas), 7546, 7548, 7572 | Noted. |
| 1. Respondent believes that sustainability should be more important. | 7350, 7355, 7498 | Noted. |
| 1. Miscellaneous comments:  * the proposed approach includes common sense lifestyle areas within the urban zone. * opposition to Council allowing the number of poultry and small livestock to be in rural zones only. * lifestyle blocks should have more checks and controls. * properties should be urban or rural only. * urban or lifestyle properties can be suitable for some prohibited animals. * comment suggests that respondent doesn’t understand the decision tree. | 7408, 7451, 7476, 7292, 7329, 7314, 7405, 7560 | Noted. |

Table 7: Responses to Q4 which are unclear if respondent supports or opposes using both property size and PDP to defines urban, lifestyle, and rural.

| **Comments not indicating support or opposition.**  **(Total respondents: 27)** | **Respondent/s** | **Staff comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Concerns expressed about the proposed approach’s consistency, property sizes, exceptions, or lack of information (such as not including Country Living Zone or understanding the flow table) without clearly stating their stance. | 7430, 7344, 7360 (Pack Group), 7294, 7311, 7376, 7352, 7414, 7360 (Pack Group), 7293, 7524 | To help improve understanding of the proposed process, staff will ensure maps are included for formal consultation purposes. |
| 1. Respondents mention their current zoning classification or residential status without indicating explicit support or opposition to the proposed approach. | 7268, 7340, 7407, 7278, 7284, 7439, 7564 | Noted. |
| 1. Comments highlight specific circumstances, such as being located next to a school or having a certain property size, without clearly indicating support or opposition to the proposed approach. | 7245, 7372 (Waikino School), 7299 (Avian Wildlife Rehabilitation Trust) | Noted. |
| 1. Comments request zoning changes:    * Tamahere should be zoned lifestyle or rural.    * Matangi should be zoned lifestyle as many homes there are lifestyle or bigger, then have greater Matangi – rural. | 7303, 7333 | Noted. |
| 1. Miscellaneous comments:    * some respondents mention restrictions on poultry for lifestyle properties, but their stance on using both property size and PDP zones is not explicitly stated.    * respondents express uncertainty about future zoning classifications or the location of proposed zones.    * respondent feels that anything not in town should be allowed all animals.    * Council shouldn’t restrict someone’s property rights. | 7261, 7514, 7299 (Avian Wildlife Rehabilitation Trust), 7527, 7553, 7567 | Noted. |

Roosters

**5. Do you believe roosters should be allowed to be kept in lifestyle areas in the Waikato district?**

Table 8: Responses to Q5

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 184 | 60% |
| No | 88 | 29% |
| Unsure | 29 | 9% |
| No response | 5 | 2% |
| **Total** | **306** | **100%** |

**6. Please tell us why:**

Table 9: Responses to Q6 in support of roosters in lifestyle areas

| **Comments in support (Total respondents: 155)** | **Respondent/s** | **Staff comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Respondents support allowing roosters in lifestyle areas due to the rural nature of these zones, expecting farm animal noises and smells. | 7399, 7271, 7274, 7284, 7247, 7298, 7303, 7308, 7312, 7314, 7319, 7324, 7326, 7328, 7329, 7251, 7255, 7256, 7371, 7374, 7340, 7390, 7406, 7407, 7405, 7413, 7421, 7435, 7431, 7447, 7451, 7272, 7273, 7276, 7279, 7283, 7287, 7292, 7293, 7295, 7304, 7305, 7313, 7332, 7365, 7342, 7401, 7404, 7426, 7428, 7435, 7436, 7387, 7452, 7473, 7477, 7479, 7480, 7490, 7519, 7526, 7530, 7535, 7537, 7542, 7549, 7555, 7550, 7559, 7567 | The most common reason that people feel roosters should be allowed in lifestyle zones is because lifestyle zones are rural by nature and therefore anyone living in these areas should expect some degree of farm animal type noise, including roosters. It is also noted that a number of respondents live in the lifestyle zone because they want to have some farm animals. |
| 1. Support for allowing roosters on larger properties if proper management is in place (e.g. keeping them in a coop overnight), including distance from dwellings and limits on the number of roosters. | 7400, 7402, 7387, 7393, 7300, 7314, 7321, 7333, 7363, 7340, 7450, 7272, 7281, 7318, 7327, 7418, 7417, 7409, 7356, 7408, 7455, 7478, 7481, 7502, 7505, 7512, 7517, 7470, 7551, 7558, 7559, 7570 | Some feedback received has suggested one rooster per property or one for every 10 chickens.  They also need to be kept on their own property and in a coop at night. |
| 1. Respondents highlight the protective and calming role of roosters for hens, promoting self-sufficiency, and emphasizing their importance in farming communities. | 7265, 7275, 7282, 7296, 7310, 7314, 7344, 7372 (Waikino School), 7408, 7421, 7437, 7439, 7270, 7252, 7257, 7346, 7391, 7395, 7396, 7422, 7425, 7442, 7429, 7472, 7484, 7532, 7535, 7536, 7543, 7558, 7560 | Noted. Self-sufficiency is a common theme throughout the feedback. |
| 1. Support is conditional on rules mitigating excessive noise, such as loud crowing during night hours, allowing roosters on properties for breeding purposes for short periods of time, and ensuring roosters are kept on their own property. | 7245, 7308, 728, 7282, 7373, 7445, 7453, 7505 | Noted. |
| 1. Support is grounded in ethical concerns about culling healthy animals, the necessity of roosters for breeding, and the practicality of living in rural areas. | 7319, 7376, 7381, 7350, 7451, 7306, 7317, 7321, 7328, 7363, 7367, 7396, 7439, 7493 | Noted. |
| 1. Respondents highlight the importance of being able to breed chickens as well as special-breed chickens, otherwise the special breed chickens would die-out in NZ). | 7472, 7494, 7495, 7501, 7510 | Noted. |
| 1. Miscellaneous comments, including:    * support based on personal experience (learning to tune out rooster noise)    * comparison to other common household pets/kids    * considerations related to property ownership and not in urban areas    * people should be able to decide what they do on their property, not be restricted by Council. | 7316, 7338, 7389, 7345, 7348, 7317, 7356, 7383, 7431, 7474, 7485, 7486, 7498, 7515, 7516, 7527, 7529, 7543, 7544, 7553, 7563 | Noted. |

