

Summary of submissions **Domestic Animal Policy, Dog Policy and Animal Bylaw Review** April 2024



Contents

Executive summary	1
Who were the submitters?.....	1
Raising public awareness of the formal consultation	2
Oral hearings	3
Summary of final recommendations and results at a glance	4
A recap of early engagement	13
<i>Dogs</i>	13
<i>Cats</i>	14
<i>Other animals</i>	14
Formal consultation	15
Analysis of submissions	15
<i>Part 1: Dogs</i>	15
Proposal: Implement a Draft Action Plan.	15
Proposal 1: Expand off-leash provision across ten suburbs in Wellington.	17
Proposal 2: Allow off-leash access to Oriental Bay Beach during off-peak hours (before 10 am and after 7 pm) in the warmer months (1 November – 30 April).....	21
Proposal 3: Restrict dogs from the Wishing Well Area grassy area at Oriental Bay Parade.	24
Proposal 4: Swap around the “off-leash” and “prohibited” areas at Island Bay Beach.	26
Proposal 5: Change the “prohibited” requirement for Kaiwharawhara Park to “on leash” at all times.....	29
Proposal 6a: Modify the configuration of existing off-leash areas to enhance children’s play spaces in Tawa.....	30
Proposal 6b: Modify the configuration of existing off-leash areas to enhance children’s play spaces in Johnsonville.	32
Proposal 7a: Convert Waimapihi Reserve from off-leash to ‘on-leash’ to support wildlife conservation at the reserve	34
Proposal 7b: Convert off-leash area with ‘on-leash’ requirements to reduce user conflict at Hataitai Park (Alexandra Roadside only).	36
Follow-up question: How do you feel about keeping Hataitai Park (Ruahine Street) as an off-leash area even if it does not have a roadside fence?	37
Proposal 8: Rename the “Responsible Dog Owner Status” to “Accredited Dog Owner Licence”	39
Proposal 9: Decouple the proposed Accredited Dog Owner Criteria from the Dog Policy.	40
Proposal 10: Various changes to the Accredited Dog Owner criteria.....	41

Proposal 11: Introduce a requirement for dog owners to carry effective means of waste disposal in public places.....	43
Proposal 12: Introduce a “Dog-Friendly Wellington” section into the Dog Policy.	45
Proposal 13: Introduce level of service categories for off-leash areas (Destination, Community, and Local).....	47
<i>Part 2: Cats</i>	48
Proposal 14: Introduce a bylaw requirement for the mandatory desexing of cats.....	48
<i>Other public suggestions for further regulations of cats</i>	49
<i>Part 3 - Other Animals</i>	51
Proposal 15: Clarify that written permission is not required to keep poultry, bees, or stock in rural areas.	51
Proposal 16: Clarify the scope of birds categorised as ‘poultry’ in the bylaw.....	52
Proposal 17: Specify the types of poultry allowed in residential areas without prior permission.	53
Proposal 18: Introduce new conditions for keeping poultry.....	54
Proposal 19: Introduce a cap of four beehives in residential areas without the need for written permission.....	55
Proposal 20: Allow the Council to require the removal or relocation of hives if they cause a nuisance.....	56
Proposal 21: Introduce requirement that beekeeping on Council land must occur within licensed community garden areas.	57
Proposal 22: Reference legal requirements under the Biosecurity Act into the Bylaw.	58
Proposal 23: Introduce bylaw definition for stock.....	59
Proposal 24: Require prior written permission for keeping stock in residential areas....	60
Proposal 25: Introduce new condition requirements for keeping stock.	61
Appendix A - Copy of organisations submissions	63
Paul Ward on behalf of Capital Kiwi	64
Sally Cory on behalf of New Zealand Veterinary Association & Companion Animals Veterinarians Branch.....	66
John Burnet on behalf of Wellington Beekeepers Association	67
David Lloyd on behalf of Companion Animals New Zealand.....	68
Karin Kos on behalf of Apiculture New Zealand	70
Karen Stacie Martyn on behalf of Church of Flying Spaghetti Monster	72
Bronwen Shepherd on behalf of Te Ahumairangi Ecological Restoration.....	72
Andrew Meehan on behalf of ONZM Oriental Bay Residents Association.....	72
Myfanwy Hill on behalf of Urban Wildlife Trust	72
Jo Ledington on behalf of Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne	73

Miriam Moore on behalf of Tawa Community Board.....	74
Willowbank Reserve Care Group.....	74
Gary Beecroft on behalf of Friends of Tawa Bush Reserves.....	76
Arnja Dale on behalf of Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA).....	79
Anke Atkins on behalf of Oriental Bay Residence Association	83
Steve Glassey on behalf of Animal Evacuation New Zealand Trust	83
Judie Alison on behalf of Predator Free Ngaio	86
Myfanwy Hill on behalf of Greater Wellington Regional Council – Environmental Operations	88
Claire Bibby on behalf of Glenside Association	89
Bruce Patterson on behalf of Grenada Village Community Association.....	90
Carol West on behalf of Ōtari- Wilton’s Bush Trust Board (OWBTB).....	91
Kate Littin on behalf of Forest and Bird, Kerry Shaw on behalf of Wellington Branch of Forest & Bird Places for Penguins	92
Lisa Snow on behalf of the Island Bay Dog Beach Users Group.....	97
Dave Harkness on behalf of Capital BMX	99
Appendix B – List of individual submitters	101
Dogs	101
Cats	125
Other animals	134

Executive summary

On 31 August 2023, the Social, Cultural, and Economic Committee provided approval to enter public consultation on the draft Dog Policy, Domestic Animal Policy, and Animal Bylaw between **18 September** and **October 18, 2023**.

A **total of 25 proposals** were presented and are summarised in the [Statement of Proposal](#). These encompassed a wide range of topics, from seeking public input on new exercise areas to proposing mandatory desexing of cats and introducing beehive limits in residential areas. A list of all formal consultation questions is available in table 3 (p. 8).

We received a total of **3,139 submissions**, including input from **24 organisations**, marking this review as one of the council's largest response rates in any consultation. We extend our gratitude to all submitters for their thoughtful and valuable input into the development of these policies and bylaws.

Who were the submitters?

The consultation process did not request information regarding gender, age, or ethnicity. The key demographic information collected during the surveys included:

- Full name of submitter (full list is available in **appendix B**).
- Submitter's animal ownership status (ie whether the submitter owned an animal or not).
- Name of organisation, if applicable.
- Suburb (to assist with analysing place-based questions).

The full submissions are available separately. However for ease we have included the submissions from the 24 organisations as **appendix A** and all submitter names as **appendix B**.

Table 1: Submissions by animal ownership

Animal ownership served as a crucial demographic variable in analysing submissions and assessing support levels for each proposal. The division between owners and non-owners was factored in when evaluating overall percentage support.

Animal	Owner	Non-owner	Split	Total
Dog	1685	470	80/20	2155
Cat	277	310	50/50	587
Poultry	39	114	25/75	153
Bee	15	125	10/90	140
Stock	12	92	10/90	104
Total	2028	1111	65/35	<u>3139</u>

Table 2: Submissions by organisation

A total of 24 organisations provided feedback during formal consultation. Table 2 outlines the topics each organisation provided feedback on. The full submissions are available in **appendix A**.

Organisation	Dogs	Cats	Other animals
1. Animal Evacuation New Zealand Trust	✓	✓	
2. Apiculture New Zealand			✓
3. Capital BMX Club Inc	✓		
4. Capital Kiwi			
5. Central Allbreeds Dog Training	✓		
6. Church of the Flying Spaghetti Monster	✓		
7. Companion Animals New Zealand		✓	
8. Forest and Bird and Places for Penguins	✓	✓	
9. Friend of the Tawa Bush Reserve	✓		
10. Glenside Association	✓	✓	✓
11. Grenada Village Community Association	✓		
12. Greater Wellington Regional Council, Environmental Operations	✓	✓	✓
13. Island Bay Dog Beach Users	✓		
14. New Zealand Veterinary Association & Companion Animals Veterinarians Branch		✓	
15. Oriental Bay Residents Association (x 2)	✓		
16. Ōtari-Wilton's Bush Trust Board	✓		✓
17. Predator Free Ngaio	✓	✓	
18. Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA)	✓	✓	✓
19. Tawa Community Board	✓		
20. Te Ahumairangi Ecological Restoration	✓	✓	
21. Urban Wildlife Trust	✓	✓	✓
22. Wellington Beekeepers Association			✓
23. Willowbank Reserve Care Group	✓		
24. Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne	✓	✓	
Total	18	10	8

Raising public awareness of the formal consultation

To ensure we heard from a mix of both animal and non-animal owners, all messaging emphasised: “We want to hear from you, whether you own an animal or not”. The following methods were used to raise public awareness of the consultation:

A Facebook [photo competition](#) was held to encourage dog owners to submit photos of their pets for inclusion in the policy, replacing the use of stock photos. This post reached 30,000 individuals and we received 600 entries.

- Multiple releases in Our Wellington and Resident Wrap newsletters (including '[Absolutely Pawsitively Wellington](#)') with a total reach of approx. 6,500 people.
- Notification was given to 16,000 dog owners in the register.
- Placed A2 posters with QR codes at proposed off-leash sites throughout the city.
- Distributed posters, proposals, and surveys to vets, recreation centres, and libraries.
- Released "[Get those tails wagging: Best off-leash dog parks in Pōneke](#)" article.
- Sent direct emails sent to stakeholders for consultation reminders.
- Series of radio interviews and media inquiries as listed below.

Date	Type	Media outlet	Attended by:
27- Aug	Radio interview	NZME	Cr O'Neil
29-Aug	Radio interview	The Breeze	Cr O'Neil
29-Aug	Media enquiry	The Post	-
29-Aug	Media enquiry	Stuff	-
29-Aug	Radio interview	TVNZ Breakfast	Cr O'Neil
04-Sep	Media enquiry	NZME	-
04-Sep	Media enquiry	RNZ	-
08-Sep	Media enquiry	NZME	-

Oral hearings

Oral hearings from a total of 43 submitters were presented to the Social, Cultural, and Economic Hearings Panel on **November 1, 2023**. This was the opportunity for the public to address the committee regarding their written submissions on the Animal Bylaw, Dog Policy, and Domestic Animal Policy. This hearing was chaired by Councillor Abdurahman.

34 individuals and nine organisations provided oral submissions. The organisations include:

1. Capital BMX
2. Ōtari-Wilton's Bush Trust
3. Island Bay Dog Beach users group
4. Central Allbreeds Dog Training
5. Friends of the Tawa Bush Reserves
6. Beekeepers Association
7. Wellington Branch Forest & Bird
8. Tawa Community Board
9. Urban Wildlife Trust

The minutes of this hearing can be read online [Social, Cultural, and Economic Hearings Panel - 1 November 2023, 9.30 AM - Meetings - Wellington City Council](#)

Summary of final recommendations and results at a glance

Table 3 summarises each proposal, the questions asked, and the level of support received. It includes a brief rationale for the recommended response. Percentages are based on the total number of submitters who indicated a preference.

Table 3: Summary of proposals and final recommendations and results at a glance.

#	Proposal	Consultation pātai	Strongly / Support	Strongly / Do not support	Recommendation
DOGS					
n/a	Draft Action Plan	Explore opportunities to create an off-leash area with designated zones for dogs with different energy levels	1128 (75%)	383 (25%)	Proceed and integrate all actions into relevant business work programmes for completion within the next 5 years. - High benefit-to-cost ratio; for instance, website upgrades can enhance user experience with minimal resources. - Expected benefits realised in the short term.
		Continue to investigate options to establish an off-leash area in Miramar	982 (82%)	210 (18%)	
		Explore options for more frequent mowing and turf renovation for off-leash areas	1015 (77%)	306 (23%)	
		Investigate options to support a 'fencing installation programme' with a focus on sites adjacent to roads to enhance safety and usability	1522 (91%)	142 (9%)	
		Update the website by adding information about off-leash areas (image of the park, accessibility, parking)	1645 (94%)	97 (6%)	
		Evaluate off-leash signage for visibility and effectiveness upon entry	1398 (90%)	151 (10%)	
		Add off-leash areas to Google Maps, including descriptions and operating hours, to assist users	1678 (96%)	76 (4%)	

#	Proposal	Consultation pātai	Strongly / Support	Strongly / Do not support	Recommendation
		Assess the advantages of installing "etiquette boards" in popular exercise areas with frequent complaints	1284 (86%)	209 (14%)	
		Audit the number and placement of bins in dog-walking areas to improve the convenience of disposing of dog waste	1791 (97%)	62 (3%)	
1	Expand off-leash provision across ten suburbs	Caribbean Drive, Grenada North	877 (91%)	82 (9%)	Proceed expansion across eight suburbs: • Dog ownership has surged 39% since 2016 but provision has remained the same. • Supports the overall health and wellbeing of dogs, commended by SPCA. • Addresses the provision gap in Woodridge, Grenada Village, and Grenada North. • Provides fairer coverage to meet existing demand and expected growth. • Reasonable provision mitigates dogs being taken off-lead in inappropriate areas. Bins will be installed where practical at all locations that do not have waste disposal.
		Elliot Park, Brooklyn	985 (91%)	99 (9%)	
		Mark Avenue, Grenada Village	-	-	
		Mount Albert tracks, Berhampore	1220 (85%)	211 (15%)	
		Terrace Gardens, Wellington Central	1107 (86%)	178 (14%)	
		Trelissick Park, Ngaio (extends existing off-leash)	1204 (90%)	137 (10%)	
		Hauora Reserve, Woodridge	829 (90%)	96 (10%)	
		Wahinahina Reserve, Newlands (extends existing)	925 (90%)	104 (10%)	

#	Proposal	Consultation pātai	Strongly / Support	Strongly / Do not support	Recommendation
		Appleton Park, Karori	974 (90%)	109 (10%)	Maintain status quo due to a combination of user conflict and environmental concerns.
		Spicer Forest, Tawa	1025 (86%)	171 (14%)	
		How do you generally feel about the Council's focus to increase off-leash opportunities in response to the growing number of dogs in Wellington?	1682 (87%)	254 (13%)	Noted.
2	Allow off-leash access to Oriental Bay Beach during warmer months at off-peak times	How do you feel about the proposal to increase off-leash provision in the city centre by expanding the times at Oriental Bay Beach during off-peak hours (between 7 pm and 10 am) in the warmer months (1 November - 30 April)?	1361 (74%)	483 (26%)	Proceed with an amendment to scale back off-leash access exclusively to the eastern side of the rotunda during the warmer months at off-peak hours. Dogs would remain completely prohibited on the longer section of the beach.
3	Restrict dogs from the Wishing Well area at Oriental Bay	How do you feel about the proposal to prohibit dogs from the lawn area next to the Wishing Well on Oriental Parade in response to concerns about dog waste in the area?	861 (60%)	563 (40%)	Maintain status quo as per original advice.
4	Swap around the "off-leash" and "prohibited" areas at Island Bay Beach	How do you feel about the proposal to swap around the "off-leash" and "prohibited" areas at Island Bay Beach to minimise the impact of dogs on dune restoration and introduce seasonal specified times during the warmer months?	887 (62%)	541 (38%)	Maintain status quo: - Significant local resident pushback. - Alternative solutions preferred, including an educational campaign for dunes.
5	Change the prohibited status at Kaiwharawhara Park to 'on leash'	How do you feel about the proposal to modify the current "prohibited" requirement for Kaiwharawhara Park to "on leash at all times"?			Proceed Relatively minor change that provides better utilisation of space and brings

#	Proposal	Consultation pātai	Strongly / Support	Strongly / Do not support	Recommendation
			986 (85%)	174 (15%)	consistency with the existing policy regarding sports fields.
6	Modify two existing off-leash areas to enhance children's play spaces	How do you feel about the proposal to swap the existing off-leash area at Willowbank Reserve with the existing children's play area and designate an additional dog exercise area on the reserve?	583 (77%)	175 (23%)	Maintain status quo: Willowbank Park, Tawa Feedback preferred the existing location of the play area due to its unique characteristics.
		How do you feel about the proposal to modify the existing off-leash area at Flinders Place Recreation Reserve to accommodate the construction of a new fenced play area?	573 (86%)	93 (14%)	Proceed: Flinders Place, Johnsonville Addresses the play provision gap for Johnsonville West as identified in the Play Spaces Policy.
7	Convert two off-leash areas with 'on leash' requirements to reduce user conflict and support wildlife conservation.	How do you feel about the proposal to convert the off-leash designation at the entrance of Waimapihi Reserve to on-leash to support wildlife conservation at the reserve?	1039 (86%)	172 (14%)	Proceed - Relatively small area next to a busy road. - Next to on-leash reserve with high wildlife presence (neighbouring by Zealandia). - Nearby off-leash alternative at Tanera Park.
		How do you feel about the proposal to convert the off-leash designation at Hataitai Park (Alexandra Road) to on-leash to minimise user conflict?	640 (59%)	448 (41%)	Proceed - Area rated 'poor' during engagement. - Current conflict with mountain bike area.

#	Proposal	Consultation pātai	Strongly / Support	Strongly / Do not support	Recommendation
					Nearby off-leash alternative in Hataitai Park.
7	Follow-up question:	How do you feel about keeping Hataitai Park (Ruahine Street) as an off-leash area even if it does not have a roadside fence?	640 (58%)	470 (42%)	Maintain status quo - Large off-leash area (20,000+ sqm). - Local residents prefer to keep without a fence than lose the option altogether. - Land typography is difficult for other purposes.
8	Rename Responsible Dog Owner status to “Accredited Dog Owner” Licence	How do you feel about the proposal to rename the “Responsible Dog Owner” status to “Accredited Dog Owner” Licence? Note this name change will not impact the current entitlement of any holder.	723 (79%)	195 (21%)	Proceed with a minor amendment to change ‘licence’ terminology to ‘status’. Mitigates potential confusion with other licences issued by WCC, inc dog walking.
9	Decouple the Responsible Dog Owner criteria from the Dog Policy	How do you feel about the proposed change to decouple the proposed Accredited Dog Owner criteria from the Dog Policy and make the most current criteria accessible on the website?	985 (94%)	66 (6%)	Proceed Allows criteria updates without waiting for a formal policy review.
10	Other criteria changes to the Accredited Dog Owner scheme	Overall, how do you feel about the proposed criteria changes to the Accredited Dog Owner Licence?	708 (85%)	124 (15%)	Proceed Helps reduce barriers to access, particularly for those renting or living in apartments.

#	Proposal	Consultation pātai	Strongly / Support	Strongly / Do not support	Recommendation
11	Require dog owners to carry effective means of waste disposal in public places ¹	How do you generally feel about the focus to increase enforcement of dog waste management in Wellington?	1802 (95%)	97 (5%)	Proceed • Growing public demand for increased enforcement regarding dog fouling. • Requirement successfully adopted by Christchurch City Council in 2019². • Helps address complaints; absence of waste disposal indicates lack of intent to clean up. • Supported by Central Allbreeds, Glenside Association, Oriental Bay Residents Association, Willowbank Reserve Care Group, and Friends of Tawa Bush.
		How do you feel about the specific proposal to implement a bylaw requirement for dog owners to carry effective means of waste disposal in public places? Note: the bylaw allows discretion for individual circumstances (for example, if an officer believes a person genuinely forgot bags).	1781 (91%)	169 (9%)	
12	Introduce a “Dog-Friendly Wellington”	How do you generally feel about initiatives aimed at enhancing Wellington's dog-friendly status?	1672 (89%)	205 (11%)	Proceed

¹ Councillor amendment to remove “bags” from the bylaw wording has been progressed.

² Christchurch City Council has issued 38 infringements since 2019.

#	Proposal	Consultation pātai	Strongly / Support	Strongly / Do not support	Recommendation
	section into the Policy	How do you feel about the proposal to introduce a "Dog-Friendly Wellington" section into the Dog Policy?	1629 (89%)	197 (11%)	- Brings balance to a 'dog control' centric policy, acknowledging the numerous benefits that dogs bring. - Opens the door for unique city branding and business collaboration. - Dispels misconceptions about WCC restricting dogs on public transport.
13	Introduce level of service categories for off-leash areas	How do you feel about the proposal to introduce a new level of service categories (destination, community, and local) for off-leash areas?	1100 (91%)	109 (9%)	Proceed - Helps manage dog owner expectations. - Easier to identify gaps in provision.
CATS					
14	Introduce a bylaw requirement for the mandatory desexing of cats at six months	How do you generally feel about the Council's focus to reduce stray cats in the city?	551 (99%)	7 (1%)	Proceed with an amendment that specifies the 14-month transition period applies exclusively to existing cat owners. Jumpstarts efforts to reduce the stray cat population from the outset for owners with prior knowledge of the bylaw.
		How do you feel about the proposed bylaw requirement that all domestic cats over six months must be desexed (with exceptions for cats owned by registered breeders or if the procedure would pose an unnecessary risk to the cat)?	561 (97%)	18 (3%)	
OTHER ANIMALS – Poultry, Bees and Stock					
15	Clarify that permission is <u>not required</u> to keep	How do you feel about the proposal to clarify that written permission is not required to keep			Proceed Rural zones are generally considered appropriate for keeping animals.

#	Proposal	Consultation pātai	Strongly / Support	Strongly / Do not support	Recommendation
	poultry, bees, or stock in rural areas.	poultry, bees, or stock in rural areas within the bylaw?			
16	Clarify the scope of birds categorised as 'Poultry'.	How do you feel about the proposal to clarify the scope of birds categorised as 'poultry' in the bylaw? (e.g., hens, roosters, ducks, geese, pheasants, peafowl, quail, and turkeys).	115 (96%)	5 (4%)	Proceed Reduces ambiguity in interpreting the bylaw.
17	Clarify the types of poultry allowed in residential areas without prior Council permission.	How do you feel about the proposal to specify the types of poultry allowed in residential areas without requiring prior permission? (e.g., up to 8 hens/12 quail)	111 (82%)	25 (18%)	Proceed with an amendment to clarify that new requirements only apply to poultry acquired after the adoption of the bylaw.
18	Introduce conditions for keeping poultry	How do you feel about the proposal to introduce new conditions for keeping poultry, such as the requirement to store feed in vermin-proof containers?	136 (94%)	9 (6%)	Proceed Feedback appreciated efforts to regulate activity, particularly around pest implications.
19	Introduce a cap of four beehives in residential areas without the need for written permission	How do you feel about the proposal to introduce a cap of four beehives in residential areas without the need for written permission from the Council?	97 (77%)	29 (23%)	Proceed with an amendment to clarify that new requirements only apply to beehives acquired after the adoption of the bylaw.
20	Introduce a provision that allows the Council to require the removal or relocation of hives if they cause a nuisance	How do you feel about the proposal to introduce a provision that allows the Council to require the removal or relocation of hives if they cause a nuisance?	99 (77%)	29 (23%)	Proceed Supported by the Wellington Beekeepers Association and Urban Wildlife Trust.

#	Proposal	Consultation pātai	Strongly / Support	Strongly / Do not support	Recommendation
21	Beekeeping on Council land must occur within licensed community gardens	How do you feel about the proposal to introduce a requirement that beekeeping on Council land must occur within licensed community gardens?	62 (57%)	47 (43%)	Proceed Requirement represents common practice made official through the bylaw.
22	Reference legal requirements under the Biosecurity Act	How do you feel about the reference to legal requirements under the Biosecurity Act in the bylaw?	82 (91%)	8 (9%)	Proceed with a minor amendment that clarifies registration of hives is not with WCC.
23	Clarify the scope of "Stock" in the bylaw (previously only goats covered)	How do you feel about the proposal to introduce a definition for stock in the bylaw? (e.g., alpacas, cattle, deer, donkeys, horses, sheep, goats, and pigs).	83 (90%)	9 (10%)	Proceed with amendment to remove horses from the scope. Clarify that new requirements only apply to stock (excluding goats) acquired after the adoption of the bylaw.
24	Require prior written permission to keep stock in residential areas	How do you feel about the proposal to require prior written permission for keeping stock in a residential area as part of the bylaw?	67 (73%)	25 (27%)	Proceed General agreement that it is not appropriate to keep stock in urban settings.
25	Introduce condition requirements for keeping stock	How do you feel about the proposal to introduce new condition requirements for keeping stock, including manure management?	90 (92%)	8 (8%)	Proceed and add a definition for animal identification tag as recommended by GWRC
Average level of public support for proposals by animal type:					
- Dogs (84%) - Cats (98%) - Poultry (91%) - Bees (76%) - Stock (85%)					

A recap of early engagement

Dogs

The Dog Policy Review was one of the Council's top projects on our Kōrero mai | Let's Talk platform, with over 1,700 engaged users providing an impressive 4,300 responses. Here is a quick recap of the six activities that we ran during early engagement:

Activity	What we wanted to find out
Have we hit the mark?	This survey was designed to assess the level of importance that the public placed on six different focus areas. The focus areas in order of importance are: • Investigate solutions to accommodate the increase of city-dwelling dogs (87%) • Review the amount of off-leash dog exercise areas in Wellington (86%) • Encourage responsible dog owners and promote the responsible dog owner scheme (85%) • Consider biodiversity outcomes to protect our wildlife (78%) • Provide better transparency to dog owners of where registration fees go (67%) • Explore opportunities to create "Destination Dog Parks" (63%) The percentage reflects respondents who rated the statement as "important" or "very important" (sample: 997). Overall, a strong consensus emerged, affirming our key focus areas for the review.
Rate my Dog Park	This survey provided the public with an opportunity to rate the various dog exercise areas in Wellington using a scale ranging from <i>very poor</i> to <i>very good</i>. This helped us to understand what people like and do not like about dog exercise areas, and gauge how well-used the park is based on the number of submissions received. In total, we received 1,290 ratings across more than 60 dog exercise areas in Wellington. The key findings include: • 42% of the parks received an overall rating of "good" or "very good". • 32% of the parks received an overall rating of "average". • 26% of the parks received an overall rating of "poor" or "very poor".
A "Dog-Friendly Wellington"	This survey was designed to understand the public's perception of Wellington as a "dog-friendly" city and identify any potential areas for improvement. A total of 807 individuals participated in this survey, with the majority being dog owners (96%). The key findings include: • 53% of respondents either "somewhat agree" or "definitely agree" that "Wellington is a dog-friendly city", while 32% "somewhat disagree" or "definitely disagree". • 88% of respondents wanted to see the Council focus more on making the city more dog-friendly. • 87% of respondents wanted to see more dog-friendly businesses and cafes in Wellington.
Responsible Dog Owner Discount	This survey aimed to gauge public awareness and perceptions of the Council's Responsible Dog Ownership (RDO) scheme. We wanted to understand whether dog owners were aware of the available discounts, reasons for non-applications, and feedback from course attendees. Here are the key findings: • 86% of 787 respondents were already aware of the RDO discount.

