



Minutes of a meeting of the Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber, 26 Gordon Street, Dannevirke on Wednesday 7 August 2024 commencing at 9:30am.

1. Present

Councillor S M Wards (Chairperson), Her Worship the Mayor - Mrs T H Collis, Crs E L Peeti-Webber (Deputy Mayor), N L Chase, A K Franklin, S M Gilmore, P A Johns, M F Long, K A Sutherland, and S A Wallace

In Attendance

Mr D Batley	- Evergreen Consulting
Mr B Nicholson	- Chief Executive
Mr R Suppiah	- Group Manager – Corporate and Regulatory
Mrs K Tani	- Group Manager – Strategy and Community Wellbeing
Mr H Featonby	- Group Manager - Infrastructure
Ms G Nock	- Strategy and Corporate Planning Manager
Mr K van der Oord	- Communications Team Manager
Mr J Single	- Regulatory Services Manager
Ms J Wood	- Team Leader Compliance and Monitoring
Ms A Charmley	- Planning Services Manager
Ms A Rule	- Policy and Planning Advisor
Mrs A Dunn	- Manager – Democracy Services

2. Reflection

At the invitation of the Chairperson, Councillor Johns on the life of Joyce McIntyre, who passed away recently at the age of 100. He acknowledged her service to the community over the years, richly deserving of the Civic Honour she was awarded in 2014.

3. Welcome and Meeting Opening

The Chairperson opened the meeting with a prayer.

4. Apologies

There were no apologies.

5. Public Forum

There were no requests for public forum.

6. Notification of Items Not on the Agenda

Nil

7. Declarations of Conflicts of Interest in Relation to this Meeting's Items of Business

Nil

8. Confirmation of Minutes

That the minutes of the Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee meeting held on 24 April 2024 (as circulated) be confirmed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

Sutherland/Long

Carried

9. Reports

9.2 District Strategy Review

The Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee considered the report of the Strategy and Corporate Planning Manager dated 18 July 2024 which sought direction to implement changes to the District Strategy, with an overarching goal to ensure the strategy remained relevant, transparent, and aligned with community needs. It was also noted that, additionally, the changes agreed upon in the Long-Term Plan process would need to be formally adopted in the District Strategy. The Strategy and Corporate Planning Manager clarified the specific changes that had been made.

That the report from the Strategy and Corporate Planning Manager dated 18 July 2024 concerning the District Strategy Review be received.

That the Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee approve the changes that were workshopped prior to the Long Term Plan. This ensures that any changes in the Long Term Plan are reflected in the District Strategy, maintaining coherence and consistency.

9.2 **Update on the Proposed District Plan Review and Part B of the Urban Design Better Off Funding Project**

The Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee considered the report of the Team Leader Planning Services dated 23 July 2024 which provided an update on the progress of the delivery plan for the proposed district plan review and Part B of the Urban Design Better Off Funding Project. An update was circulated, noting that the community workshops that had been proposed for August 2024, would now be rescheduled for September 2024. It was noted that the rescheduling would not affect the proposed district plan review programme.

That the report from the Team Leader Planning Services dated 23 July 2024 concerning the Update on the Proposed District Plan Review and Part B of the Urban Design Better Off Funding Project be received.

Johns/Peeti-Webber

Carried

9.3 **Policy and Bylaw Update**

The Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee considered the report of the Policy and Planning Advisor dated 02 July 2024, which provided an update on the policies and bylaws work programme. It was noted that the tables originally included in the report had not transferred through to the published version of the agenda, and a copy of those tables was circulated to members.

That the report from the Policy and Planning Advisor dated 02 July 2024 concerning the Policy and Bylaw Update be received.

Franklin/Gilmore

Carried

The meeting adjourned at 10:11am and reconvened at 10:41am.

10.4 **Hearing of Submissions on proposed Keeping of Animals Bylaw, Alcohol Bylaw, Cemeteries Bylaw, Public Places Bylaw**

10.4.1 **Submission #001 Health NZ**

Gillian Anderson, from Health New Zealand, gave a presentation, highlighting the following from their submission:

- Agrees that this bylaw remains important;
- Outlined the alcohol harms to the community;
- Supported the continuation of the bylaw and the suggested wording changes; and

- Proposed that Council develop a Local Alcohol Policy as complementary to the Alcohol Bylaw.

10.4.2 **Submission #113 Tararua College**

Phil Marsh on behalf of Tararua College, spoke to their submission. He noted that their senior students that manage their school farm were not available to attend due to their involvement in the seven aside tournament. He outlined their opposition to changes proposed in the Keeping of Animals Bylaw that would impact the Kelly Beech Agricultural Unit. He asked that they be exempted from requirements, noting the additional costs that the unit would need to meet. He outlined the compliance hurdles they already complied with, through Ministry of Primary Industries and the like. He noted that they change their operations on the agricultural unit every year, and were concerned about any requirement to continually apply for permits due to their change in operations each year.