Table 10: Responses to Q6 opposing roosters in lifestyle areas.

| **Comments in opposition (Total respondents: 77)** | **Respondent/s** | **Staff comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Respondents express concerns about the noise generated by roosters, especially during early morning hours, disrupting the peace and affecting neighbouring properties. | 7262 (Westwind Farm), 7280, 7286, 7294, 7299 (Avian Wildlife Rehabilitation Trust), 7248, 7307, 7250, 7323, 7330, 7331, 7335, 7258, 7260, 7357, 7347, 7377, 7349 (Dickenson Family Trust), 7378, 7352, 7388, 7386, 7412, 7414, 7424, 7433, 7438, 7440, 7446, 7441, 7449, 7384, 7456, 7460, 7476, 7491, 7500, 7507, 7508, 7511, 7522, 7545, 7546, 7551, 7557, 7568, 7572 | As stated above feedback indicates that the most common reason for people not wanting roosters in lifestyle zones is due to excessive noise. |
| 1. Respondent believes that the relatively close proximity of lifestyle blocks’ exacerbates the noise issue, making the noise audible to multiple residents. | 7266, 7268,7393, 7269, 7277, 7285, 7289, 7248, 7301, 7325, 7341, 7375, 7412, 7414, 7416, 7446, 7514, 7471, 7551, 7548 | Noted. See above. |
| 1. Suggestions for implementing criteria or consent requirements for keeping roosters in lifestyle areas. | 7262 (Westwind Farm), 7280, 7351, 7339, 7384, 7524, 7531, 7564 | Noted. |
| 1. Concerns about rooster noise reaching urban areas due to the close proximity of lifestyle zones. | 7354, 7424, 7427, 7518, 7564 | Noted. |
| 1. General opposition to allowing roosters in lifestyle areas, including:    * statements against the necessity of roosters for egg production.    * advocacy for removal if roosters become a nuisance to neighbours regardless of zoning, e.g. give a 7-day notice period to rehome nuisance roosters.    * roosters damaging flora and fauna.    * Roosters should not be within a 1200m radius of another dwelling (including in rural settings).    * current covenants not allowing roosters. | 7289, 7441, 7330, 7384, 7262 (Westwind Farm), 7320, 7369, 7434, 7261, 7394 (Rship), 7523, 7572, 7574 (Tamahere Community Committee), 7551 | Noted – When lifestyle areas or subdivisions have covenants in place that do not allow roosters, that covenant will take precedence over the Bylaw. |

Table 11: Responses to Q6 not indicating support or opposition to roosters in lifestyle areas.

| **Comments not indicating support or opposition (Total respondents: 17)** | **Respondent/s** | **Staff comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Respondents are unsure as it depends on proximity of both roosters and neighbours, whether neighbours are comfortable with roosters or should consider who lived at the property first. | 7278, 7379, 7382, 7430, 7503, 7410, 7520 (Chipperfield Alpacas) | Noted. |
| 1. Respondent unsure but agrees that there should be restrictions on roosters (in lifestyle zones) and setbacks. | 7259, 7358, 7368, 7496, 7574 (Tamahere Community Committee) | Noted. |
| 1. Roosters should be dealt with on a complaints’ basis only. | 7418, 7442 | Noted. |
| 1. Miscellaneous comments include:    * general ambivalence.    * respondent unsure as they are not aware of the proposed designation for their property.    * respondent unsure as some lifestyle areas are very close to urban areas and some are closer to rural areas. | 7254, 7432, 7443 | Noted. |