	• 350 respondents had previously applied for the scheme, 95% of which reported successfully achieving RDO status. • Feedback on the Council's Dog Owner Education Course indicated 55% positive, 48% neutral, and 7% negative comments. • The main reasons for not applying were "too much hassle" and "I don't know where to start". Other issues raised include "unfair" and "impractical" fencing criteria, a feeling of being "judged" if not an RDO, reluctance to prove responsible ownership through a course, frustration with having to reapply if the owner changed address, and perceived lack of financial incentive.
Pet Peeves and Pet Paw-sitives	This survey invited all members of the public to express their thoughts and preferences regarding dogs. The results shed light on the positive impact dogs have, with the strongest theme being "they make me feel happy and are good for my health". The results also highlighted people's main concerns about dogs. Interestingly, 95% of respondents were dog owners, and even among them, the biggest pet peeves were "irresponsible dog owners" and "dog waste making streets and parks messy". Specific concerns focused on poorly socialised dogs lacking control when out with their owners.
Potential Dog Exercise Areas	This activity invited the public to 'place a pin' on the map to indicate areas where they believed an off-leash area would be beneficial. This input provided valuable insights into the community's preferences and the reasons behind their choices. We received over 200 pins that pinpointed over 50 unique areas of interest for us to explore and workshop as part of this review. These sites were layered onto a map that showed Sites of Significance to Māori and penguin nesting boxes to inform internal discussions.

Cats

In May 2023, we conducted a Cat Owners of Wellington survey to understand more about how people keep their cats and their thoughts around desexing. We received a large number of responses (3,170) that provided us with valuable information on how 5,126 cats are kept in Wellington. Below are the key findings:

- 95% of respondents have both desexed and microchipped their cats.
- 89% support the mandatory desexing of cats, unless the owner is a registered breeder and/or if desexing would have a negative impact on the cat's health/ welfare.
- 75% of respondents allow their cats to roam freely outside at all times or during the daytime only.
- 54% were aware of the current bylaw requirement that all cats over the age of 12 weeks must be microchipped.
- 22% keep their cats indoors or use leashes to exercise their cat(s).

Other animals

A targeted engagement approach was taken for "other animals", including several direct emails and meetings with stakeholders known for bees, poultry, and stock.

Formal consultation

Analysis of submissions

Part 1: Dogs

Proposal: Implement a Draft Action Plan.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED

WHAT WE ASKED

During early engagement, we identified key operational improvements that have been integrated into an Action Plan. Please indicate your thoughts on the importance of each action (Actions listed below).

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

Results: Action Plan public feedback (Ranked most important to least important)

Action	Ref	Very/ important	Not very/not important	Total ³
Audit the number and placement of bins in dog-walking areas to improve the convenience of disposing dog waste.	DAP9	1791 (97%)	62 (3%)	<u>1853</u>
Add off-leash areas to Google Maps, including descriptions and operating hours, to assist users.	DAP7	1678 (96%)	76 (4%)	<u>1754</u>
Update the website by adding information about off-leash areas (image of the park, accessibility, parking).	DAP5	1645 (94%)	97 (6%)	<u>1742</u>
Investigate options to support a 'fencing installation programme' (including partial fencing), with a focus on sites adjacent to roads to enhance safety and usability.	DAP4	1522 (91%)	142 (9%)	<u>1664</u>
Evaluate off-leash signage for visibility and effectiveness upon entry.	DAP6	1398 (90%)	151 (10%)	<u>1549</u>

³ Total sample calculated from submitters who gave a preference.

Assess the advantages of installing "etiquette boards" in popular exercise areas with frequent complaints.	DAP8	1284 (86%)	209 (14%)	<u>1493</u>
Continue to investigate options to establish an off-leash area in Miramar.	DAP2	982 (82%)	210 (18%)	<u>1192</u>
Explore options for more frequent mowing and turf renovation for off-leash areas.	DAP3	1015 (77%)	306 (23%)	<u>1321</u>
Explore opportunities to create an off-leash area with designated zones for dogs with different energy levels.	DAP1	1128 (75%)	383 (25%)	<u>1511</u>

OFFICER RESPONSE

During the Dog Policy review process, we identified key operational improvements that extend beyond the scope of the Policy itself. To effectively address these matters, we created a Draft Action Plan and sought public feedback on the level of importance of each proposed action.

There was strong support for all the actions, ranging 75% to 97% out of those who gave a preference. We recommend incorporating all draft actions into the Council's business unit plans for implementation within the next five years.

It is important to note that the implementation of each action is dependent on the availability of resources and/or funding. Funding will be considered through the standard Council long-term plan or annual plan budgeting processes. Some activities may be funded through dog registration fees.

Proposal 1: Expand off-leash provision across ten suburbs in Wellington.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED (8 OUT OF 10 LOCATIONS)

MAINTAIN STATUS QUO: APPLETON PARK AND SPICER FOREST

WHAT WE ASKED

During early engagement, we identified the following locations to expand off-leash provision. Please indicate your level of support for the proposal to establish or expand each off-leash area:

- | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Appleton Park | 6. Spicer Forest |
| 2. Caribbean Drive | 7. Terrace Gardens |
| 3. Elliot Park | 8. Trelissick Park |
| 4. Mark Avenue | 9. Hauora Park |
| 5. Mount Albert | 10. Wahinahina Park |

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- **All proposed locations for off-leash areas received high levels of support**, ranging from 85% to 91%.
- The survey respondents consisted of an **80/20 split of dog owners to non-dog owners**.
- Among those expressing a preference, a majority found this proposal **reached a 'balanced distribution' of new off-leash areas** (74%).
- **Dog owners overwhelmingly favoured the Council's focus** to increase off-leash opportunities (93%), while **non-dog owners showed less support** overall (34%).
- Concerns about **safety, cleanliness**, and **potential conflicts with other park users** were key reasons for opposition.
- **SPCA commended the Council's effort** to expand off-leash opportunities.

Proposal 1: Level of support (Ranked Highest to Lowest)

Location	Strongly/ Support	Strongly/ Do not support	Total ⁴
Elliott Park, Brooklyn	985 (91%)	99 (9%)	1084
Caribbean Drive, Grenada North	877 (91%)	82 (9%)	959
Trelissick Park, Ngaio	1204 (90%)	137 (10%)	1341
Appleton Park, Karori	974 (90%)	109 (10%)	1083
Wahinahina Park, Newlands	925 (90%)	104 (10%)	1029
Hauora Reserve, Woodridge	829 (90%)	96 (10%)	925
Terrace Gardens, Wellington Central	1107 (86%)	178 (14%)	1283
Spicer Forest, Tawa	1025 (86%)	171 (14%)	1196
Mount Albert tracks, Berhampore	1220 (85%)	211 (15%)	1431

⁴ Total sample calculated from submitters who gave a preference.

WHAT WE HEARD

Location	SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
Appleton Park, Karori Total comments: 12 <i>New off-leash area</i>	Improved facilities such as increased parking availability, a larger area compared to Ian Galloway Park, and proximity to a local café. Capital BMX expressed a preference to replace Ian Galloway Park with Appleton Park to “<i>reduce clashes between dog owners and BMX riders at the current Ian Galloway location</i>”.	Conflict concerns: worried about potential conflicts with the proposed shared pathway in Appleton Park. Unnecessary proposal: Appleton Park is less of a priority due to the presence of nearby Ian Galloway. Safety: Submitters emphasised the need for adequate fencing to prevent accidents on the road adjacent to Appleton Park.
Caribbean Drive, Grenada North Total comments: 5	Good use of space: area “<i>boggy for pedestrians</i>” and therefore suitable for dogs off-leash. Suggestion to expand off-leash to other pastoral areas in the reserve.	Environmental impact: “<i>Scientists say dogs have contributed to the extinction of several bird species: and the endangerment of others, especially Kiwi</i>”.
Elliott Park, Brooklyn Total comments: 4 <i>New off-leash area</i>	Necessary for location: making Elliott Park off-leash is “<i>an absolute necessity</i>” due to its location. Already “informally” off-leash with respect among all users.	Potential user conflict with park users and children using the playground. Off-leash alternative nearby at Kowhai Park (10-minute walk). Waste: “<i>Dog owners already do not properly dispose of dog waste</i>”. Disrupt the balance: Concern that making it an “official” off-leash area would increase off-leash use and disrupt the current balance of user to dogs ratio.
Mark Avenue, Grenada Village Total comments: 2 <i>New off-leash area</i>	General supportive comments with no specific theme.	Nearby dog exercise area sufficient: Seton Nossiter is 200 meters away from Mark Avenue and is regarded as “<i>one of the best dog exercise parks in Wellington</i>”. Potential parking/traffic issues: Concern the proposed park would result in parking/traffic issues in Mark Avenue and Buccaneer Place.

Mount Albert, Berhampore Total comments: 7 <i>New off-leash tracks</i>	Area well-suited to off-leash exercise with low risk of conflict with pedestrians or wildlife and will “ <i>formalise what is already common practice</i> ”.	Aggressive dog behaviour on walking tracks: references to being aggressively approached and dogs barking/nipping on the walkway and concern this would increase if the area was made off-leash.
Spicer Forest, Tawa Total comments: 13 <i>New off-leash tracks</i>	General supportive comments. One submitter specified support for the Kiwi Crescent ascent trail section of the track becoming off-leash. Suggestion: Proposed off-leash and on-tracks need to be signposted.	Environmental concerns: - Capital Kiwi does not support due to concerns about the potential future of Kiwi in the area. - Tawa Community Board and Tawa Bush Reserves Group are strongly opposed as this area of bush is undergoing “<i>successive native regeneration</i>”. - Several submitters expressed that making the tracks off-leash will impact the currently thriving native life and potential future Kiwi. User conflict: off-leash tracks will cause conflict with families, children, and mountain bikers.
Terrace Gardens, Wellington Central Total comments: 4 <i>New off-leash area</i>	Size of area: One submitter commented support for the proposal but noted the area was small.	Inappropriate off-leash area because Terrace Gardens is a common “ <i>thoroughfare</i> ” and spot for lunchtime visitors. Safety concerns: One submitter expressed discomfort walking alone in Terrace Gardens and requested a better alternative.
Trelissick Park, Ngaio Total comments: 5 <i>Extension of existing off-leash area</i>	Good choice for off-leash and allows active exercise for owners while walking a dog.	Ecological sensitivity: “ <i>We need to protect native birds from dog predation in Trelissick Park. Kiwi have been heard up on the Northern Walkway above Ngaio: so it is only a matter of time before they find their way into Trelissick Park</i> ”.
Hauora Reserve, Woodridge Total comments: 2 <i>New off-leash trail</i>	No specific comments.	Waste: “ <i>Irresponsible dog owners will leave dog waste</i> ”. Intimidation: “ <i>Dogs will intimidate families and people visiting the reserve</i> ”. Ecological: “ <i>native planting would be destroyed by dogs</i> ”.

		Close to sections of stock and a children's play area and therefore " <i>inappropriate</i> ".
Wahinahina Reserve, Newlands <i>Extension of existing off-leash area</i>	No specific comments.	No specific comments.

OFFICER RESPONSE

All proposed locations received high levels of submitter support, ranging from 85% to 91%. It is recommended to proceed with most of the proposed sites, expanding off-leash provision across eight suburbs in Wellington. Bins will be installed where practical at all new off-leash areas that currently do not have waste disposal.

It is recommended not to proceed with off-leash provision at two sites: Appleton Park and Spicer Forest. While quantitative data indicated strong overall support, further analysis, and some submitter feedback prompted the change in direction for these sites, including:

Appleton Park

- **Karori Connections construction:** Construction of a shared pathway through Appleton Park is scheduled to begin in May 2024. This project is likely to see significant cyclist traffic, particularly during commute times, raising concerns about potential conflicts between cyclists and dogs.
- **Area is a capped landfill site:** Due to the capped landfill underlying Appleton Park, installing fencing for an off-leash area is not recommended. The cap's thickness varies and requires future recapping. Disturbing the site through digging for fence posts could pose a public health risk due to potential contaminant exposure.
- **Limited parking in the area:** It is important to clarify that the nearby carpark, which some submitters considered ideal, is the Zealandia overflow carpark designated for Zealandia visitors and employees exclusively.
- **Considering these factors, Appleton Park is not considered to be a suitable location for a proposed dog park at this time.** Better separation between potentially conflicting activities, along with improved ground conditions, is anticipated when the Appleton Park landfill cap is recontoured in the next 5-10 years. This timeframe would be ideal for revisiting the possibility of improved recreational opportunities at Appleton Park, including an off-leash dog area.

Spicer Forest

- **Potential impact on Kiwi:** Dogs are well-documented predators of Kiwi, and the proposed off-leash tracks at Spicer Forest were identified as a key concern, particularly by Capital Kiwi in their submission. Given the ongoing efforts to reintroduce kiwi to the southwestern hills, it is not recommended to introduce off-leash tracks.
- **Conflict with native regeneration:** Tawa Community Board and Tawa Bush Reserves are strongly opposed to this proposal, noting that the area of bush is undergoing successive native regeneration.
- **User conflict:** Potential conflicts with existing users, particularly among mountain bikers.

Proposal 2: Allow off-leash access to Oriental Bay Beach during off-peak hours (before 10 am and after 7 pm) in the warmer months (1 November – 30 April).

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED WITH AMENDMENT.

AMEND TO ALLOW OFF-LEASH ACCESS EXCLUSIVELY ON THE EASTERN SIDE OF THE ROTUNDA (RIGHT SIDE FACING WATER) DURING THE WARMER MONTHS AT OFF-PEAK HOURS. DOGS REMAIN PROHIBITED ON THE WESTERN SIDE OF THE ROTUNDA.

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposal to increase off-leash provision in the city centre by expanding the times at Oriental Bay Beach during off-peak hours (before 10 am and after 7 pm) in the warmer months (1 November-30 April)?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

2084 submissions received overall. Of those who gave a preference:

- 74% (1361) supported the proposal, 26% (483) did not support it. 82 made comments.
- Dog owners overwhelmingly supported the proposal (78%) while non-dog owners overwhelmingly did not support the proposal (71%).

Dog owner responses:

- 78% (1291) supported.
- 11% (189) had no preference.
- 11% (181) did not support.

Non-dog owner responses:

- 17% (70) supported.
- 12% (51) had no preference.
- 71% (302) did not support.

71 Oriental Bay residents provided feedback (representing 3% of the total).

Organisations:

- **Supporting:** SPCA, Te Ahumairangi Ecological Rest, Urban Wildlife Trust, Central Allbreeds Dog Training
- **Not supporting:** Oriental Bay Residents Association.

Proposal 2: Level of support filtered by Oriental Bay residents only

Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
25	3	0	4	39	71
39%		61%			

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
Appreciation for Council efforts and excitement for the proposal: <i>"The Council has done a great job with this proposal".</i> Maximises the benefits of the beach, especially on the "not so good" weather days: Oriental Bay resident stated, <i>"I see many days and hours when no one is using the beach at all. Accessing the beach with a dog during certain hours during summer is a sensible and fantastic idea".</i> Improved access: <i>"Thrilled at the improved access in Summer...being unable to drive I am limited to walkable distances."</i> Improved convenience: <i>"Living in the CBD is often onerous during the summertime with having to take dogs to Lyall Bay or Island Bay in the summer"; and "easy to walk down to Oriental Bay for a morning or evening swim instead of driving".</i> Allows dog to swim in the heat: <i>"I would love for our dog to swim in the summer heat".</i> The proposal is a 'fair compromise': <i>"Making Oriental Bay at least time-shared... is only fair for the majority of dog owners."</i> Inclusive proposal: <i>"This makes a lot of sense to me: allows dog owners to be treated like Wellington citizens rather than marginalised others: and allows them to enjoy central city amenities."</i> Dogs can come along: <i>"Many dog owners enjoy swimming at Wellington beaches but our options are severely limited unless we leave our dog at home".</i> Socialisation and exercise opportunities: <i>"Our dogs need daily exercise and this is a great place for dogs and owners to socialise."</i> Alignment with other cities in NZ: <i>"Aligns with other cities"</i> submitter shared a link to other popular beaches that allow dogs.	Safety: Concerns about un-leashed and uncontrolled dogs running up to people on the beach. There was also a concern that dogs being allowed at off-peak times (before 10 am and after 7 pm) coincides with times when children might be on the beach during safer sun hours. Hygiene and cleanliness: Worried about contaminated sand from dog waste and urine. Concerns about dogs carrying fleas and parasites. The premise is that the beach should be <i>"safe and clean for families"</i>. Assertion that dogs are problematic on beach setting: a view that dogs do not belong on this <i>"Popular sandy beach used by many"</i>; referred to as the <i>"best beach in the city"</i>. Better alternative option nearby: submitters noted the presence of other dedicated dog exercise areas nearby. "Keep rules simple" by maintaining a 100% ban on dogs on Oriental Bay during summer. <u>Other suggestions from the public included:</u> • Dogs allowed off-leash on the far side of the band (rotunda) only. • Dogs allowed during off-peak hours but <u>on-leash only</u>. • Dogs are allowed before 10 am but not in the evenings. • Change off-leash hours to before 9 am and after 8 pm. • Change off-leash hours to before 8 am and after 8 pm. <i>The suggestions for alternative times were considered, however, it was decided to uphold the proposed timing (before 10 am and after 7 pm) to maintain consistency with dog regulations on other beaches across Wellington.</i>
Total comments: 82	

OFFICER RESPONSE

Proceed with amendment: Dogs allowed off-leash on the far side of the Band Rotunda only.

The proposal to relax rules for dogs during warmer months on Oriental Bay Beach received majority support overall, with 74% (1361 people) in favour (of those who gave a preference). Many saw the proposal as a 'fair compromise', particularly appreciating the off-peak element that ensured dog-free hours for those uncomfortable with dogs.

However, 483 people, primarily non-dog owners and/or Oriental Bay residents, expressed concern about off-leash dogs rushing and irresponsible owners failing to pick up after their pets.

A public suggestion was to allow off-leash access only on the right side of the rotunda, introducing a 'space-shared' element to the beach. We recommend making this change and hope it will alleviate concerns as dogs are prohibited from longer parts of Oriental Bay Beach. While some may be disappointed with the scaled-back proposal, it still represents a significant expansion of access compared to the current total ban during warmer months.

Key reasons for proceeding with this amended proposal include:

- High growth of dog ownership across Wellington and limited provision of off-leash areas in the City Centre. There was overall majority support to improve off-leash access and accommodate the growing demand of the dog owner population in Wellington.
- Off-leash access allows for socialisation opportunities with other dogs, helping to promote positive behaviour and social skills.
- Having some off-leash area at the beach may reduce the need for owners to travel to alternative beaches, such as Lyall Bay, during the summer months.
- Oriental Bay Beach has no known environmental concerns (for example, no known penguin nesting or seal habitat is documented).
- Implementing this initiative is cost-effective for the Council since it utilises existing land without the need for additional space or fenced areas.
- Time-sharing element: this proposal still allows a dog-free environment at more popular times (between the hours of 10 am-7 pm) for beachgoers.
- Low incidence of animal control issues: Oriental Bay Beach is not a problematic area for animal control, and high foot traffic encourages compliance with cleanup rules.
- Alternative nearby dog-free areas: nearby Freyberg Beach and playground provide dog-free experiences year-round.
- Owners must clean up after their dogs and ensure they are under effective control.

Proposal 3: Restrict dogs from the Wishing Well Area grassy area at Oriental Bay Parade.

RECOMMENDATION: MAINTAIN STATUS QUO

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposal to prohibit dogs from the lawn area next to the Wishing Well on Oriental Parade in response to concerns about dog waste in the area?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- **2059 submissions received overall.** Of those who gave a preference: 60% (861) supported the proposal, and 40% (563) did not support it. **Five submitters commented.**
- The **responses from dog owners were evenly spread**, with approximately a third supporting, a third having no preference and a third not supporting.
- **The majority of non-dog owners supported the restriction** (77% or 332 people).
- **72 Oriental Bay residents submitted** this question (representing 3% of the total).
- **Supported by:** SPCA, Friend of Tawa Bush Reserve, Willowbank Reserve Care Group, Tawa Community Board.

Proposal 3: Level of support by dog ownership

	Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
Dog owner	172	367	573	341	190	1643
	33%	35%		32%		
Non dog owner	207	115	62	21	11	416
	77%			15%	8%	
TOTAL	379	482	635	362	201	2059

Proposal 3: Level of support by Oriental Bay residents

Key	
	Support
	No preference
	Do not support

Oriental Bay residents' submissions					
Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
27	9	10	8	18	72
50%		14%	36%		

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
General supportive comments.	One submitter expressed that the Wishing Well lawn is one of the few areas accessible to dog owners. Another expressed that the nearby public toilet would become inaccessible for dog owners to use if the proposed change was implemented.
Total comments: 5	

OFFICER RESPONSE

The decision to not proceed with this proposal and maintain the status quo takes into account the following factors:

- While the proposal received moderate support (60%), there is no policy rationale to ban dogs at this site given the other prohibited areas outlined in the policy include children's play areas, artificial sports surfaces, and ecologically valuable sites like Zealandia. Therefore prohibiting dogs at this site might establish an unusual precedent.
- Implementing multiple rules around Oriental Bay Parade could cause public confusion and may appear inconsistent with efforts to enhance off-leash status at Oriental Bay Beach. Formal consultation feedback already indicated concern about whether the public would have access to the public toilets.
- There is already a dog-free provision at the nearby Freyberg Beach.
- The area around the Wishing Well does not pose significant issues for animal control.
- The installation of 'dogs prohibited' signage may detract from the charm of the immediate environment surrounding the Wishing Well.

Proposal 4: Swap around the “off-leash” and “prohibited” areas at Island Bay Beach.

RECOMMENDATION: MAINTAIN STATUS QUO

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposal to swap around the “off-leash” and “prohibited” areas at Island Bay Beach to minimise the impact of dogs on dune restoration and introduce seasonal specified times during the warmer months?

Note: the proposed times for Island Bay are dogs are allowed off-leash before 10 am and after 7 pm, but are prohibited between 10 am and 7 pm.

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- **2054 submissions received overall.** Of those who gave a preference: 62% (887) supported the proposal, and 38% (541) did not support it.
- This proposal received the **most comments out of the whole review**, totalling 247 text feedback entries available for qualitative analysis.
- **324 Island Bay residents provided feedback** (representing 16% of the total sample of submissions) and **overwhelmingly did not support it (87%)**.
- **There is an even balance of support between dog owners and non-dog owners** for every level of support category.
- **Supported by:** SPCA.
- **Not supported by:** Island Bay Dog Beach Users Group (representing 50 dog owners).