10.4.3 **Submission #123 Federated Farmers**

Sally Dryland on behalf of Federated Farmers regarding the draft Keeping of Animals Bylaw, spoke about their concerns with putting in bylaws and additional regulations. She advised that it was unclear to them about why Council was proposing banning specific animals in the urban area. She asked that clause 5.2 be removed, as clause 5.1 from the old law covered everything that was required. They were comfortable with clause 5.4 being included. Regarding bees, she submitted that Council should not be including its own rules as beekeepers were already required to comply with other rules. She submitted that the additional requirements for keeping of cats should be removed. As a farmer they did not want wild cats, but were concerned that cat owners would be discouraged from desexing their cats due to the cost of including microchipping in the requirements. She felt that Council should help by providing cat cages to help with trapping. She spoke in opposition to proposed clause 10, keeping of animals in urban area. She believed that roosters should be the only one that should be added in to poultry section. Noted many retired farmers kept animals within the urban boundary and this bylaw may alienate them, commenting that no one likes to ask for permission for what to do on their property. With regard to the proposed rule about feeding feral animals, she advised that rooks were pre-fed prior to poisoning so this rule would seem to prevent that. Similarly, rabbits and other pests including possums, deer, and goats were also pre-fed prior to poisoning. With regard to clause 12.2 she asked whether that clause would include migration of animals, such as deer. With regard to the proposed permits, she felt it was unclear as to who would need to obtain one and what the cost would be. If there is a cost of \$100 for a permit, she did not believe that would cover the full cost, so questioned whether it would be money well spent. With regard to clause 15.1 she expressed concern about a change in neighbour leading to a change in permit activity. With regard to the section on offenses, as no timeline was specified in the draft bylaw, she asked whether as soon as the bylaw was signed, would people be in breach, and then would it be the discretion of staff as to whether action was taken. In closing she felt there should have been

more data provided supporting what Council was trying to achieve through this bylaw.

10.4.4 **Submission #003 Federated Farmers**

Sally Dryland on behalf of Federated Farmers regarding the draft Public Places Bylaw, expressed concern about how they already have requirements for compliance for traffic management plans, stock effluent and expressed concern that the bylaw would be putting additional requirements in place for farmers. She felt there should be more education for best practice for stock crossings rather than another permit to apply for. With regard to repairs for roads, the state of the road beforehand should be taken into account. She advised that she was disappointed about the length of the consultation on the bylaws, as it was difficult to engage with their members until the content of the consultation was available.

10.4.5 **Submission #027 and #087 Randall and Annette Gerrand**

Randall and Annette Gerrand noted they own a lifestyle property just out of Pahiatua, which was in the urban area under three titles, totalling 10 acres. They noted their property was previously zoned rural when purchased 37 years ago. They graze horses, rams, sheep cows and poultry, and use their property for a food source. They have good fences with a hot top wire and have never had any problems with animals escaping. They keep a ram and have not had any problems with the ram attacking anyone. They understand that such animals could be a nuisance on small properties, but on their property their nearest neighbours are rural, with the nearest urban neighbour being 400 metres from their chook house and have never had any complaints raised against the operations at their property. They were concerned about the bylaw change impacting on their finances and mental wellbeing, through not being able to keep horses. They understood the need to control animals on small section in the middle of town but believes if people have over a hectare of land, they should be exempt. Concerned that only sheep would be able to be grazed in urban areas as this would impact on the animals kept on their property. In closing they noted that although their property was zoned urban, they have no connection to services.

10.4.6 **Submission #178 Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals**

Dr Christine Sumner spoke on behalf of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. She shared a presentation highlighting the following points from their submission:

- Benefits of desexing cats;
- Breaking the cycle of cat over-population;
- Encourage desexing of cats before puberty and asks Council to lower the age of desexing to four months;
- Noted 19 Councils have cat number limits, eight councils have

requirements for desexing and microchipping, 1 that has desexing only and 1 that has microchipping only.

The meeting adjourned at 12:05pm and reconvened at 12:59pm.

10.4.7 **Submission #226 Forest and Bird**

Amelia Geary spoke on behalf of Forest and Bird, noting their submission was similar to the submission from SPCA and endorsed the position they raised. Their submission was on keeping of cats, and made the following points:

- Noted the inclusion of commonly used cat management tools and how these complement each other for when officers respond to complaints regarding cats;
- Noted the wide range that cats can roam, of up to 30 kms, which impacts on urban and rural cats' locations;
- Supports desexing of cats at four months of age;
- Asks that funding be allocated to providing information to the community about council expectations about cat ownership, and to provide funding towards snip and chip programmes in the district;
- She noted that Wellington City Council actively manages stray cat populations.