Beehives

**7. What is your preferred limit for the number of beehives on a property that you would be comfortable allowing in our district?**

| **Property area** | **Number of beehives** | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7+** | **No response** | **Total** |
| **Properties between 500 – 2,500m2** | 22 | 29 | 114 | 25 | 34 | 9 | 7 | 37 | 29 | 306 |
| **Properties between 2,501 – 4,000m2** | 4 | 10 | 28 | 7 | 108 | 23 | 30 | 65 | 31 | 306 |
| **Properties above 4,001m2** | 1 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 12 | 19 | 54 | 167 | 32 | 306 |

**8. Please tell us why:**

| **Comments in support of more beehives (Total respondents: 138)** | **Respondent/s** | **Staff comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Respondents emphasise the crucial role of bees in pollination and ecosystem health, advocating against limiting hives due to potential damage to the ecosystem. | 7371, 7421, 7265, 7272, 7273, 7281, 7298, 7303, 7314, 7315, 7363, 7344, 7372 (Waikino School), 7376, 7379, 7386, 7405, 7412, 7425, 7435, 7430, 7439, 7443, 7444, 7445, 7441, 7442, 7451, 7264, 7274, 7288, 7322, 7328, 7251, 7377, 7350, 7354, 7391, 7396, 7401, 7429, 7283, 7357, 7373, 7319, 7453, 7472, 7477, 7478, 7481, 7484, 7485, 7487, 7489, 7491, 7493, 7494, 7495, 7505, 7506, 7509, 7511, 7512, 7515, 7519, 7530, 7532, 7536, 7542, 7543, 7545, 7548, 7551, 7552, 7555, 7550, 7570, 7574 (Tamahere Community Committee) | A strong theme in the feedback received from respondents who support more beehives being allowed in our community is that limiting beehives could be damaging to our ecosystem. Bees are important for pollination and the health of our food chain. |
| 1. Respondents stress the importance of responsible beekeeping practices to mitigate any nuisance caused by bees. | 7270, 7330, 7332, 7257, 7338, 7260, 7406, 7276, 7374, 7397, 7428, 7430, 7443, 7250, 7247, 7505, 7506, 7538, 7570, 7574 (Tamahere Community Committee) | Noted. |
| 1. Respondents argue against proposed limits, with suggestions ranging from unlimited hives to restrictions based on factors like forage availability and setbacks, rather than property size. | 7298, 7352, 7446, 7255, 7473, 7496, 7516, 7517, 7523, 7553 | Noted. |
| 1. Submissions express opinions on hive limits based on property size, with suggestions for differentiation between urban and rural areas or specific size ranges. | 7287, 7293, 7413, 7326, 7439, 7331, 7260, 7358, 7342, 7351, 7365, 7321, 7371, 7450, 7375, 7347, 7381, 7356, 7396, 7402, 7427, 7447, 7373, 7391, 7421, 7444, 7445, 7442, 7451, 7452, 7455, 7477, 7479, 7480, 7481, 7500, 7528, 7559, 7571 | Noted. See comment above. |
| 1. Respondents believe that beehives are suitable close to a 1.8m closed-board fence and setbacks are arbitrary because bees can fly. | 7286, 7390, 7397, 7427, 7453 | Noted. |
| 1. Miscellaneous comments include:    * Council should support limits with case study results/specific resources.    * Beekeeping could provide more income for struggling families.    * Property owner’s rights should be respected, no covenants, further restrictions are not required.    * 4,000m2 is basically rural. | 7309, 7315, 7474, 7486, 7490, 7498, 7501, 7512, 7514, 7471, 7529, 7553 | Noted. |

| **Comments in opposition of more beehives (Total respondents: 25)** | **Respondent/s** | **Staff comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Respondents express concerns about the ecological consequences of unrestricted beekeeping, highlighting the potential negative impact on pollinator diversity and native bird populations. | 7262 (Westwind Farm), 7572 | Noted. |
| 1. Opposition is driven by fears of bee stings and allergic reactions and bees defecating on belongings (such as washing, house, car), particularly in densely populated urban areas and on smaller properties where the presence of swarms poses significant safety hazards. | 7261, 7280, 7285, 7307, 7426, 7399, 7349 (Dickenson Family Trust), 7526, 7557 | Noted |
| 1. Concerns are raised regarding the spatial requirements of beekeeping, with respondents arguing against clustering hives closely together due to competition for food sources and the necessity of adequate space for bee activity. | 7280, 7289, 7300, 7460, 7471, 7564 | Noted. |
| 1. Opposition extends to the integration of beehives into urban environments, prompting calls for stricter regulations on hive placement and setbacks to mitigate safety risks for residents. | 7339, 7507, 7531, 7557, 7558 | Noted. |
| 1. Respondents advocate for policies that promote responsible beekeeping practices, including limitations on hive numbers per property and considerations for non-commercial beekeeping activities to ensure sustainable coexistence with human populations, consultation with neighbours. | 7388, 7424, 7434, 7510, 7524 | Noted. |