Proposal 4: Level of support including dog ownership breakdown

	Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
Dog owner	204	511	522	116	296	1649
	43%		32%		25%	
Non dog owner	88	84	104	20	109	405
	42%		26%		32%	
Total	292	595	626	136	405	2054

Proposal 4: Level of support filtered by Island Bay resident responses only

Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
17	15	9	33	250	324
10%	3%	87%			

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
A submitter affiliated with the Dune Restoration Group noted <i>“Dunes are full of poo, and dog owners need to stop their dogs from ruining fragile plants”</i>. Two submitters suggested further restricting dog access to Island Bay Beach. Impact of dogs on dune ecosystems, particularly during high tide: (<i>“When there is no beach sand to walk on they walk along the dunes. The pingao and spinifex trailers are damaged by people walking on them and dogs digging them out”</i>) Observable issues since the area became off-leash in 2016: the off-leash area has not helped the vulnerable state of the dune <i>“despite the best efforts of local volunteers”</i>. Others expressed the view that efforts to replant the dunes are “pointless” as dogs dig them out. The observation is that the dunes are used as a place to toilet their dogs or <i>“dispose of their dog bags”</i>. Dogs on the beach during summer were described as an “annoyance” generally. SPCA: <i>“recognises the importance of managing the negative impacts that dogs can have on valuable biodiversity areas and supports the protection of areas that are important habitats to native wildlife. We commend the Council for finding an alternative area at the Island Bay Beach location where dogs can exercise off-leash”</i>.	Strong sentiment that there is a better way to protect the dunes. Banning dogs is “not the solution” For example, a more substantial roped-off fence area, mesh fencing, educational campaign, increased patrolling, and better signage (including fines). A recurring theme was that the proposed swap came with time restrictions during on-peak hours in summer. Some indicated support if the time restrictions were relaxed. 100% of responses received by Island Bay Dog Beach Users Group wanted the location of the dog beach to remain where it is and with no time restrictions. Consensus that status-quo works well: <i>“The western part of the beach is: and always has been: the principle swimming area. It is the area that other Wellingtonians visit on a sunny day. The eastern part of the beach is the more rugged part....having the dog off-leash area where it currently is: makes the most sense”</i>. The alternative off-leash area at Reef Street is not suitable or “like for like” experience – some said they would support it but only if Reef Street was fenced on the roadside. Doubts were expressed regarding the actual impact of dogs on the dunes, with a request for data from the dunes in Island Bay to support the proposed change. Many emphasised that dogs may not be the primary threat, pointing out the significant damage caused by frequent storm surges, climate change, and erosion. Sample concerns: some dissatisfaction with how this specific issue was grouped with a general city-wide survey on dogs, suggesting that respondents might not have considered the issues closely enough.
Total comments: 247	

OFFICER RESPONSE

While the overall results indicate higher levels of support at 62%⁵, a contrasting viewpoint arises when considering the significant lack of support from Island Bay residents, with 87% expressing opposition. This proposal received the highest number of comments among all proposals, totalling 247, with the majority of comments being unsupportive in sentiment (83%). Many of the oral submissions heard by committee also voiced concern regarding this proposal.

Despite many submitters expressing support for the intention to protect the dunes, they disagreed with the proposed solution. Submitters caveated their lack of support with statements such as: *“I do recognise the importance of preserving our native flora and fauna”* and *“preserving the dunes ought to be a key effort”*. Some expressed support or indifference to the space swap but opposed the reduction in hours. Many highlighted that alternative interventions, such as better fencing, education campaigns, monitoring, and improved signage could bring the desired outcomes without restricting dogs.

The community overwhelmingly supports the status quo, noting that this is a “community asset”, and for some, the reason they chose to live in Island Bay. Despite nearby alternatives like Reef Street being considered as an off-leash alternative, the community does not view them as comparable to the experience provided at Island Bay Beach.

We appreciate the quality of submissions and the detailed alternative solutions presented to the Council. Following this consultation, the recommendation is to maintain the current off-leash area (status quo) and enhance educational efforts to promote dune preservation through alternative measures.

⁵ Percentages calculated out of those who gave a preference.

Proposal 5: Change the "prohibited" requirement for Kaiwharawhara Park to "on leash" at all times.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED WITH PROPOSAL

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposal to modify the current "prohibited" requirement for Kaiwharawhara Park to "on leash at all times"?

Note: if sports activities are being played, dogs would be allowed on marked surfaces only.

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- **1996 submissions received overall.** Of those who gave a preference: 85% (986) supported the proposal, and 15% (174) did not support it. **Three made comments.**
- **Two Kaiwharawhara residents provided feedback:** both did not support.
- **Supported by:** Te Ahumairangi Ecological Rest, Urban Wildlife Trust, SPCA.

Proposal 5: Level of support by dog ownership status

	Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
Dog owner	328	529	645	76	46	1624
53%			40%7%			
Non dog owner	54	75	191	27	25	
35%		51%14%				372
Total	382	604	836	103	71	
1996						

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
Two general supportive comments.	One submitter was concerned that the on-leash signage could be ignored.
Total comments: 3	

OFFICER RESPONSE

Overall, there is strong public support at 85% with no significant opposition. This proposal represents a minor adjustment, bringing Kaiwharawhara Park in line with existing Council policy rules regarding sports fields.

Proposal 6a: Modify the configuration of existing off-leash areas to enhance children's play spaces in Tawa.

RECOMMENDATION: MAINTAIN STATUS QUO AT WILLOWBANK

WHAT WE ASKED (6a): WILLOWBANK

How do you feel about the proposal to swap the existing off-leash area at Willowbank Reserve with the existing children's play area and designate an additional dog exercise area on the reserve?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- **1967 submissions received overall.** Of those who gave a preference: 77% (583) supported the proposal, and 23% (175) did not. **57 submitters made comments.**
- **120 Tawa residents provided feedback** (representing <1% of the total).
- **Not supported by:** Friends of Tawa Bush Reserves, Willowbank Reserve Care Group, Tawa Community Board.

Proposal 6: Level of support including dog ownership breakdown

	Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
Dog owner	172	342	996	47	38	1594
32%	62%				5%	
Non dog owner	23	46	213	26	64	373
18%	58%				24%	
Total	195	388	1209	73	102	1967
30%	61%				9%	

Proposal 6: Level of support filtered by Tawa resident responses only

Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
31	30	9	11	39	120
51%		7%	42%		

Key	
	Support
	No preference
	Do not support

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
No specific comments.	Multiple submitters stated that the proposed new play area would be dangerous due to the placement of gum trees with falling branches, children's proximity to the road, and a steeper descent for river access. Submitters also said the area was boggy in winter and lacked sun. Concern for the safety of the Willowbank Care Group and Friends of Tawa Bush Reserves (who work in the reserve) if a new dog park was introduced, as there would be an increase in dogs in the area. Submitters expressed that there was no need for an additional off-leash area, as there is currently sufficient access to dog parks in the area including an off-leash park five minutes from the play area. Concern that there would be an increase in dog waste if another park was introduced.
Total comments: 57	

OFFICER RESPONSE

Overall, there is a notably low level of qualitative support. Concurrently with the Dog Policy Review, a separate early engagement survey was conducted to gather community input on desired features for the renovation of the play area. A prevalent theme was the endorsement of maintaining the play area at its current site. Given the resounding feedback in favour of retaining the current location, we recommend moving forward with design plans based on the existing site, which in turn, will not require any changes to the current off-leash area (status quo).

Proposal 6b: Modify the configuration of existing off-leash areas to enhance children's play spaces in Johnsonville.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED WITH CHANGES AT FLINDERS PLACE

WHAT WE ASKED (6b: FLINDERS)

How do you feel about the proposal to modify the existing off-leash area at Flinders Place to accommodate the construction of a new fenced play area?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- **1945 submissions were received overall.** Of those who gave a preference: 86% (573) supported the proposal, and 14% (93) did not support it. **Six submitters made comments.**
- **61 Johnsonville residents provided feedback (representing 3% of the total).**
- **Organisation supporting:** SPCA, Friends of the Tawa Bush Reserve.

Proposal 6: Level of support by dog ownership breakdown

	Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
Dog owner	135	332	1049	47	29	1592
	29%	66%			5%	
Non dog owner	41	65	230	6	11	353
	30%	65%			5%	
Total	176	397	1279	53	40	1945
	29%	66%			5%	

Proposal 6: Level of support filtered by Johnsonville resident responses

Johnsonville residents					
Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
16	20	17	3	5	61
	59%		28%	13%	

Key	
	Support
	No preference
	Do not support

WHAT WE HEARD

THEMES HEARD IN SUPPORT	CONCERNS HEARD AGAINST
General supportive comments. A feeling that there was a need for a new fenced play area. One submitter noted that the area should be well-marked and fenced to avoid user/dog conflict.	One submitter expressed worry about potential conflicts between the off-leash area and children due to the playground's proximity. They suggested clear separation between the areas. Another resident noted a lack of parking, which could limit access to both the new dog park and the existing playground.
Total comments: 6	

OFFICER RESPONSE

There was an overall high level of support for this proposal (86%). While there were a few concerns regarding potential conflicts with the nearby playground and the lack of parking, these appear to be manageable. It is recommended to proceed with this proposal to establish a new neighbourhood play area. As part of this plan, the current off-leash area at Flinders Place will be reduced in size by approximately 400 square metres.

Additional reasons for advancing with the proposal include:

- Addresses the play provision gap for Johnsonville West as identified in the Play Spaces Policy.
- Flinders Place has been identified as the most suitable location for a playground in terms of available land and coverage.
- The playground will be fully fenced, with access coming off the adjoining track, thereby separating users of the play area and the dog exercise area and mitigating concerns about conflicts of usage.
- Regarding parking concerns, it is important to note that the play area network is designed around a walking distance methodology. For a neighbourhood play area like this one, the coverage area is based on a 600-meter radius or a 10-minute walk. Therefore, it is not anticipated that people will need to travel by vehicle to the site. Instead, it is intended to serve as a local park, designed for convenient and spontaneous play within the neighbourhood.

Note: Funding to secure this playground modification is dependent on the upcoming Long-term Plan. If approved, this modification it is expected to be complete in the next three years.

Proposal 7a: Convert Waimapihi Reserve from off-leash to 'on-leash' to support wildlife conservation at the reserve.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED

WHAT WE ASKED (7a: WAIMAPIHI RESERVE)

How do you feel about the proposal to convert the off-leash designation at the entrance of Waimapihi Reserve to on-leash to support wildlife conservation at the reserve?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- **2001 submissions received overall.** 86% (1039) supported the proposal, and 14% (172) did not support it. **Eight comments were received.**
- **Supported by:** Te Ahumairangi Ecological Rest, Urban Wildlife Trust, Friends of the Tawa Bush Reserves, Greater Wellington Regional Council, Capital BMX, SPCA
- **11 Aro Valley residents provided** feedback (representing <1% of the total).

Proposal 7a: Level of support including dog ownership breakdown

	Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	
Dog owner	318	477	655	104	63	1617
	49%		41%		10%	
Non dog owner	180	64	135	3	2	384
	64%		35%		1%	
Total	498	541	790	107	65	2001
	52%		39%		9%	

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
This will minimise the impact of dogs on wildlife and the importance of managing dogs in making Wellington Predator Free. Off-leash dogs at the entrance of the reserve were a hazard for pedestrians. One submitter said that they had seen many off-leash dogs in the reserve surrounding the entrance.	One submitter stated that Waimapihi Reserve was essential for those living on steep slopes/without yards nearby.
Total comments: 8	

OFFICER RESPONSE

It is recommended to proceed with this proposal for the following reasons:

- There is a mixture of high support and indifference toward this proposal, which is a common theme across both dog owners and non-dog owners' responses.
- The proposal aims to reduce the impact of dogs in the nearby wildlife-sensitive area.
- Dog owners will still be able to access the reserve to exercise their dogs as long as the dog is under the control of its owner and on a leash at all times.

Proposal 7b: Convert off-leash area with 'on-leash' requirements to reduce user conflict at Hataitai Park (Alexandra Roadside only).

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED

WHAT WE ASKED (7b: HATAITAI PARK)

How do you feel about the proposal to convert the off-leash designation at Hataitai Park (Alexandra Road) to on-leash to minimise user conflict?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- **1999 submissions received overall.** Of those who gave a preference: 59% (640) supported the proposal, and 41% (448) did not support it.
- **One comment was received** and stated that the off-leash area should remain, and emphasised 'users can be respectful of each other in the same space'.
- **72 Hataitai residents provided feedback and mainly did not support (59%).**
- **Supported by:** SPCA, Capital BMX, Greater Wellington Regional Council, Friends of the Tawa Bush Reserve.

Proposal 7b: Level of support including dog ownership responses

	Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
Dog owner	143	281	763	259	171	1617
	26%	47%			27%	
Non dog owner	145	71	148	13	5	382
	56%		39%		5%	
Total	288	352	911	272	176	1999
	32%	46%			22%	

OFFICER RESPONSE

Overall support for this proposal stands at 60%, which falls to the lower end compared to other proposals, but it still constitutes a majority. There were no significant issues identified with this proposal and only one submission out of 1999 submissions commented on it specifically. It is recommended to proceed with this change to remove off-leash status at the Alexandra Roadside of Hataitai Park, particularly in light of the Council's plans to improve the nearby bike skills area.

Follow-up question: How do you feel about keeping Hataitai Park (Ruahine Street) as an off-leash area even if it does not have a roadside fence?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- **2000 submissions received overall.** Of those who gave a preference: 58% (640) supported the proposal, and 42% (470) did not support it. **Ten made comments.**
- 73 Hataitai residents provided feedback (representing 4% of total submissions)
- **Supported by:** Urban Wildlife Trust.
- **Not supported by:** Friends of the Tawa Bush Reserve (no comment provided).

Level of support including dog ownership breakdown

	Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
Dog owner	207	376	683	273	84	1623
	36%	42%		22%		
Non dog owner	15	42	207	63	50	377
	15%	55%		30%		
Total	222	418	890	336	134	2000

Level of support filtered by Hataitai resident responses

Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
23	14	13	14	9	73
51%	18%		31%		

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
Convenient off-leash area for local residents. Limited alternative use: some noted that the area is not suitable for other activities, reinforcing the suitability of maintaining it as an off-leash space. The large size of the grassy area was highlighted as a positive aspect, providing ample room for dogs to roam and play.	Concerned due to the road at the bottom of the park and possible risk to the dog. One submitter stated they preferred to use the space on-leash. <i>"Feels like a massive loss to not fence in Ruahine St. It would be a perfect place for lots of dogs to run because it's so big and used for nothing else."</i>

Some expressed support for keeping the park off-leash but emphasised a preference for it to be fenced , indicating that this would increase their likelihood of using the space.	
---	--

Total comments: 10

OFFICER RESPONSE

Overall support to keep Hataitai Park (Ruahine Street) as an off-leash area even if it does not have a roadside fence stands at 58%. This falls to the lower end of the support spectrum compared to other proposals, but it still constitutes a majority.

At this stage, it is recommended to maintain off-leash status at Hataitai Park. The findings indicate that dog owners prefer having the space available, even without fencing, rather than losing the option altogether. Residents in Hataitai particularly favoured keeping the area as off-leash even without a fence (total of 37 responses).

While fencing presents potential benefits for the future, it is not advised at present due to uncertainties surrounding the plans to widen the tunnel from the Basin Reserve, which could impact the existing off-leash area.

Proposal 8: Rename the “Responsible Dog Owner Status” to “Accredited Dog Owner Licence”.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED WITH A MINOR AMENDMENT TO CHANGE ‘LICENCE’ TO ‘STATUS’.

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposal to rename the “Responsible Dog Owner” status to “Accredited Dog Owner” Licence?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- **2032 submissions received overall.** Of those who gave a preference: 79% (723) supported the proposal, and 21% (195) did not support it. **Six made comments.**
- **Supported by:** Te Ahumairangai Ecological Rest, Oriental Bay Residents Association, Friends of the Tawa Bush Reserve, Central Allbreeds Dog Training, SPCA.

Proposal 8: Level of support including “No preference” responses

Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
260	463	1114	134	61	2032
35%		55%			10%

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
Submitters believed the responsible dog owner label was unfair and judgemental. <u>Alternative names suggested:</u> • Approved Dog Owner • Accredited Dog Owner <i>status</i>	The name change was a waste of time and money. Dog owners without the responsible dog owner status were irresponsible.
Total comments: 6	

OFFICER RESPONSE

Overall strong level of support was received (80%) with only minor concerns raised. This support aligns with the sentiment identified in earlier engagement, highlighting the perception that the current terminologies imply that non-status owners are “irresponsible” by default. This is a relatively straightforward change for the council to implement, primarily involving website updates. This rebrand also presents an opportunity to publicise the benefits of completing the ADO scheme.

Proposal 9: Decouple the proposed Accredited Dog Owner Criteria from the Dog Policy.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposed change to decouple the proposed Accredited Dog Owner criteria from the Dog Policy and make the most current criteria accessible on the website?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- **1993 submissions received overall.** Of those who gave a preference: 94% (985) supported the proposal, and 6% (66) did not support it. **Four submitters commented.**
- **Supported by:** Te Ahumairangai Ecological Rest, Oriental Bay Residents Association, Urban Wildlife Trust, Friends of the Tawa Bush Reserve, Central Allbreeds Dog Training, Capital BMX, SPCA

Proposal 9: Level of support including “No preference” responses

Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
292	693	942	49	17	1993
50%			47%		3%

WHAT PEOPLE HAD TO SAY

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
The proposal will reduce the time and cost of consultation to modify the criteria.	Decoupling will make changing the criteria too easy and existing responsible dog owners will not be aware if the criteria have changed.
Total comments: 4	

OFFICER RESPONSE

There is majority support (94%) for this proposal (of those that gave a preference), with comments acknowledging its potential to significantly reduce the time and cost of consultation needed to modify the criteria.

To address the concerns, we will ensure transparent communication regarding any criteria changes on the relevant Council website pages and through other communication channels as deemed appropriate.

Proposal 10: Various changes to the Accredited Dog Owner criteria.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED

WHAT WE ASKED

Overall, how do you feel about the proposed criteria changes to the Accredited Dog Owner Licence?⁶

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- **1978 submissions received overall.** Of those who gave a preference: 85% (708) supported the proposal, and 15% (124) did not support it. **28 submitters commented.**
- **Supported by:** Te Ahumairangi Ecological Rest, Oriental Bay Residents Association, Friends of the Tawa Bush Reserve, SPCA
- **Not supported by:** Central Allbreeds Dog Training (some of the proposals) and Urban Wildlife Trust

Proposal 10: Level of support including “No preference” responses

Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
160	548	1146	97	27	1978
36%		58%		6%	

WHAT PEOPLE HAD TO SAY

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
Appreciation that the modified criteria removes/addresses the following barriers: Access through the high cost of training programmes (no longer applicable). The requirement to re-enrol if moving house is a costly barrier (no longer applicable). Fully fencing discriminates apartments/ rental homes (no longer applicable). <u>Some suggested further modifications:</u> Introduce kiwi aversion training.	Four submitters commented that the obedience course is essential, and one submitter expressed that an educational course alone is inadequate. One submitter commented that if Council wants more responsible dog owners, the RDO programme should not be too easy. Urban Wildlife Trust stated: “The changes may enable dogs to wander if not properly contained: it also appears that the ability to get a licence is getting easier and there is no strong driver to have well-trained dogs.

⁶ Criteria published on pg. 36- 37 Statement of Proposal.

• Add more third-party Obedience courses to the list of eligible training schools. • Educate on correct waste disposal. • Re-consider written tests as they may be a barrier for those with lower literacy. • Reduce administrative and bureaucratic restrictions. • Further increase the discount. • Better promote the course to increase uptake.	We would support the reintroduction of some basic dog training (not just owners) before receiving a licence”
Total comments: 28	

OFFICER RESPONSE

There is overall high support for this proposal at 85%, with few concerns expressed in the comments. A primary theme was that attaining the Accredited Dog Owner status should not be “too easy”, particularly regarding the emphasis for owners to attend obedience training instead of a purely theoretical course.

This decision to allow either a theoretical or practical option (dog obedience training) helps to enhance the accessibility of the course, recognising that formal training can present financial barriers for some owners. Additionally, some owners may have adopted dogs that are already well-trained or feel proficient in self-training methods, and thus prefer not to undergo (and pay for) obedience training solely to attain ADO status. The Council will continue to promote attendance at third-party obedience courses, providing information on these via our website.

Other suggested changes from the consultation have been noted and relayed to the operational teams. These suggestions include exploring the possibility of partnering with Kiwi Aversion training, better ways to promote the scheme, and reviewing the list of eligible third-party obedience organisations. Proposal 9 (above) will provide the Council more flexibility to gradually incorporate some of these suggestions over time, as deemed appropriate.

Proposal 11: Introduce a requirement for dog owners to carry effective means of waste disposal in public places.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the specific proposal to implement a bylaw requirement for dog owners to carry effective means of waste disposal in public places?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- 95% (1802) supported the Council's focus to increase enforcement of dog waste management in Wellington.
- 91% (1781) supported this specific proposal to require dog owners to carry effective means of waste disposal in public places.
- 102 submitters made comments.
- **Organisations widely supported** Te Ahumairangi Ecological Rest, Oriental Bay Residents Association, Friends of the Tawa Bush Reserve, Central Allbreeds Dog Training, Glenside Association, Capital BMX, Willowbank Reserve Care Group, Tawa Community Group.

Proposal 11: Full sample including "No preference" responses

	Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
Total	1092	689	140	119	50	2090
85%					7% 8%	

WHAT WE HEARD

THEMES HEARD IN SUPPORT	CONCERNS HEARD AGAINST
Overall generally supportive comments for increasing enforcement of dog waste. Many felt frustration at irresponsible owners not correctly disposing of waste and the lack of ability to take action. Some were in favour of heavier fines and cranking down on irresponsible owners.	The requirement was not an effective solution, with better options available (e.g., increasing bins). Some noted that waste bags are often dumped, so this bylaw would not resolve that problem. Enforcement of bylaw would be 'high cost'. Gives 'too much power' to Animal Control.

Despite being in support, some had questions about enforcement of the requirement (some asked if dog owners would be searched or if there would be spot checks).	It might make responsible owners feel uncomfortable. <i>"I support education around dog waste: but am highly opposed to creating a system of stopping and fining people for simply walking the streets with their dogs. This will create a culture of fear"</i>
Total comments: 102	

OFFICER RESPONSE

It is recommended to proceed with this proposal for the following reasons:

- Growing public demand for increased enforcement of dog fouling.
- Dog faeces pose health risks to humans and wildlife, contribute to water contamination, and interfere with the enjoyment of public spaces. The absence of waste disposal methods on hand indicates a lack of intent to clean up.
- The infringement fee can be implemented with a degree of flexibility and will consider individual circumstances. For instance, if a dog owner accidentally forgets their bags but demonstrates a genuine intention to clean up, the fee may not be issued.

It is evident from the feedback that the public wants to be 'met halfway' by the Council regarding more frequent emptying of bins, provision of additional bags, and better placement of bins. This feedback has been passed over to the relevant operational teams. The Council is looking to place additional bins at sites that are proposed to move off-leash as part of this review.

Proposal 12: Introduce a “Dog-Friendly Wellington” section into the Dog Policy.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposal to introduce a "Dog-Friendly Wellington" section into the Dog Policy?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- Out of those who gave a preference, 89% supported the proposal.
- 86 submitters made comments.
- Dog owners overwhelmingly support this proposal (91%).
- **Supported by:** Central Allbreeds Dog Training, Oriental Bay Residents Association, Te Ahumairangi Ecological Rest, Forest & Bird
- **Not supported by:** Friends of the Tawa Bush Reserve (no specific comments).

Proposal 12: Level of support including dog ownership breakdown

	Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
Dog owner	1007	499	113	23	10	
91%					7% 2%	1652
Non dog owner	33	90	118	80	84	
30%		29%	41%			405
Total	1040	589	231	103	94	
79%					11% 10%	2057

Key	
	Support
	No preference
	Do not support

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
‘Dog-friendly’ is a unique branding for Wellington and increasing the variety of dog-friendly spaces improves the lives of dog owners in Wellington. Submitters offered suggestions to increase the dog-friendly nature of Wellington (ranked from most, to least frequent):	Concern that dog-friendly initiatives will increase dog waste and conflict with other users. More dog-friendly areas will result in the exclusion of people allergic to dogs, previously attacked by dogs, scared of dogs, and children.

• Allowing dogs on public transport. • Providing a list of dog-friendly businesses on the Wellington City Council website. • Introducing more bins around popular dog walking areas/ parks. • Providing more poo bags at popular dog walking areas/parks. • Increasing off-leash area. • More fencing at off-leash areas (for the safety of dogs and pedestrians).	<i>"We need to be more "friendly" to people who do not want to be attacked or accosted by dogs off-leash in undesignated areas."</i> Dog-friendly initiatives go against increasing biodiversity in Wellington as they attack wildlife like Kiwis and have a significant carbon footprint. One commented that being dog friendly is a <i>'feel good measure'</i> and not a priority for the ratepayer.
Total comments: 86	

OFFICER RESPONSE

There is overall strong support for this initiative, at 89%. Early engagement revealed that some dog owners think the Council is actively restricting dogs on public transport and establishments (retail and hospitality) from becoming "dog friendly".

The proposed policy provides food businesses with an avenue to contact the Council if they want to establish a more dog-friendly space while adhering to food safety requirements.

The updated policy also explains that the regulation and management of public transport services do not fall under the jurisdiction of WCC. As part of this review, we have provided this feedback to the Greater Wellington Regional Council (the Public Transport Authority for the Wellington Region).

Proposal 13: Introduce level of service categories for off-leash areas (Destination, Community, and Local).

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposal to introduce a new level of service categories for off-leash areas?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- **1998 submissions received overall.** Of those who gave a preference: 91% (1100) supported the proposal, and 9% (109) did not support it.
- SPCA was the only submission to comment: *"We commend the Council on introducing this system to help manage dog owners' expectations of off-leash areas and proactively identify where improvements in services"*.
- **Supported by:** SPCA, Central All Breeds Dog Training, Urban Wildlife Trust, Te Ahumairangi Ecological Reserve, Oriental Bay Residents Association, Forest & Bird
- **Not supported by:** Friends of Tawa Bush Reserve.