10.4.8 **Submission #230 Leah Wilson**

Leah Wilson noted that she was speaking, not submitting and gave her understanding of the term "submit". She spoke about what she has learned about governments and corporates, and her belief that these corporations set out to harm people. She spoke about concepts that she believed in that aligned to the sovereign belief system. She outlined her concerns that the bylaw lacks elements to be a lawful and binding contract. She believed the bylaws lacked clarity and gave no certainty to the receiver.

10.4.9 **Submission #231 Predator Free NZ**

Jessi Morgans spoke on behalf of Predator Free New Zealand in support of the progressive stance towards cat control in the bylaw. She noted that it would set an expectation of what reasonable cat ownership looks like. She acknowledged that cats were important companions, but they also had a devastating effect on our wildlife. Desexing would prevent unwanted kittens, microchipping would allow for cats to be returned to their owner in the event that they were lost and would allow for better control of feral cats in areas near urban settlements. She recommended that Council invest in an education campaign in the community, partner with vets, include information on its website, and provide time for people to adapt to the new requirements. They also recommended that Council investigate partnering with the SPCA for snip and chip campaigns. In response to

a question regarding their submission on implementing a phased in approach, she noted that Wellington City allowed a 12-month period in association with an education campaign. She noted that in Ruapehu DC, New Plymouth DC both had restrictions for feeding or attracting feral cats. In conclusion she noted the importance of controlling stray cat populations.

10.4.10 Submission #100 Hennie Verwaayen

Hennie Verwaayen expressed concern with the proposed Keeping of Animals Bylaw, and although not affected directly by the proposed changes, he advised he was against any time being spent on implementing bylaws that control cats. He believed that there were already good laws in place that could deal with any issues that impacted on neighbours from adjoining properties. There were also laws in place that deal with animal rights, that applied to both rural and urban people. He believed that the bylaw would increase bureaucracy and compliance requirements. He did not believe there was anything in the bylaw that was Tararua specific. In response to clarification about the purpose of a bylaw to control nuisance that was covered by other legislation, he believed the Government should pass laws to cover matters that impacted the whole country. With regard the council's business model, he believed Council needed to reduce its expenditure to suit the ability of the community by sticking to the basics.

10.4.11 Submission #227 Totally Vets

Robyn Howe spoke on behalf of Totally Vets regarding their submission on the draft Keeping of Animals Bylaw. She spoke about her experience with handling of male animals through her work in the Tararua Breeding Centre. She spoke about the fencing of the property where their work is undertaken. She noted they supported the rules and concept of farming animals in an urban environment, however noted there were no smell or noise issues from other animals except bucks and stags. From a safety point of view, she noted that all sexes of animals could be dangerous and therefore the focus should be on fencing and containment requirements.

10.4.12 Submission #187 Dannevirke A&P

Kirstin Wahlberg spoke on behalf of the Dannevirke A&P Association. She noted that she was alerted by Federated Farmers on 26 July regarding the Bylaw review and was concerned that many people were not aware of the review. She believed the bylaw was putting in too much control and spoke about her beliefs in concepts that saw laws as enslaving people, and her belief that the bylaw was a pattern of council overreach into their lives that they do not accept. She spoke about her beliefs that Council actions equated to actions of servitude. She gave Council five working days to prove the bylaw did not breach the Crimes Act 1961.

10.4.13 Submission #228 BS Ranch

Bec Smith of BS Ranch spoke to her submission regarding the draft Keeping of Animals Bylaw. She advised that she was a beef farmer, and leased family land

for this purpose. One of these blocks was on 16 acres on High Street in Dannevirke and had been a working farm since late 1800s. Over the years Councils had tinkered with the zoning, which now saw this land as being zoned half rural and half urban. She was concerned that the proposed bylaw would put her business at risk. Her objection was about being told what to do on her own land, and noted she already abided with rules on animal wellbeing. She believed the stock grazing rules would make farming her land not possible. She felt that if people chose to move next to an existing farm, then they need to understand that there would be animals and noise on that land. She asked that Council reconsider the proposed bylaw.

10.4.14 **Submission #149 and 150 BJ and Barry Crosse**

BJ and Barry Crosse spoke to their submissions regarding the draft Keeping of Animals Bylaw. BJ spoke about their love for the community and purchasing their 1.4 hectare property. On their property they keep horses and other stock. She was concerned that the proposed bylaw would penalise their ability to keep stock on their property. Barry spoke about the proposed restriction on keeping specified male animals in the urban area. He felt that the honest people would comply with the requirements but not everyone would do so. With regard to complaints, he believed that neighbours should discuss any problems with animal behaviour between them.

That the report from the Manager - Democracy Services dated 29 July 2024 concerning the Hearing of Submissions on proposed Keeping of Animals Bylaw, Alcohol Bylaw, Cemeteries Bylaw, Public Places Bylaw be received.

Wallace/Chase

Carried

13. Items not on the Agenda

1 Nil

There being no further business the Chairperson thanked those present for their attendance and contributions, and declared the meeting closed at 2:29pm.

Chairperson