| **Comments which are unclear if respondent supports or opposes beehives (Total respondents: 46)** | **Respondent/s** | **Staff comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Respondents expressed satisfaction with the current number of beehives suggested by the Council. | 7278, 7284, 7286, 7294, 7295, 7297, 7296, 7248, 7304, 7318, 7317, 7327, 7252, 7333, 7364, 7341, 7378, 7340, 7393, 7395, 7400, 7409, 7416, 7432, 7433, 7384, 7313, 7544 | Noted. |
| 1. Respondents indicated ambiguity or lack of clarity regarding support or opposition to beehives. | 7311, 7389, 7394 (Rship), 7408, 7417, 7254, 7348 | Noted. |
| 1. Respondents emphasized the importance of having sufficient food sources year-round for beehives, instead of section size. Too many hives close together is bad for bees. | 7277, 7299 (Avian Wildlife Rehabilitation Trust), 7253, 7370 | Noted. |
| 1. Respondent highlighted the importance of proper hive placement for the well-being of bees and to avoid nuisance. | 7448 | Noted. |
| 1. Respondents suggested that:  * there should manageable numbers of beehives appropriate to the size of the property. * we should defer to beekeeper expertise and let them do their thing. | 7249, 7520 (Chipperfield Alpacas), 7549, 7563 | Noted. |
| 1. Comments expressing the belief that existing laws are sufficient to address any problems related to beehives, and bylaws make little difference as bees fly away. | 7306, 7316 | Noted. |

## Poultry

**9. What type of bird/s do you believe should be included in the definition of poultry and why?**

| **Types of bird suggested to be included in the definition of poultry** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Suggested bird** | **Respondent/s** |
| Chickens  (Total respondents: 60) | 7261, 7267, 7269, 7271, 7274, 7275, 7276, 7278, 7282, 7285, 7291, 7292, 7294, 7296, 7305, 7307, 7315, 7328, 7332, 7258, 7259, 7360 (Pack Group), 7364, 7367, 7374, 7377, 7380, 7383, 7354, 7356, 7410, 7416, 7417, 7425, 7435, 7437, 7442, 7451, 7481, 7343, 7341, 7376, 7327, 7487, 7489, 7491, 7495, 7503, 7511, 7517, 7524, 7526, 7533 (Rural NZ Post), 7518, 7545, 7546, 7548, 7554, 7550, 7571 |
| Ducks  (Total respondents: 52) | 7261, 7267, 7269, 7271, 7274, 7275, 7276, 7278, 7282, 7285, 7291, 7292, 7294, 7296, 7305, 7328, 7327, 7332, 7258, 7360 (Pack Group), 7364, 7367, 7368, 7377, 7380, 7383, 7356, 7404, 7416, 7417, 7425, 7435, 7438, 7442, 7451, 7481, 7307, 7343, 7487, 7489, 7491, 7495, 7503, 7509, 7511, 7517, 7526, 7533 (Rural NZ Post), 7546, 7548, 7554, 7550 |
| Peacocks  (Total respondents: 35) | 7282, 7274, 7276, 7291, 7292, 7294, 7327, 7360 (Pack Group), 7368, 7376, 7377, 7380, 7425, 7435, 7451, 7245, 7277, 7261, 7280, 7286, 7248, 7249, 7320, 7328, 7369, 7347, 7351, 7386, 7414, 7487, 7489, 7503, 7526, 7546, 7554 |
| Geese  (Total respondents: 38) | 7267, 7271, 7274, 7276, 7291, 7292, 7294, 7296, 7327, 7332, 7258, 7360 (Pack Group), 7364, 7368, 7374, 7377, 7380, 7404, 7410, 7417, 7425, 7435, 7442, 7451, 7481, 7328, 7343, 7347, 7376, 7487, 7489, 7491, 7495, 7503, 7517, 7526, 7533 (Rural NZ Post), 7546 |
| Turkeys  (Total respondents: 39) | 7271, 7274, 7276, 7278, 7282, 7291, 7292, 7294, 7296, 7327, 7332, 7258, 7360 (Pack Group), 7364, 7368, 7374, 7377, 7380, 7404, 7425, 7435, 7442, 7451, 7328, 7414, 7343, 7347, 7376, 7487, 7489, 7491, 7503, 7517, 7526, 7533 (Rural NZ Post), 7545, 7546, 7554, 7550 |
| Quail  (Total respondents: 26) | 7269, 7274, 7282, 7285, 7291, 7294, 7296, 7305, 7328, 7332, 7258, 7259, 7360 (Pack Group), 7367, 7376, 7380, 7383, 7354, 7410, 7425, 7435, 7442, 7451, 7503, 7518, 7548 |
| Pheasants  (Total respondents: 23) | 7261, 7274, 7276, 7282, 7291, 7294, 7296, 7258, 7360 (Pack Group), 7367, 7380, 7354, 7425, 7435, 7442, 7451, 7328, 7252, 7376, 7489, 7503, 7548, 7554 |
| Pigeons  (Total respondents: 20) | 7274, 7291, 7294, 7296, 7305, 7328, 7258, 7360 (Pack Group), 7376, 7377, 7380, 7425, 7435, 7447, 7451, 7307, 7503, 7526, 7518, 7545 |
| Guinea fowl  (Total respondents: 6) | 7258, 7379, 7340, 7451, 7487, 7510 |
| Roosters  (Total respondents: 3) | 7269, 7383, 7438 |
| Ostriches  (Total respondents: 1) | 7258 |
| Parrots (Total respondents: 1) | 7413 |
| Doves  (Total respondents: 1) | 7425 |