Proposal 13: Level of support including "No preference" responses

Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
368	732	789	74	35	1998
55%			40%	5%	

Key	
	Support
	No preference
	Do not support

OFFICER RESPONSE

Overall there was high majority support (91%, 1100 submissions – of those that gave a preference) for this change, with no negative comments received in the public feedback. The new section will provide clarity for owners regarding the expected levels of services across off-leash areas. It will also help the Council to identify gaps in service level provision which can help guide future investment decisions.

Part 2: Cats

Proposal 14: Introduce a bylaw requirement for the mandatory desexing of cats.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED WITH AMENDMENT TO ADD AN EXPLANATORY NOTE REGARDING THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD FOR THE BYLAW

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposed bylaw requirement that all domestic cats over six months must be desexed (with exceptions for cats owned by registered breeders or if the procedure would pose an unnecessary risk to the cat)?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

The survey results showed a roughly equal split between cat owners and non-cat owners.

Strong support for cat management. Among those expressing a preference:

- A significant majority (99% or 551 respondents) supported the Council's focus to reduce stray cats in the city. Only 1% (7) did not support this initiative.
- Similarly, a strong majority (97% or 561 respondents) supported the proposal for mandatory desexing, with only 3% (18) opposing it.

Widespread support from organisations including Te Ahumairangi Ecological Restoration, Urban Wildlife Trust, Companion Animals NZ, Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne, Glenside Association, NZ Veterinary Association, SPCA, Predator Free Ngaio and Greater Wellington Regional Council.

Proposal 14: Level of support by cat ownership status

	Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support			Total	
Cat owner	200	58	4	8	6				276
93%					2%	5%			
Non cat owner	281	22	1	4	0				308
98%					1%	1%			
	481	80	5	12	6				584

Key	
	Support
	No preference
	Do not support

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
Protecting native wildlife: overwhelmingly emphasised the importance of controlling the cat population to protect native fauna. Submissions highlighted the impact cats can have on native birds, lizards, and other wildlife. The belief that feral cats are the problem: <i>“Domestic and feral cats are a massive problem in NZ and have had a huge impact on the native fauna of our country, so I strongly support any effort to control the cat population.”</i> Pro-animal welfare: Many expressed concerns about the increase of stray/abandoned cats, emphasising the suffering caused by uncontrolled breeding. Submissions mention the difficulties of finding homes for these animals. Supporters see mandatory desexing as a way to promote responsible pet ownership. Emphasis that desexing is a common-sense practice: <i>“It is an absolute no-brainer!”</i>	A few felt mandatory desexing infringed on their rights to breed cats and have litters (Resulting in a “reduced DNA pool”). Some are worried about the potential negative health effects on cat development if desexed too young. Uncertainty around stray reduction methods: Some expressed concern that desexing might be followed by euthanasia instead of releasing animals back into the wild. Others supported euthanasia. Funding and affordability: - The cost of desexing was a concern for some, suggesting a need for financial assistance programmes for those that needed it. - Concerns that mandatory desexing could penalise low-income cat owners. Two submitters suggested increasing the Council budget for operational cat reduction. Enforcement: - Uncertainty about how desexing compliance would be monitored. - Concern over the practicality of enforcing mandatory desexing.
Total comments: 118	

Other public suggestions for further regulations of cats

Submitters also used this opportunity to suggest further regulations for cats, including:

- containment of cats to property (64)
- introduce cat registration (27)
- cat caps per household (17)
- limits per zone/neighbourhood (12)
- require cats to wear collars/bells (6)

Submitters also expressed the nuisance cats can cause (10), questioned why there is not equal treatment to dogs (7), and regulated breeders (7).

OFFICER RESPONSE

The proposal to make cat desexing mandatory has received broad community support, which has continued the trend from early engagement results. Submitters recognise the importance of controlling the cat population to protect native wildlife and prevent stray cats.

Concerns around affordability can be addressed through published FAQs which will be available on the website. Financial aid is available for those that need it and this will need to be communicated well to alleviate any anxieties regarding the proposal. Over time, we want desexing to be considered as part of owning a cat, much like vaccination costs.

In response to questions around enforcement, enforcement will prioritise education and collaboration. Animal Liaison Officers will work alongside rescue organisations and the SPCA to promote responsible pet ownership and desexing.

Veterinarians are not obligated to enforce the policy, however, they will be made aware of the new bylaw requirements and provided with information and available resources to cat owners.

Part 3 - Other Animals

Proposal 15: Clarify that written permission is not required to keep poultry, bees, or stock in rural areas.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED

OFFICER RESPONSE

This proposal represents a relatively minor change, as it is already common practice for rural areas to keep poultry, bees, and stock, and this has not been identified as an issue for the Council. This change is designed to clarify within the bylaw that written permission is not required. This addition aims to minimise any confusion with other new bylaw requirements resulting from this review. General comments throughout the submissions appreciate that such clarifications will promote more responsible animal ownership.

Proposal 16: Clarify the scope of birds categorised as ‘poultry’ in the bylaw.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposal to clarify the scope of birds categorised as ‘poultry’ in the bylaw? (eg hens, roosters, ducks, geese, pheasants, peafowl, quail and turkeys).

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- 150 submissions were received overall. Of those who gave a preference: **96% (115) supported the proposal**, and 4% (5) did not support it.
- No comments were received.
- **Supporting organisations:** Urban Wildlife Trust, SPCA.

Proposal 16: Full sample including “No preference” responses

Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
55	60	30	2	3	150
77%			20%	3%	

OFFICER RESPONSE

There is overwhelming support for this proposal, with 96% in favour and no comments or concerns raised during the process. It is advised to proceed with the change to enhance the clarity of the bylaw.

Proposal 17: Specify the types of poultry allowed in residential areas without prior permission.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED WITH AMENDMENT

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposal to specify the types of poultry allowed in residential areas without requiring prior permission?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- 153 submissions were received overall. Of those who gave a preference: **82% (111) supported the proposal**, and 18% (25) did not support it. Seven made comments.
- **Supported by:** SPCA.

Proposal 17: Full sample including “No preference” responses

Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
52	59	17	15	10	153
73%			11%	16%	

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
<i>“I love that more people are allowed to raise hens in the city, but also aware many don’t know what they are doing so inspectors and checking on their health would def be needed.”</i>	Hens do not belong in residential areas on the basis that they are noisy, smelly and can cause a nuisance to neighbours. In favour of a lower number of birds being kept reducing the possibility of rewilding, overcrowding, and noise.
Total comments: 8	

OFFICER RESPONSE

Proceed with an amendment to clarify that new requirements only apply to poultry acquired after the adoption of the bylaw.

There is majority support, with 82% in favour. During the process, a few concerns were raised, particularly regarding the appropriateness of keeping hens in residential areas and a request to reduce the number of birds allowed. It is important to note that the number of hens allowed has not been changed since the last review. This proposal will permit up to 12 quail, primarily to recognise their small size and gentle calls (making them more suitable for residential settings for individuals interested in egg production or hobby farming).

Proposal 18: Introduce new conditions for keeping poultry.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposal to introduce new conditions for keeping poultry?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- 151 submissions were received overall. Of those who gave a preference: 94% (136) supported the proposal, and 6% (9) did not support it.
- **Supported by:** SPCA and Urban Wildlife Trust.

Proposal 18: Full sample including “No preference” responses

Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
92	44	6	6	3	151
90%				4% 6%	

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
Ten submitters expressed support for pest control measures like vermin-proof containers, noting the impact that poultry has on vermin populations and therefore native species. <i>“As a rodent trapper, I believe that requiring vermin-proof storage of poultry feed can effectively help reduce rodent numbers and facilitate eradication”.</i> <i>“The Urban Wildlife Trust supports any measures to restrict the increased pest populations (such as rats) that domestic poultry can cause”.</i>	Submitters expressed that further policies are unnecessary as existing policies cover noise, smell, etc. Submitters expressed that poultry ownership is up to the individual. <i>“I think that there are existing provisions and powers for the council to monitor the safe and healthy keeping of stock and adding more bureaucratic measures will not improve the situation.”</i>

OFFICER RESPONSE

There is overwhelming majority support (94%), with particular enthusiasm for the clause requiring feed to be stored in vermin-proof containers. While some express concerns that "existing policies are sufficient," this change makes it enforceable under the bylaw, enhancing its effectiveness.

Proposal 19: Introduce a cap of four beehives in residential areas without the need for written permission.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED WITH AMENDMENT

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposal to introduce a cap of four beehives in residential areas without the need for written permission from the Council?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- 77% (97) supported the proposal, and 23% (29) did not support it⁷.
- **Support:** Wellington Beekeepers Association, Urban Wildlife Trust, Apiculture NZ.
- Non beekeepers were typically in more support of the proposal than beekeepers.

Proposal 19: Full sample results with breakdown of beekeeper status

	Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
Beekeeper	2	4	1	2	6	15
	40%	7%	53%			
Non-beekeeper	43	48	13	15	6	125
	73%			10%	17%	
Total	45	52	14	17	12	140

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
ApiNZ and Beekeepers Association support limits as they are useful to prevent unreasonable hive numbers and potential commercial operations in residential zones.	The proposal did not take property size or proximity to neighbours into consideration. Individuals should consult neighbouring properties (neighbours may have allergies).

OFFICER RESPONSE

Proceed with an amendment to clarify that new requirements only apply to beehives acquired after the adoption of the bylaw. Overall majority support (77%), including key stakeholders in the beekeeping community. While we acknowledge suggestions for amending the bylaw, enforcing square meterage and distance regulations may pose challenges, particularly in densely populated areas with varying property sizes. It's worth considering that stringent requirements could deter potential beekeepers. Therefore, adopting a simpler rule, such as a "cap of four" hives, is more practical. Additionally, the bylaw retains clauses allowing hive removal if they cause a nuisance to adjoining neighbours, and officers will be able to factor in allergies.

⁷ Percentages calculated out of those who gave a preference.

Proposal 20: Allow the Council to require the removal or relocation of hives if they cause a nuisance.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposal to introduce a provision that allows the Council to require the removal or relocation of hives if they cause a nuisance?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- Of those who gave a preference: 77% (99) supported and 23% (29) did not.
- **Supported by:** Wellington Beekeepers Association, Urban Wildlife Trust.

Proposal 20: Level of support including “No preference” responses

Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
48	51	12	19	10	140
71%			8%	21%	

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
General supportive comments. SPCA suggested that the Council add a condition requiring good husbandry and health practices for bees and that beehives be set back from the road to avoid bee death from car collisions.	Submitters expressed that ‘nuisance’ is a vague and subjective term that needs to be more clearly defined. “...<i>It can't be simply because someone's bees are in a neighbour's garden.</i>” <i>ApiNZ supports a more appropriate word such as ‘hazardous’ as it implies a more serious situation.” They also prefer relocation over removal, stating that removal should be a last resort.</i>

OFFICER RESPONSE

There was strong support for this proposal to provide an outlet for the Council to request relocation or removal of hives if they cause a nuisance. We note that some submitters suggested a preference for the use of the word ‘hazardous’, however, the term ‘nuisance’ will be maintained as this is widely used terminology in legislation, such as the Health Act 1956 and Local Government Act 2002.

Proposal 21: Introduce requirement that beekeeping on Council land must occur within licensed community garden areas.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposal to introduce a requirement that beekeeping on Council land must occur within licensed community garden areas?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- **140 submissions were received overall.** Of those who gave a preference: 57% (62) supported the proposal, and 43% (47) did not support it.
- **Supported by:** Wellington Beekeepers Association, Urban Wildlife Trust.

Proposal 21: Level of support including “No preference” responses

Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
29	33	31	31	16	140
44%		22%	34%		

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
<i>“Think it’s a good idea to have hives in community gardens as there is already a duty of care community involved.”</i> Urban Wildlife Trust: <i>“We strongly support beehives not being kept within bush areas on public land”.</i>	One submitter expressed that under-utilised Council land should be able to be used for hives as bees are important. Two submitters requested that the Council provide a map of hives across Wellington so residents with allergies can identify high-risk areas.

OFFICER RESPONSE

This proposal is recommended to proceed as there was more support and it reflects existing Council practices that are being formalised through the bylaw. The request to provide a map of hives across Wellington has been passed on to the relevant operational teams.

Proposal 22: Reference legal requirements under the Biosecurity Act into the Bylaw.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED WITH A MINOR AMENDMENT FOR CLARIFICATION THAT REGISTRATION IS NOT WITH THE COUNCIL

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the reference to legal requirements under the Biosecurity Act in the bylaw?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- 136 submissions were received overall. Of those who gave a preference: 91% (82) supported the proposal, and 9% (8) did not support it.
- **Supported by:** SPCA, Wellington Beekeepers Association, Urban Wildlife Trust.

Proposal 22: Level of support including “No preference” responses.

Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
46	36	46	2	6	136
60%			34%		6%

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
Apiculture NZ supports having a strong bee health and biosecurity position. SPCA acknowledges the importance of beekeepers being aware of their obligations under different legislation.	<u>No specific comments for concern but there was an area of clarification offered by the Beekeepers Association:</u> Biosecurity Act states "The Beekeepers Registration Number must be displayed on at least one hive or a sign within each apiary". Registration must be with The Management Agency, <i>not</i> Wellington City Council.

OFFICER RESPONSE

Strong support for this proposal aiming to signpost relevant legislation for beekeepers. We thank the Wellington Beekeepers Association for their assistance in updating this clause for clarification of readers.

Proposal 23: Introduce bylaw definition for stock.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED WITH AMENDMENT TO TREAT HORSES SEPARATELY FROM THE STOCK DEFINITION

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposal to introduce a definition for stock in the bylaw? (eg alpacas, cattle, deer, donkeys, horses, sheep, goats and pigs).

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- **104 submissions were received overall.** Of those who gave a preference: 90% (83) supported the proposal, and 10% (9) did not support it. **Four made comments.**
- **Non-stock owners overwhelmingly supported** the proposal (85%).
- **Supported by:** Urban Wildlife Trust, Glenside Association, SPCA
- **Not supported by:** Greater Wellington Regional Council.

Proposal 23: Level of support including stock ownership status

	Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
Stock owner	2	3	3	1	3	12
	42%		25%	33%		
Non-stock owner	40	39	9	4	1	93
	85%				10% 5%	
Total	42	42	12	5	4	105

WHAT WE HEARD

THEMES HEARD IN SUPPORT	CONCERNS HEARD AGAINST
No specific comments.	<i>Horses are domesticated pets and should be treated differently under the bylaws. It would be inappropriate to tag horses.</i> Suggestion to remove goats, deer, and pigs from the stock category and class them separately as they would have a higher impact on biodiversity if they escaped.
Total comments: 4	

OFFICER RESPONSE

In response to the concerns raised, particularly from stock owners, we have separated horses from the stock definition in the updated bylaw. Horses are not required to be tagged under the amended bylaw.

Proposal 24: Require prior written permission for keeping stock in residential areas.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposal to require prior written permission for keeping stock in a residential area as part of the bylaw?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- **103 submissions were received overall.** Of those who gave a preference: 73% (67) supported the proposal, and 27% (25) did not support it. **Three provided comments.**
- **Supported by:** Urban Wildlife Trust, SPCA.

Proposal 24: Level of support including “No preference” responses

Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
43	24	11	15	10	103

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
A feeling that it is ‘inappropriate’ to keep stock in residential areas. <i>“Houses in wellington city are too close together and don’t have enough land for stock.”</i>	No specific comments.
Total comments: 3	

OFFICER RESPONSE

Overall support and agreement that stock is less suitable to be kept in residential areas. This bylaw change reflects and formalises common practice to require permission. Additionally the requirement has been outlined in fact sheets and the Council website for many years.

Proposal 25: Introduce new condition requirements for keeping stock.

RECOMMENDATION: PROCEED

WHAT WE ASKED

How do you feel about the proposal to introduce new condition requirements for keeping stock, including aspects like manure management and providing suitable living accommodations?

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

- 102 submissions were received overall. Of those who gave a preference: 92% (90) supported the proposal, and 8% (8) did not support it. **Six provided comments.**
- **Supported by:** Urban Wildlife Trust, SPCA

Proposal 25: Level of support including “No preference” responses

Strongly support	Support	No preference	Do not support	Strongly do not support	Total
65	25	4	4	4	102
88%		4%	8%		

WHAT WE HEARD

SUPPORTIVE THEMES	OPPOSING THEMES
Three submitters expressed their support for the proposal to introduce new condition requirements for keeping stock. <i>“The welfare of stock is extremely important. Any enhancement to stock welfare is necessary and welcome.”</i>	One submitter was concerned about the requirement to manage manure, saying it was impractical for rural properties and even dairy farms are not held to similar standards. Two submitters expressed that existing policies are sufficient for the management of stock and the proposed changes are therefore unnecessary.
Total comments: 6	

OFFICER RESPONSE

This proposal received a high level of support with a general consensus that certain condition requirements should be required to keep stock. Addressing concerns that existing policies may be inadequate, it's important to note that the current bylaw only pertains to goats. Regarding the issue of manure management, the clause in question provides some flexibility by offering options to "recycle, reuse, or remove" manure and stipulates that this must be done "before it creates a nuisance" - it does not specify a strict timeframe.

Appendix A - Copy of organisations submissions

Order of submissions

- Paul Ward on behalf of Capital Kiwi
- Sally Cory on behalf of New Zealand Veterinary Association & Companion Animals Veterinarians Branch
- John Burnet on behalf of Wellington Beekeepers Association
- David Lloyd on behalf of Companion Animals New Zealand
- Karin Kos on behalf of Apiculture New Zealand
- Karen Stacie Martyn on behalf of Church of Flying Spaghetti Monster
- Bronwen Shepherd on behalf of Te Ahumairangi Ecological Restoration
- Andrew Meehan on behalf of ONZM Oriental Bay Residents Association
- Myfanwy Hill on behalf of Urban Wildlife Trust
- Jo Ledington on behalf of Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne
- Miriam Moore on behalf of Tawa Community Board
- Willowbank Reserve Care Group
- Gary Beecroft on behalf of Friends of Tawa Bush Reserves
- Arnja Dale on behalf of Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA)
- Anke Atkins on behalf of Oriental Bay Residence Association
- Steve Glassey on behalf of Animal Evacuation New Zealand Trust
- Judie Alison on behalf of Predator Free Ngaio
- Myfanwy Hill on behalf of Greater Wellington Regional Council – Environmental Operations
- Claire Bibby on behalf of Glenside Association
- Bruce Patterson on behalf of Grenada Village Community Association
- Carol West on behalf of Ōtari- Wilton's Bush Trust Board (OWBTB)
- Kate Littin on behalf of Forest and Bird and Kerry Shaw on behalf of Wellington Branch of Forest & Bird Places for Penguins
- Lisa Snow on behalf of the Island Bay Dog Beach Users Group
- Dave Harkness on behalf of Capital BMX

Paul Ward on behalf of Capital Kiwi

Kia ora Wellington City Council,

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on these reviews. I will keep The Capital Kiwi Project's comments brief and at a high level, focusing only on the core issues for the project.

I do not request to speak to this submission but am happy to do so if there is an appetite from council.

Introduction to The Capital Kiwi Project

The fundamental change in context underpinning Wellington City Council's policy approach to domestic animals is that, for the first time, WCC is now a guardian of kiwi on its land.

Kiwi have been extinct in the wild Wellington for at least 150 years. Kiwi nationally remain under threat with approximately 70,000 wild kiwi remaining and this number trending towards extinction. The Capital Kiwi Project has been working in partnership with communities, iwi and more than 100 landowners (including WCC) to prepare for kiwi to return to the capital. It's been an epic collective effort.

The Capital Kiwi Project encompasses a community-owned network of 4,600 traps covering 24,000 hectares of Wellington's western hills – an area bigger than Abel Tasman National Park. The network has removed thousands of predators from the landscape.

Since November 2022, 63 North Island brown kiwi have been released into the hills on Terawhiti Station to the south-west of Wellington. Most of these kiwi are not monitored or tracked. This is part of the commitment to building a wild, free-ranging population of our icon and taonga in Wellington's backyard.

At least another 200 kiwi will be released over the coming years.

The kiwi that are monitored are thriving: putting on weight and pairing up. Wellingtonians are also beginning to encounter kiwi – the sighting of a kiwi pair by a mountain biker at Makara Peak was recorded in September; footprints have been photographed at Mākara Cemetery and calls are being reported heard at night from western Karori. A monitored kiwi was located close to the Skyline Track over from Parkvale, Karori north.

Dog policy is critically important

More and more Wellingtonians are going to start coming across kiwi, WCC's role in education around kiwi awareness, and animal policy – and enforcement – now has a critical role to play in keeping them safe. The primary policy consideration is around dogs:

- effecting responsible pet ownership
- keeping kiwi safe from dogs on council land

Kiwi are now spreading through the south-western hills. From now onwards expect them to be experienced around Karori Cemetery, Ōtari and anywhere northwards around the suburban bush fringe of the Outer Green Belt. For this reason we do not support Spicer's Forest or the Skyline Track being designated off-lead dog exercise areas.

Even a small, uncontrolled dog will quickly kill an adult kiwi. Council policy needs to ensure dogs are controlled in all WCC public lands around the south-west city fringe. With

the trap network controlling the impact of stoats depredating kiwi chicks, uncontrolled dogs are now the single biggest threat to kiwi in these areas.

But this is a policy area that must be handled with care and balance. Wellington is now home to kiwi (again). It is also a city of passionate dog owners, and the ownership rate has notably increased in recent years. The provision of an appropriate mix of incentives and enforcement is required to ensure our pets and native wildlife can thrive alongside each other.

Effectively, this means that dogs need to be on-lead in areas where that is required; along with additional responsible dog ownership messaging: that dogs are contained at night, and that missing or uncontrolled dogs are quickly reported.

Enforcement is important

The Capital Kiwi Project is concerned about the WCC resource available to monitor and enforce dog policy. As we understand it dog ownership post Covid-19 in Wellington has exploded by 40 per cent and animal control resource has not moved with it.

Our understanding is that comparable councils have a ratio of one Animal Control ranger to every 1,000 registered dogs but in Wellington this is closer to a 1: 3,000 dogs.

If policy is not adequately enforced, rules become little more than advice and will be ignored. We support WCC increasing its animal control resource by one-two FTEs in order to keep kiwi safe.

Partnership approach

The success of the project to date has been based on working together (with communities, landowners, iwi); that principle of kotahitanga will continue to need to be applied when it comes to the Wellington dog-owning community.

The Capital Kiwi Project believes behaviour change must be something dog owners come to want to do and that to be successful it must be co-owned and led by the dog-owning community.

Appropriate incentives and education will need to be provided (actions to deliver this could range from RDO registration discounts, to education, training, comms and in situ events).

Progressively evolving existing behaviour norms needs to be carefully considered in partnership with the communities affected. For example, for some dog owners, the enforcement of (existing) on-lead dog policy on the Skyline Track, Mākara Peak and the cemeteries will be perceived as a removal of exercise areas – such is the rate of present non-compliance.

A policy challenge to ensure successful compliance with on-lead dog requirements in WCC areas where kiwi are present is to ensure that off-lead dog exercise options are available nearby in apt areas.

We have local examples of successful behaviour change e.g. Waimapihi Reserve. Where community-leadership, in partnership with WCC, has seen a shift from nearly all dogs off-lead and by-laws ignored, to most dogs on-lead and the community and dog owners taking the lead in delivering guardianship.

Taking the lead

WCC have been partners in bringing kiwi home to Wellington's hills; it is a globally significant example of community-led re-wilding. A kiwi awareness working group focused

on WCC lands surrounding Karori meets monthly and is made up of Capital Kiwi Project team members, community stakeholders and staff from across multiple WCC functions.

We have valued the WCC contribution to education of dog owners so far and are committed to keeping working in partnership with Council to ensure that awareness of what is required to keep kiwi safe is understood, widespread and supported by Wellingtonians.

Part of that ongoing conversation will include consideration of Kiwi Avoidance Training (KAT). This involves a trainer putting a dog through a course to deter it from engaging with kiwi. We have worked together with the Makara dog-owning community to have 130 dogs put through KAT. This is as part of the Project's strategy for looking after kiwi on private land (e.g. large blocks such as farm stations and forestry where kiwi and working dogs are present).

The suburban fringe context is very different, with around 1,000 dogs in Karori alone, and almost all of these being domestic dogs. In addition while KAT is effective, it is not a silver bullet and doesn't remove the need to have a dog under control. KAT may be offered further afield than the rural zones, but it will be as part of a suite of tools (we look forward to ongoing discussion with communities and WCC around the provision of KAT).

The primary message remains: responsible dog ownership is key to keeping our kiwi (and other wildlife) safe from our pet dogs, and for the western suburbs Outer Green Belt and reserves and cemeteries, that means dogs on-lead.

I hope these comments are helpful and are received in the constructive spirit they are intended.

We very much appreciate the commitment and work of the WCC team in this important kiwi conservation partnership and look forward to the outcome of this consultation.