| **Suggested bird** | **Respondent comments for birds they feel should not be included in the definition of poultry** | **Respondent** | **Staff comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Peacocks  (Total respondents: 21) | Peacocks should not be included because peacocks are not farmed for their meat or eggs, peacocks require much more space and peacocks are excessively noisy. | 7442, 7446, 7354, 7326, 7450, 7370, 7265, 7364, 7336, 7289, 7417, 7478, 7296, 7284, 7293, 7320, 7496, 7516, 7530, 7522, 7523 | Noted. |
| Pigeons  (Total respondents: 15) | Respondents believe that pigeons should not be included for reasons such as pigeons can be kept as pets or for racing, and pigeons require different levels of space so residents should be able to keep more. | 7261, 7276, 7409, 7283, 7381, 7289, 7300, 7374, 7429, 7476, 7478, 7354, 7392, 7442, 7522 | Noted. |
| Quail  (Total respondents: 7) | Respondents believe that quail should not be included as quail are smaller and require different levels of space, so residents should be able to keep more. | 7261, 7276, 7409, 7283, 7333, 7374, 7429 | Noted. |
| Ducks  (Total respondents: 1) | Respondents believe that ducks are excessively noisy and shouldn’t be allowed in urban areas. | 7354 | Noted. |
| Turkeys  (Total respondents: 5) | Respondents believe that turkeys should not be included for reasons such as:   * they typically require large areas to roam around in * they are excessively noisy and shouldn’t be allowed in urban areas. | 7370, 7265, 7328, 7354, 7530 | Noted. |
| Roosters  (Total respondents: 3) | Respondents believe that roosters should not be included as they should not be allowed in urban areas. | 7354, 7339, 7427 | Noted. |
| Pheasants  (Total respondents: 2) | Respondents believe that pheasants should not be included as they should be restricted as they need large areas to roam around in. | 7326, 7336 | Noted. |
| Geese  (Total respondents: 2) | Respondents believe that geese should not be included as they are excessively noisy and shouldn’t be allowed in urban areas. | 7354, 7478 | Noted. |

| **Respondent comments not related to a specific bird** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondent comments** | **Count** | **Respondent** | **Staff comments** |
| 1. Respondents feel that all suggested birds are considered poultry and suggest Council keeps existing definition. | 78 | 7272, 7273, 7279, 7280, 7287, 7290, 7298, 7303, 7304, 7311, 7316, 7317, 7323, 7324, 7325, 7329, 7330, 7331, 7252, 7253, 7255,7260, 7357, 7358, 7359, 7344, 7345, 7378, 7350, 7351, 7352, 7340, 7393, 7394 (Rship), 7395, 7396, 7384, 7400, 7406, 7407, 7405, 7412, 7413, 7421, 7428, 7433, 7430, 7439, 7443, 7447, 7452, 7453, 7455, 7460, 7473, 7484, 7488, 7493, 7498, 7501, 7508, 7471, 7520 (Chipperfield Alpacas), 7527, 7531, 7532, 7535, 7536, 7549, 7544, 7551, 7552, 7555, 7559, 7562, 7568, 7569, 7570 | Noted. |
| 1. Respondents believe that poultry, by definition, is a domesticated bird that we eat or keep for eggs, provide meat [and feathers], and is contained in suitable housing. | 18 | 7262 (Westwind Farm), 7274, 7281, 7289, 7312, 7348, 7391, 7446, 7372 (Waikino School), 7479, 7515, 7516, 7470, 7537, 7523, 7558, 7564, 7574 (Tamahere Community Committee) | Noted. Already part of definition. |
| 1. Respondents argue that some birds should not be considered poultry or should have their own rules, this includes:  * Pet birds, including parrots, and pigeons. * Birds smaller than a chicken, such as quail and pigeon. * Large birds such as turkeys, geese, peacocks, pheasants. | 19 | 7263, 7265, 7370, 7284, 7293, 7320, 7289, 7336, 7300, 7381, 7254, 7478, 7476, 7409, 7505, 7511, 7537, 7559, 7574 (Tamahere Community Committee) | Noted. |
| 1. Respondents feel that all birds (anything with feathers) or domesticated fowl should be included in the definition of poultry. | 15 | 7264, 7270, 7362, 7375, 7347, 7401, 7426, 7431, 7477, 7302, 7306, 7251, 7319, 7364, 7574 (Tamahere Community Committee) | Noted. |
| 1. Respondents have argued that bird size should be a determinant of whether we define a bird as poultry. Birds larger than chickens e.g. peacocks, turkeys, pheasants, geese that require more space, are noisier, and can be aggressive should impact the definition of poultry, should not be allowed in urban or lifestyle areas. 2. A bird that typically requires a large area to roam around in and nest should be restricted. 3. Less common birds need to be limited less than chickens. | 12 | 7373, 7318, 7365, 7408, 7414, 7418, 7326, 7259, 7249, 7368, 7429, 7530 | Noted. |
| 1. Respondents suggest that there be reasonable control and/or housing requirements and that poultry be confined to owner’s property be added to the Bylaw.. | 7 | 7446, 7395, 7434, 7299 (Avian Wildlife Rehabilitation Trust), 7307, 7445, 7571 | Noted. |
| f) Respondents felt that a response was dependent on whether the birds were going to be located on urban, lifestyle, or rural properties and whether they were free-range or would be kept in an aviary. | 6 | 7247, 7250, 7480, 7338, 7399, 7512 | Noted. |
| g) Miscellaneous comments include:   * Puukekos are a pest and need controlling. * Budgies etc are fine but it’s not great for our eco-system if they escape. * Breeding and saving the rarest breeds of poultry from extinction in NZ. * Only chickens should be considered poultry. * This should be about animal welfare and how the animal is kept. * Poultry is already defined in the dictionary, is it being suggested that the language be changed? | 11 | 7288, 7402, 7350, 7376, 7437, 7257, 7386, 7453, 7551, 7552, 7572 | Noted. Puukekos are partially protected and can only be shot during hunting season. Any request to cull puukekos would require permission from the Department of Conservation. |
| Respondents oppose limits in Bylaw because people should be able to keep whatever pets they want, and each situation should be judged on its individual merit. | 13 | 7389, 7393, 7418, 7432, 7485, 7422, 7486, 7496, 7501, 7502, 7529, 7553, 7563 | Noted. |

**10. What is your preferred limit for the number of poultry (including chickens) you would be comfortable allowing in our urban areas?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **0** | **1-3** | **4-6** | **7-9** | **10-12** | **13+** | **No response** | **Total** |
| **Properties in urban areas, less than 550m2** | 43 | 91 | 82 | 22 | 12 | 30 | 26 | 306 |
| **Properties in urban areas, more than 550m2** | 15 | 41 | 61 | 36 | 48 | 78 | 27 | 306 |