Sally Cory on behalf of New Zealand Veterinary Association & Companion Animals Veterinarians Branch

The New Zealand Veterinary Association (NZVA) and Companion Animal Veterinarians branch (CAV) support the principles of cat guardianship and cat management that contribute to a harmonious relationship between people, cats, and the environment. Having a companion cat is a privilege but carries responsibilities. These responsibilities are not only to the cat, but to other people on whom the cat's actions may have an effect, and to the environment we share.

De-sexing of both male and female companion cats that are not intended for breeding, before puberty is an effective tool to prevent overpopulation and unwanted cats.

Mandatory desexing

We acknowledge that there is some evidence that desexed cats may have reduced metabolic rates and are more likely to gain weight (Fettman, M.J., et al. Effects of neutering on bodyweight, metabolic rate, and glucose tolerance of domestic cats. Research in Veterinary Science. 1997, Vol. 62, pp. 131-136). We also acknowledge that evidence-based reasons to delay, or exclude de-sexing in individual situations, may present over time. In addition, there may be specific health related conditions that might preclude desexing in an individual cat and we see the veterinarian as being best informed about the health implications of desexing for an individual cat. On that basis we support section 4.2 (b) that a registered veterinarian can provide a certificate exempting an individual from being desexed if they see the procedure being one that will place the cat at unnecessary risk.

The NZVA and Companion Animal Veterinarians branch are key stakeholders in the National Cat Management Strategy Group, which recognises that mandatory desexing reduces cat overpopulation and is a key aspect of responsible guardianship of cats. It acknowledges that legislative mandatory desexing will be of benefit in areas where a high number of cats entering animal shelters/pounds are unwanted kittens from owned cats or owned adult cats surrendered because of unwanted breeding.

The implementation of mandatory desexing is likely to have a positive impact on cat management in terms of reducing cat overpopulation and in turn should result in a decrease in cat predation on wildlife and a decrease in animal shelter/control cat intake and euthanasia.

Mandatory desexing will be most effective if cats are desexed before the onset of sexual maturity, measures are put into place to ensure desexing of cats is priced to be accessible, mandatory identification is upheld, and legislation is adequately enforced. We acknowledge that the phasing in of mandatory desexing of cats will need to be combined with effective public educational campaigns.

Formal assessment of the impact of national mandatory desexing should occur and would be a beneficial addition to the literature in the field of cat management.

John Burnet on behalf of Wellington Beekeepers Association

Wellington City Council - Proposed Bylaw wording for Bees

Some comments from members of the Wellington Beekeepers Assoc.

Keeping Bees on private land

6.1

- a) Is Council aware of how many Wgton beekeepers have more than 4 hives – I would suggest 20 – 50
- b) What will obtaining permission involve? Will this be one-off or an annual requirement?
- c) Will there be a cost? If so, this may drive beepers underground
- d) How does Council define “residential”? What about properties who pay residential rates but are located in a rural area? There’s a big difference between sections in Mt Vic or Newtown and lifestyle blocks in Takapu Valley.
- e) Any allowance for beekeepers who split their hives in spring (effectively doubling hive numbers) to reduce risk of swarming and re-unite later in summer?
- f) While bee expert Mark Goodwin (advice to Waipa Council) suggests there should be no restriction, we suggest there may need to be some definitive limit to prevent unreasonable urban hive numbers or commercial operators.
- g) The word “nuisance” is very subjective (bee defecation?) and while it could be defined as “injurious to health” (allergic to bee stings?), “hazardous” could be a better term
- h) How is “dangerous” defined?
- i) We are pleased there is no mention of obtaining written permission from neighbouring properties. This is impracticable and unworkable.

6.3

- a) Removal if required should be a mutually agreed process and timeline that is practical and sensitive. We support restriction to adjoining properties. Properties

“nearby” is not appropriate.

- b) If property is rural zoned with hives, why is removal an option. We assume relocation elsewhere on the property may be all that is required.

Assessment considerations

6.5

Assessment c – Many schools already have hives and should be encouraged.

Assessment d – How are hives per property determined based on the hives in the area? For privacy reasons the Apiary Registrar will likely refuse to provide this information. No one else can.

David Lloyd on behalf of Companion Animals New Zealand

Dear Wellington City Council,

Introduction

Companion Animals New Zealand (CANZ) is an organisation that educates the community on providing A Good Life for companion animals. CANZ is committed to animal welfare, and to advancing responsible companion animal ownership in New Zealand. Our hope is that all companion animals in New Zealand can enjoy A Good Life.

CANZ welcomes the opportunity to make a submission on the proposed changes to the Wellington City Council Wellington Consolidated Bylaw 2008: Part 2 – Animals. We are specifically interested in giving feedback in relation to the management of cats.

Companion Animals NZ encourages the Wellington City Council to include mandatory desexing of cats in the bylaw.

Scientific evidence supporting the mandatory desexing of cats

CANZ considers desexing of cats to be an essential part of responsible cat ownership.

The overpopulation of cats is a well-known and recognised issue not only in New Zealand but throughout the world.

Domestic cats can reach reproductive maturity as early as 3.5 months of age (Farnworth, 2013a). Research conducted in Australia has shown that only 70% of cats are desexed prior to the age of 6 months, allowing opportunity for sexually mature cats to produce litters before they are desexed (Toukhsati, 2005)

Stray cats

The exact numbers of stray cats in New Zealand is not definitively known, however one study has estimated it to be around 196,000 (Farnworth, 2013b). With 75% of companion cats in Wellington being free roaming (WCC Statement of Proposal, 2023) the likelihood of interaction between owned and stray cats is extremely high. Consequently, there is huge potential for un-desexed owned cats to mate with stray cats and produce unwanted litters which contributes towards the overall overpopulation issue in New Zealand. In Wellington, 36% of households have a cat. There are an average of 1.7 cats per household), and 8% of these cats are not desexed and guardians of 5.8% of cats are not sure if they are desexed or not (Companion Animals NZ, 2020 unpublished data). The number of households in the Wellington City is 75,201 (Stats NZ, 2018 census). It can therefore be estimated that Wellington City region contains 6000 - 9700 owned, un-desexed cats. Given that a female cat has an average of four kittens per litter, and can have up to three litters per year, it is easy to see how rapidly cat populations can expand. Desexing is the most affordable, sustainable, and practical solution to controlling the cat population. Each year thousands of cats and kittens are taken to animal shelters, many of which are either unsuitable for adoption or are unable to find homes and are subsequently euthanised. There is a lack of national statistics relating to cat numbers in animal shelters, however 17,570 kittens arrived at SPCA centres across New Zealand in 2017 alone (SPCA, 2019). This is representative of the issue New Zealand wide and should be

addressed through implementing mandatory desexing of owned cats to prevent unwanted litters and breeding with the stray cat population.

As well as the benefit of reducing unwanted litters and associated euthanasia as described above, there are additional benefits to the desexing of cats (Berg, n.d., Cupp, 2014). Desexed cats engage in less nuisance behaviour e.g. roaming, fighting, spraying. Desexing has important disease prevention benefits, such as reduced mammary, uterine and ovarian tumours and pyometra (uterine infection) in females, reduced risk of testicular tumours and prostate disorders including cancer in males, and an increased lifespan in both males and females.

As well as mandating the desexing of cats, CANZ agrees it is important for Wellington City Council to mandate the age by which cats must be desexed. As described above, age of desexing plays an important role in preventing unwanted litters and so managing the cat overpopulation problem.

The traditional age of desexing of cats is 6 months. However, research suggests there is no significant behavioural and physical advantages of desexing at this age (Joyce, 2011). The New Zealand Veterinary Association supports pre-pubertal desexing of cats from 8 weeks of age and cites benefits of early age desexing including improved population control, faster surgical procedure with less trauma and stress for the individual cat, and reduced recovery times (NZVA, 2018). CANZ recommends amending the draft bylaw to include compulsory desexing by 4 months of age.

CANZ proposes that a cat should be exempt from desexing if:

- a) The cat is owned, for the purposes of breeding, by a cat breeder registered with the New Zealand Cat Fancy or Catz Incorporated
- b) The owner provides a certificate from a veterinarian stating that the desexing of the cat will adversely affect its health and/or welfare

What about enforceability?

We appreciate that there is no national Cat Management Act allowing enforceability of cat-specific bylaws. We believe that the creation of such an Act would allow for a significant improvement in the lives of New Zealand cats, and we are part of the National Cat Management Strategy Group advocating for the creation of such an Act.

Despite the current enforceability issues, we nevertheless encourage Wellington City Council to include these provisions in their bylaw for the following reasons

- The bylaw sets an expectation of what is required to be a responsible cat owner and normalises desexing and microchipping.

- The bylaw would show Wellington City Council to be leaders in animal and environmental welfare.

- The bylaw would serve as an indicator to Central Government that Local Government feels the control of cats is of importance. The more District Councils have bylaws which show the need to control cats, the more attention may be paid to the control of cats by Central Government, ultimately resulting in effective legislative change such as the introduction of a Cat Management Act. As your proposal indicates, cat management is becoming a priority for a growing number of councils.

- The amended bylaw will encourage cat owners to desex and microchip their cat, resulting in increased rates of microchipping and desexing. Increased rates of microchipping and desexing has benefits for cats, cat owners, Wellington City Council, animal welfare organisations and the environment.

CANZ appreciates the opportunity to contribute to the Wellington City Council Animals Bylaw. CANZ requests that Wellington City Council include a requirement for residents to desex their cats in the bylaw and that you consider our suggestions above regarding mandating desexing of cats by four months of age.

CANZ would welcome further engagement on these issues. If any further information is required, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,

David Lloyd

General Manager, Companion Animals New Zealand

References

Berg, J. (n.d.) The spay/neuter controversy and topics in genital surgery. Retrieved from <http://vetfolio.s3.amazonaws.com/bc/1d/831cd1f54b539492b4855b811b2e/the-spay-neuter-controversy-and-topics-in-genital-surgery-pdf.pdf>

Companion Animals NZ (2020) Companion Animals in New Zealand 2020. Retrieved from <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5d1bf13a3f8e880001289eeb/t/5f768e8a17377653bd1eebef/1601605338749/Companion+Animals+in+NZ+2020+%281%29.pdf>

Cupp, C., Laflamme, D. (2014) Effects of neutering on life expectancy in adult cats. *Journal of Veterinary Internal Medicine*. 28 (3)

Farnworth, MJ.; Adams, NJ.; Seksel, K.; Waran, NK.; Beausoleil, NJ.; Stafford, KJ.

(2013a) Veterinary attitudes towards pre-pubertal gonadectomy of cats: a comparison of samples from New Zealand, Australia and the United Kingdom. *New Zealand Veterinary Journal*. 61(4), 226-233

Farnworth, MJ.; Muellner, P.; Benschop, J. (2013b) A systematic review of the impacts of feral, stray and companion domestic cats (*Felis catus*) on wildlife in New Zealand and options for their management. Wellington, New Zealand Veterinary Association.

Joyce, A.; Yates, D. (2011) Help stop teenage pregnancy! Early-age neutering in cats. *Journal of Feline Medicine and Surgery*. 13(1), 3-10.

Lord LK.; Ingwersen W.; Gray JL.; Wintz DJ. (2009) Characterization of animals with microchips entering animal shelters. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*. 235 (2), 160-167.

SPCA (2019). A pitter-patter of tiny paws across New Zealand. *News and events*.

Retrieved from <https://www.sPCA.nz/news-and-events/news-article/akittensjourney>

Stats New Zealand (n.d.) Gisborne District. Retrieved from

<https://www.stats.govt.nz/tools/2018-census-place-summaries/gisborne-district>

Stuff (2011). Microchip boom for Canterbury pets. Retrieved from

<http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/christchurch-earthquake/5184059/Microchip-boom-for-Canterbury-pets>

The New Zealand Veterinary Association. Pre-pubertal desexing of dogs and cats. (2015)

Retrieved from <https://www.nzva.org.nz/page/policydesexing>

Wellington City Council, (2023). Te Arotake i te Ture ā-Rohe Kararehe, te Kaupapahere

Kurī me te Kaupapahere Kararehe Kāinga Animal Bylaw, Dog Policy and Domestic

Animal Policy Review Tauākī Tono Statement of Proposal | September 2023

<https://www.letstalk.wellington.govt.nz/87976/widgets/416524/documents/269009>

Karin Kos on behalf of Apiculture New Zealand

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the Dog Policy and Animal Bylaw Review.

Apiculture NZ (ApiNZ) is the national body representing the apiculture industry in New Zealand covering the full range of sectors, from hobbyist and commercial beekeepers to honey exporters, packers and suppliers. ApiNZ aims to support and deliver benefits to the New Zealand apiculture industry by supporting a thriving long-term future for New Zealand

honeybee products and services, including having a strong bee health and biosecurity position.

In general, ApiNZ supports bylaws for bees that balances practicality for beekeepers for workability for the local council. Bees play a crucial role in our environment and need our protection.

While we broadly support the proposed standard, we have comments on some of the provisions in the proposed standard. Appendix One contains comments and proposed changes on specific clauses in the Bylaw. Our main comments are summarised below.

Provision 2.2.4 - Written permission for keeping more than four hives

This clause is too general as it only says that granting permission to keep animals with specific conditions may be subject to a fee. There should be specific rules for when fees apply and when they do not for transparency. There is also no clarity on how long this permission, once gained, will last: will be a one off or if it will have to be re-applied for and if so, how often.

Provision 6.1.2 - Number of hives per residential block

ApiNZ supports there being a limit on the number of hives on each residential block. While the issue is more appropriately about how many hives are in the locality, as it is difficult to determine how many hives are in a specific area, limits are useful to prevent unreasonable hive numbers. We support the proposed minimum of four hives, as it is best to keep at least two hives to allow enough flexibility to manage the hives appropriately.

Provision 6.1.3 – Council may require removal of hives

Removal should be the option of last resort, especially for rural properties. Other options should be considered first, including (but not limited to) moving the hives to another part of the property, building a tall fence to direct bees leaving the hive to above head height, or turning the hives so the bees leave the hive in another direction.

If Council requires hives to be removed for any of the reasons listed in the proposed bylaw, it should be a mutually agreed process with a timeline that is practical. It is not always practical to remove hives within a very short timeframe, as time may be needed to either find another suitable site to keep the hives or to find a new home for them. The removal process should be tailored to the individual situation. A one size fits all process is not appropriate as circumstances will vary.

The use of the word 'nuisance' in this provision is very subjective as the problem could vary from bee faeces to something much more serious. ApiNZ supports a more appropriate word such as 'hazardous' as it implies a more serious situation.

We also recommend a link to Apiculture New Zealand's bee welfare code titled: New Zealand Honeybee Care Code™ Supporting bee welfare. It can be found on our website here: <https://apinz.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/NZ-Honeybee-care-code-Final.pdf>. Reference should also be made to WCC's Caring for Bees factsheet which is available on the Council website. We note some of the material is dated and we would happy to support Council in updating this valuable factsheet.

We are happy to answer questions about any of the points raised in this submission.

Note: the submission also included Appendix with comments on specific clauses in the bylaw.

Karen Stacie Martyn on behalf of Church of Flying Spaghetti Monster

Remove poisonous trees karaka! More fenced off lead areas please

Bronwen Shepherd on behalf of Te Ahumairangi Ecological Restoration

The pressure on ecologically significant natural areas including trellisick park, te ahumairangi hill and waimapihi are too high with dogs concentrating in these areas. A focus on expanding access to dog parks away from ecological areas and more towards lower ecological and/or parks needs to be a primary motivator for the proposal.

Additionally more stringent control for on leash requirements in ecologically significant areas should be aligned Eg the dog bylaws should align with SNA (Significant Natural Areas): ONL etc.

Dogs should be on leash in trellisick park and control needs to be much higher in waimapihi western hills and te ahumairangi

Andrew Meehan on behalf of ONZM Oriental Bay Residents Association

Submitter did not leave any comments. They strongly supported the proposal to prohibit dogs from the lawn area next to the Wishing Well on Oriental Bay and strongly did not support the proposal to increase off-leash provision in the city centre by expanding times at Oriental Bay Beach during off-peak hours in the warmer months.

Myfanwy Hill on behalf of Urban Wildlife Trust

The Urban Wildlife Trust supports initiatives that will enable our indigenous biodiversity to coexist with domestic pets in an urban environment.

Dogs

- We support the provision of improved off leash areas where this does not significantly conflict with wildlife and note that must come along with increased enforcement of high biodiversity areas where dogs are required to be on-leash. Examples are within Otari-Wilton's Bush and Makara Peak Mountain bike Park where threatened bird species are found.
- We also support the removal of on-leash status from coastal areas such as the rocky section of Island Bay where seabirds are often found. And again we request increased enforcement of coastal on-leash areas where little penguin deaths are known to occur such as Oruaiti Reserve.
- The changes to the RDO criteria are of concern as it may enable dogs to wander if not properly contained: it also appears that the ability to get licence is getting easier and there is no strong driver to have well trained dogs which are less likely to wander not come back when called and not be able to walk on-leash, all of which may put native wildlife at risk.
- We would support the reintroduction of some basic dog training (not just owners) prior to receiving a licence. In all these regards there appears to be a loosening of restrictions on dog owners which the Urban Wildlife Trust can support if carefully considered but not enough mention of consequences if a dog owner is doing the wrong thing. For example: we support the mandatory 12 standdown period before you can reapply for the new RDO status but feel it should be strengthened to - if caught with your dog off-leash in any on-leash area rather than the higher bar of needing a written warning. Alternatively extend the standdown period to 24 months.
- We would also support the Council supporting local dog clubs to carry out basic training in key areas and increase the number of Animal Control Officers to ensure that they are carrying out proactive patrols across areas of high biodiversity.

Bees

We support some level of restriction on beehives as the impact of exotic honeybees on our native bee population is still unclear. We strongly support beehives not being kept within bush areas on public land.

Stock

The Urban Wildlife Trust is concerned about the keeping of species which need to be controlled across public land due to their impact on the environment. This includes deer, goats and pigs. Restrictions around the keeping of these species to ensure they are adequately contained is strongly supported.

Jo Ledington on behalf of Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne

Vulnerable threatened species are now commonplace throughout Wellington City, thanks to the efforts of Zealandia Te Māra a Tāne and countless Wellingtonians, community groups and organisations, including WCC, who have committed to the national Predator Free 2050 vision. Wellington is one of the only cities in the world where native biodiversity is increasing. It is our privilege to be in a position to care for these taonga species and provide safe habitat for them to live, breed and safely disperse.

Encouraging responsible pet ownership is critical for the revival of native species across Wellington City. Decisions made in this process can and will make a difference to the survival of native species including kākā, kiwi, tīeke and kereru in Wellington. We encourage you to continue to make bold decisions for the future of wildlife in this city to ensure the city achieves being 'a sustainable, climate friendly eco-city' as per the Long Term Plan 2021-31.

Dogs

We have selected no preference for the specific locations and questions in this survey but strongly ask for the following criteria to underpin all decisions made in this space. These include:

- Off-lead areas are fenced for the protection of both dogs and wildlife.
- Off lead/dog exercise areas should not overlap with habitat of vulnerable native wildlife but if they do: they must be fenced.
- Dog exercise areas that currently overlap with vulnerable wildlife must be fenced asap – in particular beaches (for the protection of kororā): Waimapihi/Polhill: Wright's Hill and Karori Park dog exercise areas for the protection of kākā fledglings and in the longer term: kiwi.
- Increased enforcement of owners letting dogs off-lead in inappropriate areas.

Cats

We strongly support mandatory desexing of cats in Wellington and increased management of stray cats to protect people's much loved pets from disease and injury and to prevent them from becoming part of the feral cat population. The proposed timeframe for mandatory desexing of June 2025 is suitable for existing pets but new domestic cats should be required to meet this bylaw as they reach 6 months of age.

We are proud to work alongside a council that has historically been progressive in domestic cat management techniques such as microchipping. We urge you to take bold

and progressive steps to continue leading New Zealand's domestic cat management. Predator-Free NZ research from 2022 revealed that 82% of cat owners already support de-sexing. Wellington needs to be taking bolder steps and taking action now to begin community consultation on policies such as cat registration, curfews, property containment and leash walking. Research shows there is already appetite for these measures in New Zealand - 43% of cat owners agree cats should be kept indoors or on private property (Predator Free NZ, 2022). Let's be change makers for the future of happy domestic cats and wildlife in Wellington City and beyond.

Miriam Moore on behalf of Tawa Community Board

Spicer Forest

The Tawa Community Board are strongly opposed to creating a new off leash area in Spicer Forest. This area of bush is undergoing successful native regeneration and it is considered that releasing uncontrolled dogs in this area poses a serious risk to native species that are beginning to thrive in Tawa. It is expected more and more native birdlife will become prevalent in this area: including the possibility of kiwi. We believe this proposal goes against the Policy's off-leash consideration of "potential disturbance to local wildlife and negative impact on conservation efforts": and urge Council to reconsider.

Willowbank Reserve

The Board are also concerned about the proposal to relocate the off-leash area and playground at Willowbank Reserve. While we understand the safety and visibility reasons behind the proposal to relocate the playground: the current open grass area is flat and popular for picnics. It provides access to feeding the eels in Porirua Stream which is popular with families. This part of the park is also the access point to the Takapu Road Station southbound platform. This part of the park is well-used and we consider the best part for off-leash dogs is the area adjacent to the stream accessed from under the rail bridge: currently designated for dogs. It is considered this needs more community engagement. I have included pictures of how our local community use this space.

Willowbank Reserve Care Group

Submission on Dog Policy and Animal By-Law Review 2023

Willowbank Reserve

Willowbank Reserve Care Group strongly disagrees with the proposal to swap the play area with the off-leash dog exercise area at Willowbank Reserve in Tawa: and to increase the size of the off-leash dog area.

There are a number of reasons why this area would not make a good off-leash dog exercise area for dogs to roam freely: (These points are in no particular order)

Focal point of reserve - It's an area often used for picnics and gatherings by school groups: mothers with babies and pre-schoolers: friends and families: for birthday celebrations and other get-togethers: and more. People like to sit quietly and read at those tables: too. It's the area with picnic tables and canopies for shade: where people congregate: eat and chat. People like to play ball games in this area: and run around.

- WRCG and FOTBR - Volunteers from Willowbank Reserve Care Group (WRCG) and Friends of Tawa Bush Reserves (FOTBR) work in the reserve regularly: and their safety should be considered. An increase in the size and location of the off-leash area impacts this. WRCG and FOTBR work under a Memorandum of Understanding with WCC. WRCG has worked continuously in the reserve over the last 5 years with the support of the WCC Parks and Reserves: doing riparian and other planting: weeding: and litter pickup: including in the stream. Also: WRCG is doing ongoing Citizen Science water quality monitoring in the stream. There are already issues with dogs off-leash in the reserve: and members of our groups have been intimidated by off-leash dogs. Also: dog poo left lying

around means members of our groups potentially come into contact with it when working in the reserve.

- Heritage aspects -The heritage fruit trees are in this area: and these are delicate. People like to look at the trees and collect the apples: pears: walnuts and figs. These trees date from the original orchard: and some are well over 150 years old. This is an important historic part of the reserve: detailed in several books about the area. The Tawa Historical Society hosts the occasional walking tour which includes this area. (for the Wellington Heritage Festival)
- Memorial trees - There are a number of memorial trees planted in this area.
- Access to stream -There is easy access to the stream here: and people like to look at the eels: and children paddle in the stream. Dogs can cause disturbance and erosion to stream banks: releasing sediment into the water. Dogs are also a potential threat to eels.
- The whole reserve - This major change would impact the use and feel of the whole reserve. If you wish to walk to the Takapu Stream end of the reserve: you need to walk through that area. Commuters and other train users regularly walk along the path to Takapu Station. With the increased housing development in the area: eg Willowbank Heights by Countdown: more people are likely to be walking through and using this area. People also walk along Ara Tawa.
- Issues with dogs - Owners often don't pick up after their dogs: and an increased off-leash area will only make it worse: in an area where people sit and picnic and play. Owners either don't pick up the dog poo: or leave bags of dog poo lying around or throw them into bushes. Dogs off-leash can jump up at people and frighten them.
- Existing areas adequate -The existing off-leash dog areas: on either side of Porirua Stream: are more than adequate. They are used: but never crowded. Also: the Taylor Park dog exercise area is close by: and this is fully fenced. Also in Tawa are off-leash areas at Grasslees Reserve and in Linden. Why is it thought necessary to add another 2:000 square metres to Willowbank Reserve?
- Visitors - The Bucket Tree Lodge on Boscobel Lane is right next door: and has national and international visitors: who often visit the reserve: and are interested in the heritage aspects of the reserve: as well as the play area and picnic area.

All the above points indicate why it's not a good idea for dogs to be roaming around off-leash in that area.

Willowbank Reserve – play area

Play Area - We strongly oppose the moving of the existing playground.

The playground is in a large open area: with people around at the park and people walking to the station. It is not isolated.

Why should it be close to the road (with noise and pollution issues) and the few houses there? The proposed area is right beside the carpark and road: and there is only a low fence by the footpath. There is a deep culvert at the far side of this area: which is a hazard.