## **11. Is there anything else you’d like us to consider?**

| **Topic** | **Comments** | **Respondent** | **Staff comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rules for bees  (Total respondents: 13) | Respondents feel that hives or large, commercial apiaries (more than 20 hives in one apiary) should be required to get a resource consent or be registered with Council. | 7262 (Westwind Farm), 7308, 7425, 7296 | Hives are already required to be registered with MPI under the Biosecurity Act 1993 and APINZ, no requirement for them to also be registered with Council. |
| The Bylaw should emphasise the legal obligation to register beehives under the Biosecurity Act 1993. | 7300, 7308, 7250, 7422, 7422, 7453 | The 2021 Bylaw includes an advisory note stating that beekeepers must register their beehives. |
|  | Other miscellaneous comments from respondents include:   * asking what nuisance bees are creating that the 25m setback is managing? what research and consultation with the beekeeping associations are these requirements based on? * putting hives against a 1.8m closed-board fence will result in bees flying that high until they locate a food-source. * disagree with setback limits for beehives. * bees are a danger to animals as they get into their feed bins. | 7309, 7532, 7545, 7572 | Noted. |
|  | A submission has been received from the Tamahere Community Committee and they have advised that restrictions of beehive positioning is not sensible, beehives need to be positioned for bee health and survival. | 7574 (Tamahere Community Committee) | Noted. |
| Rules for Cats  (Total respondents: 26) | Respondents feel that all or some of the following should be implemented for cats:   * limiting numbers per household * microchipped/registered * cat free areas around gully systems/native bush * curfew * contained on their own properties * desexed. * It is suggested that Council should supply traps and free vet costs for putting feral/stray cats to sleep. * Ability for neighbours to seek compensation for damages caused by cat/s. | 7264, 7251, 7423 (Go Eco), 7247, 7443, 7328, 7381, 7354, 7427, 7251, 7448, 7510, 7361, 7360 (Pack Group), 7454 (Predator Free NZ Trust), 7512, 7515, 7519, 7522, 7359, 7568, 7354, 7277 | The proposed Bylaw doesn’t currently have any guidelines around cats.  **Staff recommendation**  It is not recommended that Council include any guidelines around cats in the proposed Bylaw. Council doesn’t have the capacity to monitor the number of cats someone may have and whether they are de-sexed, microchipped etc. We also do not have the ability to enforce/fine people who do not follow the Bylaw and we wouldn’t prosecute as it’s too expensive. |
| Respondents are concerned about the lack of distinction between stray and feral cats and prohibiting aid being given to stray and/or feral cats. | 7274, 7552 | Noted. |
| Respondent feels that stray cats have a significant impact on native wildlife, emphasizing the urgency of addressing the issue. | 7443 | Noted. |
|  | The SPCA has made a submission regarding cats which is summarised below:   * Supports mandatory desexing of all cats by four months of age, exempt registered breeding animals. * Supports mandatory microchipping and registration of all cats by four months of age. * If limiting the number of cats per dwelling, suggest limit no lower than three. * Advocates for cat owners to keep cats on their own properties. * Urges Council to improve their tracking of nuisance roaming cats, including property damage, spraying, fighting, defecating on neighbouring properties. | 7541 (SPCA) | Noted. |
| Feedback regarding Council  (Total respondents: 37) | Council should build a sense of community where neighbours can communicate and work together for a solution. | 7251, 7422, 7563 | Noted. |
| Council should stop the regulations, relax them further, or not even have a bylaw. Complaints could be dealt with on a case by case basis through a clear process. | 7306, 7389, 7405, 7420, 7424, 7431, 7485, 7419, 7451, 7473, 7501, 7502, 7515, 7469, 7529, 7523, 7542, 7543, 7553, 7479, 7500, 7544, 7373, 7396, 7400 | Noted. |
| Council needs to be clearer around what enforcement action/penalties will be applied against people who breach the Bylaw and Council should actually monitor the Bylaw. | 7258, 7352, 7489 | Noted. |
| Some feedback suggests that Council should be focusing on:   * crucial matters * spending money on essential things * their role and stay away from this issue. | 7422, 7486, 7496, 7563, 7571 | Noted. |
| Miscellaneous comments suggest:   * that property owner’s rights should be considered that some properties have covenants, so which rules should people adhere to? * The Bylaw process should be better publicised. * Animal husbandry is an essential skill to keep alive. | 7474, 7524, 7371, 7451 |  |
| Setbacks  (Total respondents: 15) | Setbacks should not be based on distance from neighbouring dwellings. Current setbacks are unrealistic. | 7271, 7373, 7293, 7324, 7255, 7350, 7419, 7300, 7508, 7494, 7518, 7338 | Noted. |
| It is suggested that no pens or anything should be on a boundary. All animals should be kept within own property, not on shared driveways etc. | 7269 | Noted. |
| Respondents unclear how Council confirms that these setbacks are adhered to. | 7250, 7450 | Noted. |
| Poultry  (Total respondents: 17) | Respondents feel that everyone should be allowed poultry for eggs and that this Bylaw shouldn’t make it harder for people on lifestyle properties to have chickens. | 7441, 7483, 7289 | Noted. |
| The issue of how many chickens someone can keep has been raised with some respondents feeling that numbers should be based on welfare standards and others feeling that chickens shouldn’t be kept in singles. It was also mentioned that baby chickens shouldn’t be included in the count until they reach adulthood. It is suggested that the current limits do not reflect research recommendations. | 7272, 7308, 7367, 7570, 7340, 7567 | Noted. |
| Respondent believes that chickens/poultry should not be allowed on urban properties or properties smaller than 5,000m2 as flies and rats come around. | 7349 (Dickenson Family Trust), 7433, 7440 | Noted. |