There is no safe access to the stream.

There is the possibility of the large gum trees losing branches in high winds: or at any time without warning. Gum trees are known as "widow makers". Why would you put a playground there?

We want children to explore and enjoy the whole reserve: not just a play area close to the road and carpark.

There will be a considerable cost to remove the old playground and prepare a new site and construct a new one: and also to replace signage: and place more seating; this at a time when there is considerable pressure on rates.

People want to be able to enjoy Willowbank Reserve without dogs roaming freely in that main area; lots of families with small children use this area.

Dog waste comprises various viruses: bacteria and parasites that are transmittable and can thus harm humans and other animals. Dog waste also harms the environment by contaminating soil and waterways.

Greater monitoring and enforcement is needed of dogs being kept on a leash (except in designated off-leash areas): and of owners removing and properly disposing of dog waste.

Grasslees Reserve is an example of bad planning – the barbecue area and picnic tables are right by the off-leash dog exercise area: (and not separated by fencing): thus dogs run around that area too and it is not suitable for intended use. The same would happen at Willowbank Reserve.

We note that there are currently 66 off-leash dog exercise areas in Wellington: which is a significant number and must cover a significant area of land already. How much area do they currently take up: and how much area would the proposed new ones take?

Overall: we strongly oppose the proposals relating to Willowbank Reserve: and think that more weight needs to be given to environmental concerns and the needs of other park users. The current off-leash dog areas on either side of Porirua Stream at Willowbank Reserve are more than adequate and are better sited. The playground should stay at its present site.

Also: we strongly oppose the off-leash proposals for the Forest of Tawa. Kiwis could extend their range here: and dogs: of course: cannot be off- leash in an area with kiwis. Volunteers have already spent considerable time and effort doing planting and pest control in this area of regenerating bush: and the walkways are popular with walkers and cyclists. Off-leash dogs are a problem for walkers and cyclists on any bush track: as dogs tend to run ahead of their owners: and can bark and jump up at walkers.

The reserves in Tawa are part of an important ecological corridor. Our native flora and fauna need protecting. Birds including tui and kereru are regularly seen in the main area of the reserve at Willowbank.

The whole proposed policy of extending the number and area of off-leash dog exercise areas in Wellington is very pro dog: and more weight needs to be given to environmental concerns and the needs of other park users: including people who are wary or afraid of dogs.

Effective waste disposal

We are in favour of Proposal 11: requirement for dog owners to carry effective means of waste disposal in public places.

Gary Beecroft on behalf of Friends of Tawa Bush Reserves

Spicer Forest, Caribbean Drive, Willowbank Reserve

• FOTBR STRONGLY OPPOSES - NEW OFF-LEASH AREAS IN THE CARIBBEAN DRIVE RESERVE: SPICER FOREST RESERVE: FOREST OF TAWA RESERVE AND WILLOWBANK RESERVE: AND ALL OTHER WCC ECOLOGICAL BUSH CLAD RESERVES.

For these reasons:

1. Dogs are predators' and kill wild animals: bird: reptiles: and insects: and significantly impact the environment. Scientists say dogs have contributed to the extinction of several bird species: and the endangerment of others (especially Kiwi).
 2. A percentage of dog's attack people who walk or cycle in the ecological parks. Even one child being maimed in one too many. Dos should be in fenced areas (refer to WCC dog attack records - Dangerous and menacing dogs' category which has 77 attacks in 2022).
 3. A significant number of urban dog owners do not have control of their dogs and do not keep them to restricted areas. Both a lack: and disregard: of compliance.
 4. There are a significant number of other areas that are fenced: or could be fenced: for as leash free areas for dogs.
 5. WCC has not allocated the resources to police any of the existing area's dogs are not leash free: and dogs run wild in many parks and reserves already causing environmental destruction and defecation: and are regularly a threat to people: and children.
 6. Many FOTBR members are dog owners. The FOTBR members are not anti-dogs: they are anti poor and non-compliant dog owners: and vicious predator dogs.
- BUT STRONGLY SUPPORTS - THAT THERE SHOULD BE MORE CONTROLLED OFF-LEASH AREAS IN THE TAWA AND WELLINGTON REGION.

For these reasons:

1. There are a significant number of other areas that are not part of the bush ecology park that are already fenced: that can be leash free areas for dogs.
2. There are significant number other park areas (at least seven in Tawa alone) that are not ecological bush areas that can be fenced as leash free areas for dogs. There are other areas of free open land that are not identified by name that would be excellent for leash free areas: that are NOT ecological reserves(Many are named below).
3. Many FOTBR members are dog owners: they want well developed: safe: fenced: dog recreation areas.

IN MORE DETAIL

1. The FOTBR organisation

- FOTBR is a Tawa based community group with Kaitiakitanga authority (for protection and guardianship of the environment and the restoration of native bush reserves to ensure their long-term preservation) as given by the WCC for all WCC owned reserve lands within the Linden: Tawa: Grenda North and Takapu Valley areas. The FOTBR are working (with WCC Parks and Reserves) towards developing an ecological corridor from Wellington's northern suburbs to Porirua Harbour. This corridor includes all Tawa's current bushed reserves (eleven reserves in total).
- The organisation has about 100 paid up members.

2. Ecological Corridors

- FOTBR: WCC Parks and Reserves staff and the WCC planning departments have all worked to create a safe ecological corridor from the PCC "Recreation Park" area: along the western hills of Tawa: through Grenada and Caribbean Reserve to Belmont Reserve.

- WCC own planning department supports this concept with the “Outer Green Belt Management Plan” (OGBMP): the “Northern Reserves Management Plan”: and “Our Natural Capital – Wellington biodiversity Strategy & Action Plan”. These plans are not just about plants: the plants are there to create an ecology that allows true biodiversity to occur: including animals: birds: reptiles: and insects. Leash free dogs: as the predators they are: will put all that at risk.

- WCC are partnering with PCC and GWRC to create ecological corridors along streams and connecting parks. This will face significant danger of failure with free running dogs.

- WCC’s and “Our Natural Capital – Wellington biodiversity Strategy & Action Plan” states “In order to establish healthy and resilient indigenous biodiversity within Wellington: we need to focus on certain areas. We need to protect what we have: we need to restore what is degraded: we need to research the requirements of our biodiversity and the best methods for looking after it: and we need to connect people to it”. This goal will be significantly put at risk by extending leash free dog areas: (and failing to dog patrol all other ecological areas).

3. Important NOTE

- This submission is about “by laws”: but the real issue is actually about dogs: “What are they: where do they come from: and what can they do.”

- and people (who don’t or can’t train and control their dog(s):

- and the WCC budget – where WCC cannot enforce their own council policies due to insufficient allocation of resources.

- And the failure of existing WCC policies and procedure to protect and preserve the ecology of native bush reserves.

4. Dogs

References: (There are many more references: but they all say the same thing).

Dogs

- Dogs (*Canis lupus familiaris*) are serious predators: descended from the Grey Wolf (*Canis lupus*).

- According to the Thriving Canine.

- o domesticated dogs have a predator instinct: it is the dog’s nature to hunt and kill [creatures] for food.

- o Domesticated dogs [still] have a high prey drive suited to herding: hunting: and killing.

- o Even though domesticated: a dog is still a predator: and has a desire to hunt.

- According to an article in BBC News in 2019: dogs are a predator of wildlife: with over 200 species [in their study] threatened (100 mammals: 22 are reptiles: 78 are birds: and 3 amphibians – of the 200 species: 30 were classed as critically endangered: 71 endangered: and 87 vulnerable).

- Experts say dogs that are allowed to roam freely are the real problems.

5. Many Environmental Impacts

Experts say dogs (if running free – i.e.: off a leash) affect wildlife and ecology in five general ways;

- o Dogs as predators’ kill wild animals: bird: reptiles: and insects: (Scientists say dogs have contributed to the extinction of several bird species).

NOTE: Unmanaged dogs injure and kill many native and critically endangered marine mammals and coastal birds every year in New Zealand: the Department of Conservation says.

- o Dogs disturb the ecosystem:
- o Dogs transmit diseases to wildlife: (and this is a significant problem):
- o Dogs compete with wildlife for food:
- o And if dogs become feral: they interbreed.

Gary Beecroft on behalf of Friend of the Tawa Bush Reserve

Please see the Friends of the Tawa Bush Reserve written submission sent to policy.submission@wcc.govt.nz

Arnja Dale on behalf of Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA)

SPCA's feedback on proposed changes to the Wellington City Council's Dog Policy

New Zealanders overwhelmingly consider their companion animals part of their whānau

(Companion Animals New Zealand: 2020). Including dogs in family activities facilitates

socialisation which reduces the risk of nuisance behaviours and aggressive behaviour (Blackwell et al.: 2008).

Proposed Change 1: Expand off-leash provision across ten suburbs in Wellington

SPCA supports Proposed Change 1 and commends the Council's expansion of off-leash exercise areas for dogs to accommodate the current and future needs of both companion dog owners and dogs.

Proposed Change 2: Allow off-leash access to Oriental Bay Beach during off-peak hours (before 10 a.m. and after 7 p.m.) in the warmer months (1 November-30 April)

Proposed Change 3: Restrict dogs from the Wishing Well Area of Oriental Bay Parade

SPCA supports Proposed Change 2 and Proposed Change 3 and commends the Council's extension of time during warmer months for off-leash exercise for dogs in Oriental Bay Beach to accommodate the current and future needs of both companion dog owners and dogs. We acknowledge that the Council has balanced a proposed reduction in the Wishing Well area where dogs are permitted with increased access to other nearby areas.

Proposed Change 4: Swap around the "off-leash" and "prohibited" areas at Island Bay Beach to minimise the effect of dogs on dune restoration.

SPCA supports Proposed Change 4. Our organisation recognises the importance of managing the negative impacts that dogs can have on valuable biodiversity areas and supports the protection of areas that are important habitats to native wildlife. We commend the Council for finding an alternative area at the Island Bay Beach location where dogs can exercise off-leash.

Proposed Change 5: Change the "prohibited" requirement for Kaiwharawhara Park to "on-leash" except during sports activities.

SPCA supports Proposed Change 5 and commends the Council for increasing the time during which dogs are allowed in Kaiwharawhara Park.

Proposed Change 6: Modify the configuration of two existing off-leash areas to enhance children's play spaces in Tawa and Johnsonville.

SPCA supports Proposed Change 6 and commends the Council for finding an alternative area at the Willowbank Reserve location where dogs can exercise off-leash. SPCA acknowledges that although this proposed change would reduce the size of the off-leash area at the Flinders Place Recreation Reserve: there will remain a substantial area where dogs will be permitted off-leash.

Proposed Change 7: Convert two off-leash areas with "on-leash" requirements to reduce user conflict and support wildlife conservation. SPCA agrees in principle that there are benefits to reducing user conflicts of public spaces. We acknowledge that these areas that are proposed to be converted to on-leash areas were reported as not a highly valued space for dog owners and that the Council has identified nearby alternatives for off-leash exercise.

Proposed Change 8: Rename the "Responsible Dog Owner" (RDO) status to "Accredited Dog Owner" (ADO) Licence. SPCA supports Proposed Change 8 for the stated reasons of aligning the terminology to reflect the Council's existing policy position on responsible dog ownership and avoiding perceived unfair labelling of dog owners.

Proposed Change 9: Decouple the RDO (proposed ADO) criteria from the Dog Policy

SPCA supports Proposed Change 9 to decouple the proposed Accredited Dog Owner criteria from the Dog Policy to provide increased flexibility for modifying the criteria than the current process of the five-to-ten-year review cycle of the policy.

Proposed Change 10: Other criteria changes to the RDO (proposed ADO)

SPCA supports Proposed Change 10 and commends the Council for the following changes:

- Removing the requirement that dog owners must complete a third-party obedience training course in addition to the subsidised Council dog owner education course.
- Increasing the accessibility of the criteria for dog owners who may not have access to a fully fenced property.
- Clarifying the expectations of how a fence must be constructed (in materials used and height of fence) and these are based on criteria that are more reliable at containing dogs in an area.

While SPCA is encouraged to see the promotion of responsible dog ownership: the organisation is concerned that the proposed requirement to pass a written test on dog ownership knowledge to qualify as a first-time responsible dog owner could potentially discriminate against prospective dog owners who cannot read or write at a proficient level, have English as a second language: or other matters which may impact people's ability to fill in online forms.

A recent campaign by the Citizen's Advice Bureaux highlights how these vulnerable groups can be accommodated (Citizen's Advice Bureaux: 2020).

A survey conducted in 2014-2015 revealed that 43% of adults aged 16-65 scored a level 2 proficiency in literacy: which is below the level of literacy needed for day-to-day life

(OECD: 2016). Socioeconomic status (SES) is linked to literacy with Māori and Pasifika students overrepresented in the low socio-economic status category (Ministry of Education: 2000). Given that Māori households are significantly more likely than other ethnicities to share their home with a dog (46% of households; Companion Animals New Zealand: 2020): an inclusive approach that promotes responsible dog ownership is required to ensure this incentive is accessible to the groups which may most benefit.

Proposed Change 11: Introduce a bylaw requirement for dog owners to carry effective means of waste disposal in public places. SPCA advocates for all dog owners to be responsible: including cleaning up their dog's faeces when deposited in public places.

Proposed Change 12: Introduce a "Dog-Friendly Wellington" section into the Policy

SPCA supports Proposed Change 12 to introduce a "Dog-friendly Wellington" section in the Dog Policy. We commend the Council on taking proactive steps to foster positive community attitudes and practices at dog-friendly establishments: public transport: and rental properties.

Proposed Change 13: Introduce a new level of service categories for off-leash areas

(Destination: Community: and Local). SPCA Supports Proposed Change 13 which clarifies different types of off-leash areas in Wellington City. We commend the Council on introducing this system to help manage dog owners' expectations of off-leash areas and proactively identify where improvements in services would benefit dog owners and dogs.

Other animals

Proposed Change 15: Clarify that written permission is not required to keep poultry, bees or stock in rural areas

Proposed Change 16: Clarifying the scope of birds categorised as poultry

Proposed Change 17: Clarify what types of poultry are allowed in residential areas without prior Council permission

SPCA supports Proposed Change 15, Proposed Change 16, and Proposed Change 17 which aim to clarify expectations of owners of animals that may be subject to provisions under bylaws. We anticipate these clarifications can facilitate more responsible animal ownership and reduce the likelihood of nuisance in communities.

We further support the Council allowing owners to apply for permission to keep more hens, female ducks, and quails than permitted, or permission to keep poultry other than hens, female ducks and quails. SPCA advocates for poultry other than hens, female ducks or quail that live at residential locations to be allowed to stay for the remainder of their life if and when a reduction is passed as part of the bylaw. This will allow owners to reduce their flock over time without resorting to rehoming, euthanasing, or abandoning their animals to meet permitted limits.

Proposed Change 18: Introduce new conditions for keeping poultry

SPCA supports Proposed Change 18 requiring owners to store poultry feed in vermin-proof containers and for poultry enclosures to be cleaned regularly to prevent offensive odours. SPCA submission on WCC Animals Bylaw, Dog and Domestic Animals Policy - Husbandry and welfare are intimately connected. Where husbandry is poor, often an animal's welfare is at risk. SPCA advocates that requirements should include an assessment of a person's ability to meet the physical, health, behavioural, emotional, and mental needs of the animal they intend to keep. Meeting these needs will help ensure an animal's welfare is protected and that they can live A Good Life.

Bees

Proposed Change 19: Introduce a cap of four beehives in residential areas without the need for written permission from the Council

SPCA acknowledges that introducing a limit on the number of animals kept on a property, as described in Proposed Change 19, can promote more responsible animal ownership. SPCA supports the inclusion of a permission system that allows a person to keep more than four hives on a case-by-case basis.

SPCA further advocates that the Council consider adding a condition requiring good husbandry and health practices for bees in recognition that they are susceptible to pests and diseases. SPCA proposes that the Council consider adding a requirement that beehives are set back from roads to avoid the loss of so many bees due to colliding with vehicles.

Permission 20: Introduce a provision that allows the Council to require the removal or relocation of hives if they cause a nuisance

SPCA advocates that the Council have a plan for where the beehives will be relocated before relocating them.

Proposed Change 21: Introduce a requirement that beekeeping on Council land must occur within licensed community garden areas

SPCA acknowledges that introducing a license or permit system for keeping bees on Council land, as described in Proposed Change 21, can promote more responsible animal ownership. SPCA supports the inclusion of a permission system that allows a person to keep bees on Council land on a case-by-case basis.

Proposed Change 22: Reference legal requirements under the Biosecurity Act in the bylaw

SPCA acknowledges the importance of beekeepers being aware of their obligations under different legislation.

Stock

Proposed Change 23: Clarify the scope of “Stock” in the Interpretation section of the bylaw

SPCA supports Proposed Change 23 to clarify the term “stock” as this can help facilitate more responsible animal ownership.

Proposed Change 24: Introduce new requirements for keeping stock in residential areas

SPCA supports Proposed Change 24 which will introduce requirements for keeping stock in residential areas as this can help reduce potential nuisance and reduce the potential for owner surrender of an animal that is deemed to cause nuisance. Husbandry and welfare are intimately connected. Where husbandry is poor, often, an animal's welfare is at risk. SPCA advocates that requirements should include an assessment of a person's ability to meet the physical, health, behavioural, emotional, and mental needs of the animal they intend to keep. Meeting these needs will help ensure an animal's welfare is protected and that they can live A Good Life.

Proposed Change 25: Introduce new condition requirements for keeping stock

SPCA supports Proposed Change 25 which will require additional requirements to keep stock and commends the Council's inclusion of requirements for an animal's social needs, space, shade, and shelter.

We further advocate for specifications prohibiting the permanent tethering of stock. Tethering compromises an animal's welfare because they are unable to behave and move around normally. Permanent tethering can increase fear when it interferes with an animal's instinct to flee when alarmed. Tethered animals may lack sufficient shelter from all conditions or access to appropriate feed and water. Tethered animals can become entangled and harm themselves leading to painful injuries and are at risk from being harassed or attacked by other animals or people.

Anke Atkins on behalf of Oriental Bay Residence Association

I don't own a dog and no longer go onto Oriental Bay beach: but I enjoy watching dogs at play in the cooler month. However: I strongly object to extending this period to early and late hours in the summer months. Swimmers use beach early in the day and late in the evening.

Steve Glassey on behalf of Animal Evacuation New Zealand Trust

1. Animal Evac New Zealand (AENZ) is making this submission as part of the Wellington City Council's Animal Bylaw, Dog Policy, and Domestic Animal Policy Review 2023.
2. AENZ is grateful for the opportunity to be involved in this important process. We trust our comments and observations below are of assistance in your consideration of the review.
3. AENZ asks that the Committee note the following, previously published, documents (Annex A), that inform the basis to our recommendations:
 - No animal left behind: report to Parliament (Glassey 2019), presented by Gareth Hughes MP.
 - A critical evaluation of the companion animal disaster management framework in New Zealand, University of Portsmouth, Doctoral Thesis (Glassey, 2022).
4. AENZ congratulates Wellington City Council's forward thinking on animal management and its leadership in microchipping, desexing, and pet-friendly evacuation shelters over the past few years.
5. AENZ supports the recommendations made in the Policy Review and wishes to provide the following additional recommendations for the Committee's consideration, based on the rationale that protecting animals improves public safety (Annex B).
6. **Dogs**
 - That dog exercise areas can be designated by the local controller during a civil defence emergency while a state of emergency is in effect. This will remove barriers for evacuees to have their dogs near evacuation or assistance centres.
 - That an offence be created for impersonation of a disability assistance dog including affixing or using identification that purports the dog to be same.
 - That the council increases public awareness of the rights and protections of disability assistance dogs, given the increasing trend for emotional or therapy dogs being incorrectly purported the same rights.
 - That owners seek permission to have more than three dogs (or as per the threshold for multiple dog owner policy requirements), and that the owners should satisfy they have a suitable emergency plan as well as sufficient resources and logistics, to effect the safe evacuation of their animals (i.e. self- reliant).
 - That during a state of emergency, the local controller can authorise dog control officers from outside the city to render assistance and their powers. This will provide for default surge capacity and encourage mutual aid.
 - That within relevant policies when dog exercise areas are being designated or

reviewed, that consideration be given to include facilities that would enhance the location to be a safe evacuation area. For example, during the 2016 Kaikoura Earthquake, many families from low lying areas in the central city evacuated to Mt Victoria in darkness with all their animals. If the dog off-leash area had had lighting, toilets, Wi-Fi, and water, this would have incentivised evacuation and enhanced public safety.

- That dogs impounded during a civil defence emergency are held for an additional 21 days (above the default 7-day period), to allow displaced owners sufficient time to be reunited with their dog. This is consistent to international recommendations such as that of the American Bar Association.
- That for the purposes of the proposed Accredited Dog Owner requirements, a NZQA Level 2 or higher qualification in animal care is sufficient in meeting the education requirements given these are more significant and nationally recognised.
- That, as already passed by Kapiti Coast District Council (Clause 7.1e, 2019), a bylaw offence is created consistent with “No person shall allow any dog to be kept in a manner that does not comply with the following minimum standards: Measures must be taken to enable dogs to keep warm in cold weather, cool in warm weather, and safe in extreme weather or during a civil defence emergency”. This gives Dog Control Officers powers to act proactively during weather emergencies to prevent harm to dogs. Ideally, this bylaw should be extended to other companion animals covered within proposed policy.

7. Cats

- That the number of cats owned by each household is limited unless special permission is granted and, like for dogs, the household should satisfy they have a suitable emergency plan as well as sufficient resources and logistics to effect the safe evacuation of their animals (i.e. self-reliant). A transition period should be put in place for this policy/bylaw. This will enhance resilience, promote responsible ownership, and reduce the risk of animal hoarding.

8. General

- That dog registration and other fees collected under the policy may be used for the function and duties of local government animal control under civil defence arrangements, that being the coordination of companion animal care, accommodation, and transport.
- That the policy provides for the default position that evacuation centres are to be open to companion animals, as recently declared by Auckland Council during the North Island Weather Event, to give consistency and encourage evacuation compliance.
- That during a state of emergency, companion animals should be allowed on public transport for the purposes of evacuation; likewise, policy should not prohibit companion animals from public places being used as an evacuation centre.
- That any animal housing facility (veterinary clinics, shelters, pounds, research facility, etc.), must be able to satisfy that they have a suitable emergency plan as well as sufficient resources and logistics to effect the safe evacuation of the animals (i.e. self-reliant).

- That animal housing facilities are given periodic approval to operate and that in review of such approval, the financial viability of the entity is reviewed to ensure a hoarding situation or other compromise of animal welfare does not occur.
- That during a state of emergency and in the transitional recovery period thereafter, that the policy enables for the humane trapping of displaced companion animals such as those left behind in evacuation zones.
- That the policy mandates the council and their agents or contractors (e.g. rubbish collectors, landfill operators), when presented with a deceased companion animal, that they are scanned for a microchip and reasonable efforts are made to notify the owner, including during a state of emergency.
- That the policy is future-proofed to take into consideration the use of facial recognition and DNA data in the identification of companion animals for the purposes of reuniting with owners.
- That where horses or other equids are kept within the city, that they are microchipped as is done with dogs and cats.
- That emergency animal shelters being established during a civil defence emergency must be authorised by the local controller and monitored for welfare and compliance by the council. Under the National Civil Defence Emergency Management Plan Order 2015, the council is responsible for companion animal care, accommodation, and transport. Emergency animal shelters should be part of pre-planned arrangements in conjunction with local emergency management arrangements.

We also would appreciate the opportunity to orally present to the Committee as part of the public consultation process.

Nāku, nā / yours faithfully

Dr. Steve Glassey Patron/Vice-Chair
Animal Evac New Zealand Trust

Annex A: References

- No animal left behind: a report on animal inclusive emergency management law reform (Glassey, 2019)
<https://natlib.govt.nz/records/40128608?search%5Bpath%5D=items&search%5Btext%5D=glassey+emergency>
- No animal left behind: A critical evaluation of the companion animal emergency management framework in New Zealand (Glassey, 2022).
<https://animaldisastermanagement.files.wordpress.com/2023/06/binder-no-animal-left-behind-limited.pdf>

Annex B: Rationale

Animals matter in disaster management for several reasons, as outlined below.

Human-Animal Bond: Many people have strong emotional bonds with their animals, whether they are pets, livestock, or wildlife. This bond can influence human behaviour during disasters, with people often risking their own safety to protect their animals.

Therefore, considering animals in disaster management can enhance public safety by improving evacuation compliance and preventing animal owners from returning to evacuated areas.

Economic Impact: Animals, particularly livestock, have significant economic value. Disasters can lead to substantial economic losses due to the death or injury of animals. Therefore, protecting animals can help protect livelihoods and reduce economic impact.

Psychological Impact: The loss or suffering of animals in disasters can have a profound psychological impact on people, affecting their ability to recover from the disaster. Therefore, protecting animals can also support the psychosocial recovery of affected communities.

Ethical and Moral Obligations: As sentient beings, animals have an intrinsic value and a right to protection from harm. Society has a moral obligation to protect animals in times of disaster.

Public Confidence and Trust: Effective animal disaster management can improve public confidence and trust in authorities and meet contemporary societal expectations.

Legal and Organisational Risk: Failure to adequately protect animals in disasters can lead to legal repercussions and damage to an organisation's reputation.

Resilience: Animals, particularly pets, can enhance resilience by providing physiological and psychological benefits to people.

Therefore, integrating animal disaster management within existing emergency management arrangements is crucial. This includes making animal rescue a core function of traditionally human-centric emergency management entities, ensuring that animals are acknowledged as intrinsically linked to people, and strengthening animal emergency management laws.

Judie Alison on behalf of Predator Free Ngaio

Predator Free Ngaio works with some 600 households in Ngaio and Crofton Downs. We issue tunnels and traps to residents and collect data from them fortnightly about their catches. We record catches of rats, mice and hedgehogs, but we also equip with specialised traps any members who report observing other predators such as stoats, weasels, and possums. We also have a team that monitors traps in the Council reserves in and around our suburb through a Memorandum of Understanding with the City Council.

Through our fortnightly newsletter we share trapping tips, stories from local trappers, and general information about progress towards the Predator Free NZ 2050 target. The newsletter also highlights sightings of native birds, especially those that are returning in numbers to Wellington suburbs. There have been significant increases in populations of such birds as Kārearea, Tītipounamu and Korimako, as a result of households' trapping efforts and the work in the reserves.

We have a strong interest in anything that might set back the city's work towards being predator free, thus our interest in aspects of the dog and cat policy proposals. This submission represents the views of the steering group for Predator Free Ngaio. We did not have time to consult with our wider membership. We have chosen to submit in this form because we have not considered all of the questions in the various survey forms.

Dogs

- We would like owners to be incentivised to put their dogs through Kiwi Aversion Training, and any regular refreshers required. This might be by adding it to the list of qualifications that give access to reduced dog registration fees, e.g. as an alternative to the Council's Dog Owner Education Course or to the more general obedience courses. With Capital Kiwi's introduction of Kiwi into the Makara area, Kiwi are already starting to be seen on the Skyline Walkway, and it will not be long before they make their way into suburbs such as Karori, Otari-Wilton, Crofton Downs and Ngaio. Dogs, at least in those suburbs, would benefit from the training, but also dogs owned by people from other areas who walk them in the Makara area or the Skyline Walkway.
- We want to see the Council erect far more signage reinforcing where dogs must be on leash, such as Otari-Wilton Bush, the Skyline Walkway, etc. Despite the rules, and despite warnings from Capital Kiwi about how close to the city the Kiwi are moving, people are still letting dogs off leash in areas where they should not. At the very least, this should result in loss of Accredited Dog Owner status for some years when caught.

Cats

We are disappointed that there are not more proposals to reduce the serious damage that domestic cats do to our bird population. They are, in fact, New Zealand's peak predator for native birds yet are not seen as this by many people. The tragic story of the single roaming domestic cat that decimated the dotterel population at Eastbourne (<https://www.stuff.co.nz/environment/118927562/prowling-cat-decimates-banded-dotterel-colony-for-second-breeding-season>) is a good illustration of why cats should not be allowed to roam freely. Australia has bitten this bullet; it is time New Zealand did too.

- Proposed Change 14: Mandatory desexing of cats not used for breeding. We support this proposal very strongly. It would greatly help to reduce the number of kittens which become strays.
- Additional proposals:
 - Limit the number of cats on a property to three, as for dogs, except in the case of breeders. The more domestic cats on a property, the more likely it is that they will be uncontrolled.
 - Require all cats to be confined to their home property at all times.
 - Give power to Council officers to seize cats that are found roaming. (The current by-law 3.3 exempts "domestic cats" from being seized and impounded.) Seizure would mostly be triggered by alerts from the public to cats that were causing a nuisance. If seized cats were microchipped and desexed, their owners would be notified to collect them, warned to keep them on their property in future, and charged a fee for the impounding. If they were not desexed, they should not be returned to the owners without that being done (and the owners charged for the surgery). Even if there were indications that they are pets, e.g. a collar, but they were neither micro-chipped nor desexed, they should still be impounded and if owners can't be contacted, re-homed to a responsible cat owner or destroyed. (The fact that a cat has a collar is no guarantee that it is not a stray anyway; it might have become a stray some years before but not lost the collar.)
 - Introduce registration of domestic cats and similar incentives to those for dogs to encourage responsible cat ownership. We suggest the increased surveillance and enforcement recommended above be funded by introducing the annual registration fee and charges for any action taken.

Some research references from Predator Free New Zealand that support our position:

<https://predatorfreenz.org/research/catastrophe-part-one/>
<https://predatorfreenz.org/stories/indoor-cats-pukawa/>
<https://predatorfreenz.org/research/city-cats-dont-know-can-find/>

<https://predatorfreeenz.org/research/tracking-cats-rakiurastewart-island/>
<https://predatorfreeenz.org/stories/up-your-game-responsible-cat-owner/>

Myfanwy Hill on behalf of Greater Wellington Regional Council – Environmental Operations

Submission on the consultation regarding the Animal Bylaw, Dog Policy, and Domestic Animal Policy Review 2023

To whom it concerns,

Environment Operations at Greater Wellington Regional Council would like to provide comment on the proposed Animal Bylaw, Dog Policy, and Domestic Animal Policy changes.

Proposed change 1: Expand off-leash provision across ten suburbs in Wellington

Our prime concern is off leash dogs getting lost or wandering and accessing areas of high biodiversity value. Where there is close proximity to areas of high biodiversity areas or to areas that may increase in biodiversity value in coming years, will there be any boundaries or fencing to contain the off leash areas? While many dogs stay close to their owners, a lot will wander off track and many owners do not closely watch their dog/s.

We support the care with which you have determined proposed changes to exercise areas, with a note that the map for Spicer Forest does not indicate the network of off lead tracks. As well as allowing for ecological values, consideration should be placed on the safety of dogs and the effectiveness of the pest control in this space as the site supports a variety of native species and is an important link between Porirua and Wellington. We suggest that dogs remain on the main track.

In general, anywhere that has pest control devices including bait stations needs to ensure that dogs will be safe from those devices, and that being off lead does not result in changes being required to the bait station network that reduces the effectiveness of control.

Can we confirm that working dogs (pest animal dogs) like rat detector or mustelid detector dogs used by Predator Free Wellington and Capital Kiwi? These dogs operate best off lead, would these dogs be able to continue to operate whilst working in line with the biosecurity act?

Proposed change 7: Convert two off-leash areas with 'on-leash' requirements to reduce user conflict and support wildlife conservation

We support this change.

Proposed change 10: Other criteria changes to the RDO (proposed ADO)

The proposal is that properties can be partially fenced, and this would be acceptable as long as the dog/s are contained. How would the council enforce this? This has implications if properties are near high biodiversity sites and dogs are running free.

Proposed change 14: Introduce a bylaw requirement for the mandatory desexing of cats

We support mandatory desexing (exemptions as noted), note the enforcement steps you will take, and that education and getting people onside are key to compliance. While not part of the proposal, we feel the Council should consider targeted education / advertising of cat owners near high biodiversity areas in the city about keeping them in at night to reduce the impact of domestic cats and allow for more effective efforts to remove pest

cats in the landscape. Council should also continue to fund operational activities around cats to support and enhance the work already happening around high biodiversity areas.

Proposed change 19: Introduce a cap of four beehives in residential areas without the need for written permission from the Council

Whilst not relevant to GWRC, we wonder if it would be useful to describe the process that will occur for people who currently have more than the recommended number of hives (4), as there may be concerns such people will have to get rid of some hives. Will an 'amnesty' of sorts be offered, for example.

Proposed change 23: Clarify the scope of "Stock" in the Interpretation section of the bylaw

Goats, deer, and pigs should be removed from the stock category and classed separately: those that escape or roam have a higher impact on biodiversity and identifying and removing them from the landscape is not as simple as removing cattle.

Proposed change 24: Introduce new requirements for keeping stock in residential areas

Again, is there worth in describing how you will deal with people who already have stock but no formal permission for these? People in that position may feel anxious and inclined not to tell you at all.

Proposed change 25: Introduce new condition requirements for keeping stock

Regarding your wording *'Stock must wear an ear tag (an RFID tag or similar) or collar to indicate that they are not feral, so the owner can be traced if the animal is seized'* - with reference to the Wild Animal Control Act, do you need to specify that they are *'identified in accordance with an animal identification device approved under the National Animal Identification and Tracing Act 2012 or in accordance with an identification system approved under section 50 of the Biosecurity Act 1993 and approved by the Director-General for the purposes of this [Wild Animal Control] Act'*?. See definitions in section 2 (Interpretation) of the WAC Act. See also: <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/animals/national-animal-identification-tracing-nait-programme/> for requirements for cattle and deer.

We suggest that any retrieval costs for escaped / loose animals be attributed to the landowner as this can be a costly process. We assume there will be strict requirements around fencing and management of these animals.

Claire Bibby on behalf of Glenside Association

Dogs

The Glenside Progressive Assn strongly support proposed change 11 and 19 (bylaw requirement for dog owners to carry effective means of waste disposal in public places).

Glenside Road and Stebbings Road are popular areas for dog walkers. There is currently no enforcement for dog owners to keep dogs on lead and no enforcement of dog fouling. These roads are adjacent to streams. International research (UK: USA) is that dog faeces contains E.coli: Giardia: Parvo: Tapeworms: Roundworms: Salmonella: Coccidia and Campylobacteriosis and lingers in the soil for years. When it washes into waterways: it is a significant contaminant. Dog fat in faeces is ingested by fish and gets into the human food chain.

About 98% of the dog handlers walking dogs along Glenside Road and Stebbings Road are from Churton Park. In future: Council should be working towards a policy of no off-leash areas beside waterways including beaches and no dog swimming permitted in public waterways. Human health and native birds should have priority.

The Assn. supports prohibited areas for dogs and would like a dog prohibited area in Genside Reserve where bird counts since 2016 have identified seven species of ground/bank nesting birds in the Reserve.

Cats

Glenside is a semi-rural area and a dumping area for unwanted cats. The community has been engaged in Predator Free since 2014. This year we have had excellent support from WCC with the staff (Kate in particular) supporting the community to trap stray cats. The Assn. supports this policy. The Assn. supports funding for dedicated stray cat personnel, as there is a risk under the new structure, their role will become solely dog management. Prior to the funding of a dedicated cat position, we had no support from Council for trapping cats.

Other Animals

Support Clause 15 in that Rural includes Large Lot Residential. In Glenside, some rural blocks are to be changed from rural to large lot residential. The properties have not changed size or land use. The current by-law already gives Council the right to go onto properties if a complaint is made about animal welfare.

Bruce Patterson on behalf of Grenada Village Community Association

This submission is lodged by the Grenada Village Community Association Incorporated. The Grenada Village Community Association Incorporated was established in 1978 with the prime objective being to provide the residents of Grenada Village with an officially recognised body that identifies, represents and advocates for the overall interest of the Grenada Village community.

We refer to the proposal contained in Wellington City Council's Dog Policy Review 2022, that a section of the lower field of Mark Avenue Park in Mark Avenue, Grenada Village be officially designated as a new off-leash dog exercise area.

We would comment as follows:

Mark Avenue

We note that the new policy states that although 75% of registered dog owners live within a 15 minute walking distance to an off-leash exercise area, there are a number of areas in Wellington that do not receive this coverage and hence, it is proposed to introduce a number of new off-leash exercise areas across the city to overcome this situation. A section of the lower field of Mark Avenue Park is included in this proposal so as to provide the needed coverage for this suburb.

We find this proposal rather confusing when only 200 metres away in Mark Avenue, is the main entrance to Seton Nossiter Park – a fully designated official dog exercise area providing both on-lead and off-lead facilities in a more that 2.0km long, 30ha protected natural reserve. It also has its own off-street car park for at least 25 vehicles. The park provides established walking tracks through native bush. The Belmont Stream meanders through the valley floor. There are open space areas, and several informal picnic spots. It has stunning views, stream crossings, bridges, seating etc. It is very sheltered and has its own micro-climate due to its low-lying nature to the surrounding hillsides. It is regarded by many as being one of the best dog exercise parks in Wellington.

Mark Avenue Park, which is now being proposed as an additional dog exercise area, is situated on the western side of Mark Avenue, just south of the Mark Avenue/Guadeloupe Crescent intersection. The park is split over two levels. Access to the top field is from

Mark Avenue while access to the lower park is either via a path past the top park or from the southern end of Buccaneer Place.

The top field is used for organised junior weekend sport. It is also used for sports practices (for a variety of sports) by groups from outside the area as well as from within the local community. It is also the home ground of the 'Mark Ave Football Club' (a club that started from a kick around among friends).

The lower park is an open-space passive park with no specific organised sport being held. It is used by the community as a general recreational area for a variety of family activities. Some of these include kite flying, golf practice, model aircraft flying, dog obedience, ball skills, jogging, walking, general exercise, and other family related activities. It is a good family orientated piece of green space. Many years ago, the Wellington City Council planted a number of trees in the park surrounded by wooden shelter boxes. As this area is not used for organised sport, these trees do not impede the park for general use. Unfortunately, the drainage system has not been adequately maintained by Wellington City Council over the many years and it can become very wet and boggy in poor weather.

Should a section of the lower park be formally adopted as an off-leash dog exercise area, we are of the strong view that the relevant section should be fenced off and gated to avoid any conflict with the general public users. There should also be adequate signage displayed advising dog owners of their responsibilities to both the park and the other park users.

We also have concerns that any change to the general use of this park would create traffic and parking problems in both Mark Avenue and Buccaneer Place. Furthermore, the lower park is surrounded by nearby houses, and any increase in noise levels could create difficulties for the neighbouring residents.

It is also our opinion that based on a number of comments from residents over a great number of years, that the lower area of Mark Avenue Park entirely suits the community the way it is, except for the wet and boggy condition it becomes in poor weather.

Carol West on behalf of Ōtari- Wilton's Bush Trust Board (OWBTB)

The following is a submission from the Ōtari- Wilton's Bush Trust Board (OWBTB) on Wellington City Council's (WCC) Statement of Proposal for changes to the Animal Bylaw: Dog Policy: and Domestic Animal Policy Review.

The submission is primarily concerned with dogs in Ōtari-Wilton's Bush: although it also makes some suggestions about kiwi protection more generally in Wellington.

Thousands of Wellingtonians enjoy visiting Ōtari-Wilton's Bush each year: many with their dogs.

In making this submission: OWBTB has considered feedback from Ōtari-Wilton's Bush Trust members: members of the public and community groups to both the OWBTB and the WCC staff working at Ōtari-Wilton's Bush: over the last four years.

Maintain current Ōtari-Wilton's Bush policy

The current WCC dog policy for Ōtari-Wilton's Bush allows dogs on a leash only: and no commercial dog walker use is permitted. We note that WCC also supplies 'doggie bags' at the main entrances. OWBTB considers that these policies serve the community well and align with the overall management objectives of Ōtari-Wilton's Bush. It therefore requests that these policies be maintained and that it is explicitly stated that the policies apply regardless of any additional training (such as kiwi avoidance training) that any dog may have undertaken.

Signage and enforcement

For the policy to be effective: it needs to be well communicated and actively and visibly enforced. OWBTB therefore requests WCC resource communication measures such as signage at key locations within Ōtari-Wilton's Bush and advertising on its website and in other council communications. OWBTB also requests resourcing of regular patrols of Ōtari-Wilton's Bush by WCC dog rangers and active management of any infringements: such as fines for people who do not keep their dog on a leash.

Capital Kiwi Project + kiwi aversion training

In addition: OWBTB is very supportive of the 'Capital Kiwi Project' which covers around 11:000 hectares adjoining the southern and western suburbs and encompasses Ōtari-Wilton's Bush. In all these areas uncontrolled dogs can be a significant threat to adult kiwi. This threat can be largely mitigated by owners putting their dogs through kiwi avoidance training.

OWBTB would like WCC to strongly advocate for: and support: the availability of this training for those dog owners who live adjacent to: or who use: the 'Capital Kiwi Project' areas. OWBTB would also like the WCC's programme for the 'Accredited Dog Owners Licence' to include encouraging dog owners to put their dogs through specific kiwi avoidance training.

OWBTB would appreciate WCC's favourable consideration of its proposals for the new policy. OWBTB is happy to provide further information and wishes to speak to this submission at the appropriate time.

Carol West
Chair, Ōtari- Wilton's Bush Trust Board

Kate Littin on behalf of Forest and Bird, Kerry Shaw on behalf of Wellington
Branch of Forest & Bird Places for Penguins

Introduction

1. Forest & Bird is New Zealand's largest independent conservation organisation. Our mission is to protect New Zealand's unique flora and fauna and its habitat.
2. We congratulate Wellington City Council (WCC) for the comprehensive review of its Animal Bylaw and Dog and Domestic Animal Policies. Forest & Bird encourages councils to adopt meaningful cat and dog policies and regulations to support responsible cat and dog ownership, to minimise risks to human health and safety, and to minimise the risk of nuisance cats and uncontrolled dogs to native species.
3. Forest & Bird's core concerns regard the need for better owner behaviour with dogs on and off leash, consideration of a restriction on dogs in Houghton Bay to protect known penguin nesting site, and the omission of a cat limit in the proposed bylaw. In addition, we want to see urgent implementation of the phase-outs to leases for horse grazing in reserves.
4. We would like to speak in support of our submission.

Submission

5. Forest & Bird acknowledges cats and dogs as valued companion animals in Wellington. However, as WCC's biodiversity strategy 'Our Natural Capital' also states:

“As a city, we need to take into account the role of all species in contributing to our cultural identity and our role in protecting species that are threatened in their original habitat.”

6. Responsible cat and dog ownership is a critical component of supporting a biodiverse city where wildlife thrives. Cat and dog regulation is not controversial in Wellington and Forest & Bird supports any regulation that ensures responsible pet ownership and which enables wildlife to live and thrive in the city.
7. Dogs live in about 26% of households in Wellington² and enjoy access to a range of off-leash areas in addition to a basic on-leash access except where prohibited. When policed well, this strikes a good balance between allowing quality of life for dogs and containment to avoid risks to humans, other dogs and wildlife. It is concerning to us that WCC’s own report showed that reports of uncontrolled dogs, and attacks on people and animals rose by more than a quarter in the last year. Forest & Bird Wellington members are aware of breaches of leash requirements by owners across reserves and coastal areas in Wellington. We comment below on two aspects and appreciate the steps the Council has laid out in the action plan that address these – 1. the need for better support for enforcement including through supporting public reporting; 2. the need to improve owner understanding of the importance of keeping dogs on lead around Wellington.
8. Forest & Bird acknowledges the position cats hold as a valued companion animal to loving owners. As a loved animal, cat owners also need to take responsibility for their cat’s behaviour and safety. Forest & Bird supports mandatory microchipping, registration and de-sexing as the bare minimum of responsible cat ownership. We also request WCC include a cat limit to bring its regulation in line with the majority of other councils that regulate cats in Aotearoa.
9. We also acknowledge the enjoyment that horse owners and riders get from keeping and riding horses within Wellington and near their homes. However, in some instances we are aware that the planned phasing out of horse grazing leases on reserves is not occurring quickly. It is critical that this is reviewed across reserves in Wellington to ensure that the biodiversity outcomes are not being compromised, in accordance with the biodiversity strategy and other plans including WCC’s Outer Green Belt Management Plan and Greater Wellington Regional Council’s Key Native Ecosystems plans.

MAHERE MAHI HUKIHUKI DRAFT ACTION PLAN (YEARS 1–3) - DOGS

1. We acknowledge the several areas in the draft Action Plan for dogs that address wildlife protection. We have specific comments as follows:

DAP2 - It is critical that this work takes account of work underway to consider a future vision for the northern end of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar.

DAP5 - Together with DAP7, we think this will improve access to ‘dog friendly’ areas in Wellington and divert unwanted off-leash activity from reserves and open areas that are critical for wildlife protection

DAP6 We consider that the whole spectrum of behaviour change needs to be addressed in this action, not just signage to enhance awareness. This should be alongside a wider campaign focussed on other elements that are critical for behaviour change – desire to change, ability to change, and retention of good behaviour. This could include supporting owners to understand the need for dogs to be on lead, and better knowledge of what good behaviour looks like (e.g. DOC’s Lead the Way programme³ to

make dog owners 'wildlife wise'). This may be partially addressed by WCC's proposed public awareness campaign around breeding times of wildlife.

DAP7 See DAP5 above.

DAP8 We suggest that work should be included to support better public reporting of poor dog behaviour, e.g. dogs off lead reported through a hotline or WCC's fixit app with additional ability to upload photos.

PROPOSED CHANGES 1-7:

11. We support the changes to off-leash areas and acknowledge the concerns about wildlife behind the changes. We request one additional change to Houghton Bay.

Forest & Bird proposes that there is a restriction to the off-leash area in Houghton Bay.

12. Forest & Bird's Places for Penguins project monitors penguins and penguin nests around the Wellington coastline. We have been saddened to see several dog attacks on penguins in Wellington including the South Coast in May and Seatoun in July this year⁴.



Figure 1: Detector dog penguin site detections in Houghton Bay, September 2021 (blue dots). These are in similar locations to known active nest boxes in 2023. The orange circle indicates that a penguin was present during the survey

13. Houghton Bay has several known nest boxes in use very near to the path from the beach to the road at the western end. Also, natural nests were detected by a detector dog survey in the revetment/riprap along the beach side towards Princess Bay, as shown in Figure 1.
14. We believe that this is a high-risk area for human-wildlife conflict.
15. A compromise would be to close off the end of the beach as highlighted by the red striped area shown in Figure 2, and clearer signage to make it a 'no dogs' or 'dogs on leash' area.

More is needed to support enforcement of on-leash requirements beyond what is proposed

16. The proposed changes to off-leash areas will only have an impact if they are enforced and supported by owner and public behaviour change. For example, Chartwell Reserve in Crofton Downs is an on-leash area but off-leash dogs are routinely seen there by our volunteers. We have two key suggestions: 1. the need for better support for enforcement including through supporting public reporting; 2. the need to improve owner understanding of the importance of keeping dogs on lead around Wellington.
17. Firstly, it should not be up to the public to address poor behaviour directly with owners, particularly in stressful, confrontational situations that are often in isolated

areas. Our own volunteers have been attacked by dogs while working in the bush and this compounds their concerns about raising it with dog owners. We consider WCC could do more to support reporting by members of the public and other dog owners, when bad behaviour is seen, e.g. a hotline or addition of dog reporting to WCC's fixit app, as noted above under DAP8.

18. Secondly, we are involved with work with WCC to address signage to improve awareness of on-leash requirements and thank the Council for supporting this work. However, we believe that more needs to be done to support owner behaviour change, as noted under DAP6 above. This means a focus not just on improved signage but also supporting other elements that are critical for behaviour change – desire to change, ability to change, and retention of good behaviour. In particular, this should include supporting owners to understand the need for dogs to be on a leash, and better knowledge of what good behaviour looks like (e.g. DOC's Lead the Way programme to make dog owners 'wildlife wise').
19. We acknowledge WCC's intentions to enhance enforcement in coastal areas and Makara Peak, but again, this needs to be part of a wider programme to be more effective. This is particularly critical given the success of Capital Kiwi, and the known risks of dogs to kiwi. As kiwi become established across more of the Outer Green Belt, this will only become more important.

PROPOSED CHANGES 12&13:

20. We support these changes on the basis that they encourage good dog and owner behaviour in on-leash areas, through allowing good access to spaces where dogs can accompany owners and be exercised. Conversely, restriction of dogs to a small number of widely spaced off-leash areas that are not well connected by transport alternatives, in our view encourages owners to let dogs off the leash in the nearest open spaces such as beaches and reserves, where there can be critical impacts on wildlife.

PROPOSED CHANGE 14: Introduce a bylaw requirement for the mandatory desexing of cats

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

21. The reproductive potential of a single female cat is estimated at 300 kittens in her reproductive lifetime. The potential for a male cat is far beyond that. MPI's Code of Welfare states puberty can occur from four months of age.⁵ Responsible cat ownership includes having cats desexed at or before puberty. Palmerston North, Whanganui, Whangārei, Ruapehu and Buller District Councils all included de-sexing in their recent Animals Bylaw reviews. Whanganui's bylaw includes compulsory desexing from four months of age.
22. Forest & Bird proposes the compulsory requirement to de-sex cats in Wellington be from FOUR months. De-sexing from four months would bring the bylaw in line with Whanganui which currently has the best cat regulation in the country. We would, however, support veterinary discretion on a case-by-case basis, should six months be deemed more appropriate for specific individual cats. Prevention of unwanted kittens would be a major advancement in cat management in Wellington. Animal shelters and cat rescues strain under the burden of so many unwanted cats. Desexing from four months would go a long way to addressing this pressure.

Forest & Bird requests a limit of TWO cats per household

23. Cat limits are the most common form of regulation in bylaws across Aotearoa (Table 1.). New Zealanders show a high level (>65%) of support for limits to

be placed on the number of cats owned per household.