| Respondents believes that chickens should be contained in cages away from a boundary to minimise noise, rats, general waste, and nuisance to people. | 7339, 7537 | Noted. |
| Miscellaneous feedback received includes:   * ducks/wild ducks should not be kept as pets as they cause a nuisance to neighbours * chickens should be allowed at rental properties without having to get a landlords permission * respondent asks why there was no poultry category for lifestyle or rural properties? | 7438, 7353, 7271 | Noted and this is between the renter and landlord and not a Council decision. |
| Lifestyle/rural areas  (Total respondents: 10) | Respondents feel that people who buy in the country should not complain about the smells from animals, you’re purchasing the rural lifestyle. | 7303, 7314, 7327, 7255, 7338, 7399, 7480 | Noted. |
| Pigs should have limited numbers in lifestyle areas and distance rules. | 7249 | Noted. |
|  | Respondent unsure how changes would affect small communities that are away from urban areas. | 7535 | Noted. |
| Lifestyle blocks should not be treated as an extension of rural zones. Applications should be required to keep certain animals in rural and lifestyle zones and Council should conduct onsite visits. | 7559 | Noted. |
| Fencing/keeping to owners’ property  (Total respondents: 8) | Poultry should be kept within their own property with suitable fencing. | 7294, 7351, 7417, 7447, 7308, 7386, 7557 | Noted. |
| The number of animals allowed to be kept should be dependent on the type of animal and the land size. | 7387 | Noted. |
| Council should not limit our ability to feed ourselves or be self-sufficient, enjoy our property, earn a living, educate the next generation or keep beloved pets. | 7270, 7329, 7346, 7441, 7509, 7566, 7571, 7351, 7498, 7395, 7396 | Noted. |
| Horses  (Total respondents: 7) | The wording for keeping horses mentions a registered breeder or kept in a stable. Respondents have requested that we define what a stable is and have also mentioned that keeping horses should be aligned with the Animal Welfare Act 1999. A property of 2,500m2 is capable of sustaining horses, provided they are managed correctly. | 7312, 7253, 7254, 7430, 7552, 7273 | Noted.  **Staff recommendations**  It is recommended that clause 9.1(b) in the proposed Bylaw be updated to include “on a property that has available” a stable…. |
| Horses are not urban animals and need access to space and grass to stretch their legs. | 7516 | Noted. |
| Neighbour  (Total respondents: 5) | Community members should be able to have a conversation with Council and neighbours around further allowances of keeping livestock, where reasonable. | 7281, 7295 | Noted. |
| Animals should be kept with neighbours in mind and any issues addressed with the individuals concerned. One ‘grinch’ shouldn’t have an impact. | 7271, 7413, 7520 (Chipperfield Alpacas) | Noted. |
| Animal welfare  (Total respondents: 5) | Respondents are concerned with animal welfare. Animals need space and some of the smaller sections don’t allow for this. Any bylaws should be linked to animal welfare guidance, including animal housing standards. | 7280, 7289, 7527, 7531 | Noted. |
| Include powers of inspection so animal welfare can be assessed. | 7429 | Noted. |
| Out of scope – changing zones/land feedback  (Total respondents: 3) | Respondent would likeRiver Road changed to lifestyle. | 7268 | Out of scope. |
| Stop building subdivisions on fertile land. | 7363 | Out of scope. |
| Respondent doesn’t see why they shouldn’t be allowed to keep their animals, which they are caring for appropriately, when their land has become part of a newly developed subdivision. | 7391 | Out of scope. |
| Urban areas  (Total respondents: 2) | Respondent would like to see a minimum land area for animals kept in urban areas. For medium or high-density housing there should be tighter rules. | 7276 | Noted. |
| Respondent believes that more accountability is required for excessive odour from dairy farms close to dense lifestyle villages. | 7369 | Noted. |
| Communal/papakaainga housing  (Total respondents: 1) | Respondent would like Council to give consideration to communal/papakaainga housing. Organic waste is a huge issue, chickens/pigs can help with that. | 7304 | Noted. |
| Fireworks  (Total respondents: 1) | Fireworks should be prohibited due to risk of fire and animal welfare. | 7274 | Noted. |
| Racing pigeons  (Total respondents: 1) | Pigeon Racing New Zealand Inc provided an attachment for their submission referring Council to section 7.5 Racing Pigeons of the South Waikato District Council Bylaw.  They also refer Council to their Code of [Practice](https://www.prnz.org.nz/images/stories/prnzdocs/prnz%20code%20of%20practice.pdf) which provides guidelines/expectations around the keeping of pigeons. | 7415 (Pigeon Racing New Zealand Inc) | Noted. |
| Sheep  (Total respondents: 1) | Please sort out the keeping of sheep and rubbish that attracts rats before worrying about beehives. | 7390 | Noted. |
| Processing honey  (Total respondents: 2) | Existing Bylaw doesn’t allow for the processing of honey, registered beekeepers should be able to process honey in an approved facility on their own property, especially if the property is rural. | 7450, 7574 (Tamahere Community Committee) | Noted. |
| Definitions  (Total respondents: 1) | Council needs to define nuisance and appropriate (e.g. appropriate measures) as these are too ambiguous. | 7277 | Noted. |
| Retroactive enforcement of rule changes  (Total respondents: 1) | Respondent opposed to culling animals that were compliant with the previous Bylaw that are not with the potential new one. | 7319 | Noted. |

## **Out of scope**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Respondent** | **Staff comments** |
| Dogs | 7263, 7266, 7320, 7506, 7249, 7348, 7344, 7372 (Waikino School), 7377, 7449, 7245, 7360 (Pack Group), 7396, 7286, 7425, 7249, 7532, 7523, 7383, 7391, 7249, 7387, 7391, 7449, 7245, 7391, 7564. | Dogs are covered under the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy, and therefore do not need to be included. |