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

Cat limits per household	Council	
Two cats	Buller District Council ⁷	Mackenzie District Council ⁸
Three cats	Carterton District Council ⁹ Invercargill City Council ¹⁰ Masterton District Council ¹¹ New Plymouth District Council ¹² Palmerston North City Council ¹³	Rangitikei District Council ¹⁴ South Wairarapa District Council ¹⁵ Tararua District Council ¹⁶ Wairoa District Council ¹⁷ Whanganui District Council ¹⁸
Four cats	Hastings District Council ¹⁹ Marlborough District Council ²⁰	Manawatū District Council ²¹ Ruapehu District Council ²²
Five cats	Far North District Council ²³ Southland District Council ²⁴	South Waikato District Council ²⁵

24. In 2021, Mackenzie District Council imposed the strictest cat limit in the country, allowing only two per household in urban areas. Just this year, following consultation with the community, Buller followed suit and decreased its proposed cat limit from four to two. Imposing cat limits to households where cats pose a nuisance, e.g. cat hoarders and unwanted breeding, is desired by communities and an easy way to address and abate nuisance from too many cats.

25. We suggest WCC would benefit from the certainty provided by a two-cat limit to give direction to Council Officers to impose a limit on cat numbers as a means of dealing with a nuisance when a complaint is received.

PROPOSED CHANGE 24:

26. We suggest WCC needs to take wildlife objectives into account when considering licenses for horses and other stock. As noted above, we understand the enjoyment that horse owners and riders get from keeping and riding horses within Wellington and near their homes. However, in some instances we are aware that the planned phasing out of horse grazing leases on reserves is not occurring quickly. It is critical that this is reviewed across reserves in Wellington to ensure that the biodiversity outcomes are not being compromised for the convenience of horse owners, and that new licenses take wildlife impacts and objectives into account. This includes leases/licenses on reserves under WCC's Outer Green Belt Management Plan and Greater Wellington Regional Council's Key Native Ecosystems plans.

RESOURCING:

Forest & Bird proposes allocating appropriate resources to ensure bylaw effectiveness

27. The biggest stumbling block to effective dog and cat management in Aotearoa is funding of compliance and education. There is an element of council responsibility to give clear messages regarding responsible pet ownership, however, dog owners in particular need to also be held to account when not following the rules.

28. Cat and dog management in Wellington need not be expensive or unachievable. It just requires leadership and a well-balanced approach of education, targeted funding and enforcement.

Submission ends.

Lisa Snow on behalf of the Island Bay Dog Beach Users Group

This submission is on behalf of the Island Bay Dog Beach users group. Our group represents more than 50 dog owners: mainly from Island Bay and the immediate suburbs of Owiro Bay: Berhampore etc.

Proposed change 4: Swap around the “off-leash” and “prohibited” areas at Island Bay Beach.

- 100% of the responses received by this group wanted the location of the dog beach to remain where it is and with no restriction on hours.
- It should be noted that some people in the group feel access to the beach is something that was ‘fought for’ for many years. It was only granted in the last WCC review of dog off leash areas and it would be unfair to lose this access.
- It often seems as if the Council view providing dog friendly areas as providing areas for dogs. This is not the case. The areas are provided so that people can use the area: with their dog. Mountain bike tracks are provided for people who want to ride their bikes: not for the bikes. Sports fields are provided for people who want to kick a ball around: not the balls. Dog walkers are just another recreational group of open space users and should have recreation areas provided for them.
- In Island Bay: the only other off leash area is the tiny bit of waste ground opposite the surf club. Other off leash areas are at Mt Albert: Tawatawa reserve: Houghton Bay and McAllister Park in Berhampore. All a car ride or long walks away from Island Bay. If WCC want to encourage people to use their cars less: then having a local off leash area where dogs can run around is important.

Protection of the Dunes

- Members of the group have undertaken some research and feel that dogs are being unfairly blamed for erosion of that dunes that is created by higher tides: rough weather and global warming.
- Many people in the group have never seen dogs in the dunes. It was noted that better education or fencing the dunes off would be a solution to this.
- Currently there are some posts where in the past there have been rope ‘barriers’. There are a few A4 sized signs on these posts which are difficult to see from a distance. Better signage to explain why it is important that dogs AND PEOPLE stay out of the dunes could help prevent this damage. It should not be underestimated that if the location of the dog beach is switched: it is highly likely kids will want to play in and slide down the dunes: likely causing more damage than the dogs.
- By restricting dog walkers use of Island Bay beach: they would likely end up using Lyall Bay beach putting stress on the dunes on that beach with the additional dogs that would go there.

Location of the dog beach

- Many of the users of the beach who responded pointed out that the eastern end of the beach is the 'nicer' end. It has the swimming pontoon located in front of it and has the sea wall as shelter from wind. When dogs were completely banned from the beach: this was always the busier end of the beach. It makes sense that this should be the people only area.
- Group members with small children noted that the existing 'people only' end of the beach is where they prefer to take their children. They don't want them putting their towels down to sit: or digging in the sand and making sandcastles etc: where a few hours earlier a dog may have pooped and peed: even if the poo has been picked up.
- It is likely that if dogs were moved to this eastern end of the beach: conflict between beach users and dog walkers could arise as this area is smaller.
- There were also concerns about the birds that inhabit the rocky area near the Surf Club being disturbed.

Restriction on times of day the beach can be used by dog owners

- This is the part of the proposal that is of most concern to the members of this group.
- The beauty of the current access dog owner have to use the Southern end of the beach is that they can go and spend an extended amount of time enjoying the beach with their dog. They can go for a swim with their dog and socialise with friends at the beach without having to leave their dog at home. Restricting the hours people can be at the beach with their dog prevents this as for much of the summer: swimming before 10am and after 7pm is colder and not pleasant.
- This prevents families taking their children to the beach for the day or afterschool with the family dog: a traditional kiwi thing to do in the summer.
- Since the beach has been open to dogs: people have come to Island Bay beach because it is dog friendly from further afield: eg Lower Hutt.
- Restricting the hours is not inclusive as it assumes everyone works 9 to 5 and can go to the beach before 10am or after 7pm. However: for people who work outside of the usual office hours: this may prevent them from using the beach with their dog at all during the summer months.
- There is also concern that if dogs are restricted from this beach: dog owners will use other beaches that appear to have less people on them. This is of concern for Owhiro Bay residents as this beach area is a breeding ground for penguins. As the parts of this beach where the penguins mainly inhabit are away from the main road (and therefore: Animal Control are unlikely to just be driving by to see them) there is concern that displaced dog walkers will take their dogs there.
- It will also force dog walkers to use Lyall Bay beach dog area more. This is already a very busy beach for dog walkers who use it and increasing the numbers there will likely lead to incidents between dogs (or owners) due to overcrowding. There are also sand dunes at this beach that may be negatively affected by the increased number of dogs being walked there.
- There was also concern that the change of hours would exclude horse riders from using the beach to exercise their horses and ponies.

- We would like to make an oral submission.

Dave Harkness on behalf of Capital BMX

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the draft Wellington dog policy. We are writing to you to seek some changes in order to reduce the nuisance from dogs at the BMX track.

Previous incidents with dogs

The vast majority of our track users: both club members and public are young children some of whom are intimidated by dogs.

Following an incident in September 2022 when a dog walker parked inside the BMX leased area opened the boot of her car and her uncontrolled dog bolted across the track whilst a race was in progress: we have been keeping a log of dog related incidents.

Since we have been monitoring:

- we have had 3 instances of dogs on the track during a race. These incidents have serious health & safety consequences for our riders who could be thrown from their bikes at more than 40kpmh.
- The last person that crashed at that pace broke several ribs: a collar bone and punctured a lung. Even if an off-leash dog doesn't go on the track itself: they can still cause a problem in the leased area if they snap at or run in front of kids riding past to and from the start hill.

Other typical incidents are:

- off leash dogs entering the BMX leased area from the sports fields running ahead of their owner towards the fenced dog park.
- dog owners releasing their dogs from their cars near the skate ramps rather than putting them on leash to transfer to the fenced area: and the dogs running freely into the BMX area.
- dog fouling in areas that the kids use as 'pits' for bikes: and other parts of the leased area.
- dog prints in the track surface (due to them being on the track when the lime is wet: or during resurfacing operations when the site is closed): which impacts the crust and allows future water degradation.

We log 2 to 3 examples of these incidents each time we are at the track – 79 in total since last year and we believe this is a direct consequence of having an off leash dog park next to the BMX sports facility.

Proposal Feedback

- We welcome the proposal to create a new dog park at Appleton Park.
- We would like the current Ian Galloway Park (IGP) dog park to be relocated elsewhere. Appleton Park has advantages to dog owners – there is more parking: the area is twice as large as the current park and it's closer to Zealandia's Rātā cafe to grab a coffee. Removing the current IGP dog park will reduce risk of conflict between dogs and all sports users (we hear of problems with off leash dogs

at the skate ramps too) and would create the space for a regional scale destination pump track next to the BMX track.

- Until the IGP dog park is moved: we request that the gate between the dog park and BMX area be permanently closed: and the BMX leased area to be designated a prohibited space for dogs: like the designation for children's playgrounds or artificial turf. There are alternative access points for the dog park that avoid the need to traverse the BMX area: with those coming from the north able to access via the existing gate on Curtis Street.

Appendix B – List of individual submitters

A copy of all individual submissions are available on the Council website.

Dogs

1	Mara Wilson	27	Mark	53	5311638- no ID
2	Clare Nixon	28	Jeremy Helson	54	Amanda Smith
3	Matt Durling	29	Daniel	55	Karl Yager
4	Alyce Gibson	30	Miriam	56	Kelly
5	Shaun McMaster	31	Liviu Sas	57	Alex
6	Jenny Jebson	32	Fred Albert	58	Alex Vakhrousheva
7	Charlotte Sinclair	33	Michele McGaughran	59	Helen Davey
8	Margaret	34	Lyshe Windy	60	Cam McKenzie
9	Mary Ellen Gordon	35	Dana	61	Robyn
10	Ange	36	Anne	62	A Burke
11	Ange	37	Jenny	63	Courtney
12	Lauren Semple	38	Shaun Brennan	64	Leah Robinson
13	Emma	39	I Tong	65	David Morris
14	Lydia Talbot	40	Sha	66	Signy
15	James Smith	41	Noa Noa von Bassewitz	67	Lauree Rickard
16	Georgie Ferrari	42	Verity Schommer	68	Amanda
17	Julia	43	Madie	69	Annelize
18	Angela Hart	44	Anne Evans	70	Peter White
19	Finlay Olorenshaw	45	Carlie Uivel	71	Beth Ferguson
20	Kirsten Hagan	46	Snowy	72	SL
21	D	47	Timothy Tay	73	Melissa
22	Alicia	48	David Scott	74	Melanie McKeown
23	Esther Hay	49	Charlotte	75	Jonelle
24	Paul	50	Tamlyn Mckenzie	76	Chris
25	Chris	51	Jon Iyall	77	Kornelia
26	Lynn Walpole	52	Samuel Scott	78	Natasha

79	Vicki Bealing	110	Ian Vanstone	141	Ms M
80	5311990 - no ID	111	Tony gray	142	Rachel Allan
81	Antonio Cacciamani	112	Danielle	143	Rachel
82	Katrina Oliver	113	Cathy Scott	144	Anna
83	Rachel Hansen	114	Leanne malcolm	145	Carl Blackmun
84	Ruth Harper	115	Julie Griffin	146	Glenn Wilson
85	5312799 - no ID	116	Bernadette Staal	147	Ella
86	Jane Fahy	117	Murray Mcilraith	148	Kim
87	Chris	118	Lucy Lightfoot	149	Anna
88	Kevin Reardon	119	Gail Rawlinson	150	Khoi
89	Wendy	120	Lorraine Chin	151	Brooke Singer
90	Bronwyn Lipsham	121	Kayt	152	Elin Simes
91	Claire Walker	122	Barbara McLaughlin	153	Claire Regnault
92	Marie d Whatarau	123	Renee	154	Kirsty Ruddlesden
93	Alex	124	Juanita	155	Ingrid Downey
94	Thomas Kay	125	Casey mclellan	156	Tim cassin
95	Greer Mathers	126	Mary Sylvia	157	James
96	Chris Stevenson	127	Shanan McKeown	158	Sue Slater
97	5313492 - no ID	128	Kat Grayston	159	Debbie Bidlake
98	Briony Ellis	129	AnneMarie Curtis	160	Kira
99	Jackie Foster	130	Katy	161	Kristen
100	Vanessa	131	Paula East	162	Christine Dee
101	Rachel Dawson	132	Tessa Haigh	163	Michael Pringle
102	Melanie Vivian	133	Terry	164	Kellie Houlton
103	Kirill	134	Bevan Smith	165	Andrew Charles Liley
104	Heather	135	Trish millward	166	Joanne Bowley
105	Kris Singh	136	Gail	167	Megan Burnett
106	Brett Kraiger	137	Sherlene Ho	168	5315689 - no ID
107	Elizabeth Chisholm	138	John Jacobson	169	Natasha Furness
108	5313655 - no ID	139	Graeme Buchanan	170	Briar
109	Elizabeth Gregory	140	John Lyon	171	Natasha Hayed
				172	Kelly Nesar

173	Jeanie Stewart	203	Cameron Hart	233	Annie
174	Sangeeth Pushewalage	204	5318713 - no ID	234	Brandon Henwood
175	Beth	205	Helen McNeil	235	Briar Barry
176	Sophie Mormede	206	Louise Grant	236	Antony
177	Thomas Guldborg	207	Ben Schrader	237	Aroha Faletolu
178	Zahra Hosseinzadeh	208	A McCrone	238	Anne Taunga
179	Emma Kerr-Laurie	209	Abbey Palmer	239	Alexander Barendregt
180	Sarah	210	Alex	240	Stephen Edwards
181	Elise Lawrence	211	Ayman Farah	241	Carla Lucille Poulton
182	Elizabeth Bardsley	212	Freda Te Ohaere	242	Caitlin Osmond
183	Fiona Mulder	213	Alicia	243	Brenda Wallace
184	Emily Willard	214	Angela Evans-Morgan	244	Iz Arko
185	Karien Mallee	215	Alan Wilson	245	Denise Cadigan
186	Lisa Cheney	216	Alecsia Cope	246	5320317 - no ID
187	5316349 - no ID	217	Angela Wakelin	247	Casey Batchelor
188	Bethany O	218	Anna Anderton-Lum	248	Laurice
189	Esthe Pretorius	219	Anton Beliakov	249	Bec Hennessy
190	Bridie Kruck	220	Anna Bisset	250	Camilo Borges
191	Charlotte Kerr	221	Anna Taylor	251	Charlotte
192	John Gill	222	a	252	Chris Targett
193	James Macey	223	Amy	253	Amanda McCluskey
194	5317179 - no ID	224	Anna K	254	Brendy Weir
195	Katherine	225	Andrew kenyon	255	anna gawn
196	Andrew	226	Anna Mastalerz	256	Camila
197	Meegan Walker	227	Eli	257	Ann Shelton
198	Anne	228	Rebecca McLean	258	craig anderson
199	Frances	229	Amir Mohtasebi	259	Christian Yao
200	Sarah Q	230	Leia Alannah Herbert	260	Adam Naiman
201	Cathy	231	Ash Webb	261	Brandon
202	Susan Pryor	232	Fiona Barkess	262	Chris Sutherland

263	Charles Smith	293	Amanda Beauchamp	323	Dijon O'Kelly
264	Alison Hickey			324	Andy Jackson
265	David Hendry	294	Claudia Schotz	325	Chris Daly
266	Chris Windmill	295	Angela Rumney	326	Ruth
267	Rebecca Jackson	296	David Phipps	327	Claire Bettridge
268	Annie Thorne	297	Harriet Dempsey	328	Andrew Baker
269	Barry Purkiss	298	Kirsty Donnelly	329	5320997 - no ID
270	damian	299	Chloe	330	Clare Warne
271	Cyrus Ranchhod	300	Brett McDonald	331	Lesley Picking
272	Neil Beattie	301	Deb Jones	332	Danielle Casey
273	Clare Pohlen	302	Rebecca Mclean	333	Ahmad Tariq Saeed-Malik
274	Annabelle Batchelor	303	Chloe Robinson	334	Madeleine Denton
275	Dawn Brown	304	Courtney blakemore	335	Caroline Wood
276	Louise Hill	305	Maria Ioannou	336	Cat bennett
277	Deena Bailey	306	Barbara Tumilowicz	337	Carol Colgate
278	Petra Jaeger-Letts	307	Aaron Chester	338	Zoe Roland
279	claire freeman	308	Karen Stacie Martyn	339	Alessandro
280	David Boyes	309	Ada Wang	340	Susie Robertson
281	Davin Hall	310	Rissa Williams	341	Carl Downes
282	Diana Noyce	311	moana	342	Alan Bailey
283	Donna Jackson	312	Ashleigh Knubley	343	L Carlyon
284	Belinda Hussey	313	Bridget Marston	344	Helen Cairney
285	Brynne Tasker- Poland	314	Benny Jennings	345	Mel Brannigan
286	Denise Rongo- Raea	315	Denis Mander	346	Morgan Parker
287	Scott Weitekamp	316	Dana	347	Susan
288	5320517 - no ID	317	Craig Brown	348	Camilla Lau
289	Andrea Brown	318	Cheryl Robilliard	349	Brigid Jenkins
290	Deborah Remacha	319	Anne Dowden	350	Craig
291	D Neate	320	Crystal Payne	351	Karen Morris
292	Lee Rowland	321	Angus Lindsay	352	Brent Logan
		322	Dave Harrison	353	Christine Soper
				354	Brent Logan

355	Andrea Key	385	Ashleigh Abels	414	Greg Williams
356	Anna Boyd	386	Angelique Stanton	415	Fumi Norman
357	David Dougherty	387	Ellen	416	Greer Nehoff
358	Carrie McLachlan	388	Ellie	417	Tim Ng
359	Everett Toews	389	Finn O'Connor	418	Jill Bowman
360	Anne-Gaelle Ausseil	390	Emmanuel Karavias	419	Paul Ferrick
361	Carolyn	391	Heather Trask	420	Henry Lang
362	Annie Morris	392	Faith Roberts	421	Janet Wong
363	Y Lee	393	Erin Henderson	422	Helen Williamson
364	Kate Brooks	394	Elsie Diederichsen	423	Dylan Ford
365	LORI SPRATT	395	Ellen Forrow	424	5322664 - no ID
366	Brenda Leighs	396	Emma Medina	425	Helena Weir
367	Alice Twitchell	397	Gwilym	426	Di Williams
368	Richard John Houben	398	Esther Walker	427	5322679 - no ID
369	Bex	399	Erin Brown	428	Matt Pearce
370	Carissa Baker	400	Hannah Riley	429	Howard Smith
371	Annette Colls	401	Frances Helen Russell	430	Gretchen Leuthart
372	Ruth	402	Emma Parker	431	Eledir Seren
373	5321878 - no ID	403	Ed Goode	432	Damien Grover
374	Derdriu Whyte	404	Glynn Foster	433	Helen Shaw
375	Melanie Templeton	405	Elaine Chong	434	Michael Green
376	Eleanor Ainsworth	406	Drew Preddy	435	Carolyn McLean
377	Alice Johnson	407	Brenda Tweedy	436	Dion Peat
378	Barbara pearse	408	Elizabeth Goodwin	437	Ceri Jenkins
379	Dani	409	Ezmae Reid	438	Jane O'Shea
380	Andrew Tolley	410	Kenneth Campbell Pope	439	Peter Ng
381	Anita Bester	411	Hilary Watson	440	Alina Bochkacheva
382	Cathy Webber	412	Frances Dando	441	Frank Prskawetz
383	Alice Domett Doyle	413	Gavin Coughlan	442	Jane Scott
384	peter pfeffer			443	Jackie
				444	Peter Deefholts
				445	Jan Gould

446	Tim Seupule	476	Justin Israel	508	Mark Derby
447	Jen Abernethy	477	Frannie Aston	509	Lochlin Kirkwood
448	Alexander Bamford	478	judi Maddever	510	Mark Le Masurier
449	Anoushka Isaac	479	Isitokia Paasi	511	Brendan Marshall
450	Jeannine Thomas	480	Natalie Levy	512	Lauren Smith
451	Hayley Ellison	481	Amanda Strong	513	Margaret Franken
452	jono hastings	482	Bridget McIlraith	514	Mairead de Roiste
453	Jane Clunies-Ross	483	Jeanette Sweet	515	Michael S. Daubs
454	Helena Barwick	484	Justine Boyle	516	Lisa Hughes
455	Jon Hertzog	485	Lena	517	Mark Stringer
456	Jennifer Robin	486	Irina Nearonova	518	Gay Keast
457	David Martin	487	Reina Hammond	519	Matthew Puttock
458	Dana Cameron	488	Kat Whitney	520	Michelle Guest
459	Pam Francombe	489	Lee-Anne Duncan	521	5323166 - no ID
460	Georgie	490	jorle wiesen	522	Joanna Dowle
461	Heidi Marcov	491	Komal	523	Mahana H
462	Matt	492	Carl Bray	524	Jacqui Lane
463	Nicholas Urry	493	Kris O'Brien	525	Jo Gilberd
464	Kate Thirkell	494	Sarah Bacon	526	Penny Keogh
465	Helen Copsey	495	Emma Robertson	527	Kyla Vaughan
466	Jayme	496	Jo Lambert	528	Kirsten
467	Jackie	497	Ilse Snyckers	529	Monique Andrews
468	Karli Goldsack	498	Kylee	530	Kylie Begg
469	Gina Thurman	499	Lewis Richards	531	Mark
470	Domino Lee	500	Jane-Marie Kerslake	532	Abhimanyu
471	Jules van der Voorn	501	James	533	Michael Dunlop
472	Ryan Hunt	502	Harriet Neely	534	Muriel Brent
473	Kaz Jackson	503	Leanne Bowden	535	Mark Ireland
474	Kelly spence	504	K. Camer	536	Jason Hewett
475	Jeremy Boyd	505	Lucy MacLeod	537	Marion Kalderimis
		506	Julz T W Kee	538	Barry Chisholm
		507	kelly henderson	539	5323263 - no ID

540	Nikki	569	Senta Jehle	600	Nicole Wijngaarden
541	Katy Sage	570	James Zino	601	Tony casey
542	Nicole Skews-Poole	571	Ray Choice	602	Mark Keegan
543	Nina	572	Raechal Ferguson	603	Gerard Roberts
544	Jordan Broderson	573	Jason Laverock	604	Harley
545	Michael Christoffel	574	Katie Farrington	605	Kirsten
546	Juliette Anderton	575	Lyn Norris	606	5323394 - no ID
547	Naoko Hayashi	576	Paula	607	Renee butler
548	Maily Webb	577	Murray Holland	608	Fiona Pohlen
549	Isabel	578	Ellie	609	Martin Lewington
550	Nyree Fea	579	Alister	610	Mollie
551	Neil Dixon	580	Dee	611	Jacquelyn
552	5323389 - no ID	581	Lisa Crawford	612	Lisamarie Richan
553	Lyle Johnston	582	Richie	613	Sam Minchin
554	Kate	583	Louise Beaumont	614	Petagna
555	Michele Morris	584	Claire Jensen	615	Julz T W Kee
556	Helen Gilbert	585	Julia Matthews	616	Peta Baily Gibson
557	Kent Barber	586	Fiona Casey	617	Bethany Charlton
558	5323359 - no ID	587	Rachel Wood	618	Matthew John Roche
559	Nina Hannert-Nimmo	588	Lynzie Rogers	619	Brita McVeigh
560	Katharine Miller	589	5323522 - no ID	620	Robbie Stephen
561	Charlotte Byron-O'Connor	590	Fernando Azevedo	621	Iris Humm
562	Libby Carson	591	Paula Feathers	622	Peter Lye
563	Tessa Hansen Cane	592	Kieran Swaney	623	Melissa Ince
564	Michelle Bailey	593	Paul Day	624	Louisa Rimmer
565	Nicola gates	594	Katie	625	Richard Burt
566	Melissa Spicer	595	Ian Campbell	626	Jaime Guerrero
567	Natalia Anastasiadis	596	Lucy Robertson	627	Maggie J Kycia
568	Richard Thwaites	597	Nicki Bradfield-van Wyk	628	Ellard Clout
		598	Benedict Taylor	629	Erica Harvison
		599	5323572 - no ID	630	K Dawkins

631	Paige Tompkin	661	Daniel Read	693	Matt
632	James Hartley	662	Lis Cowey	694	Fiona Crawford
633	Matthew Spencer	663	Jenifer Parker	695	Kyle Lunman
634	Liz Lander	664	Rach Shadbolt	696	AnnieN
635	Morag	665	Anna	697	Nora Burghart
636	Mary Chesney	666	Nick willard	698	Kirstyn Harding
637	Nick Evans	667	Jennifer houston	699	Emma
638	Lindsay	668	Nicole van der Laak	700	Rachel Low
639	Josephine O'Connor	669	Gillian Warren	701	Judith maxim
640	Raewyn Glaister	670	Paloma Bruce	702	Becca
641	Jun Yamog	671	Paulette Robinson	703	5324210 - no ID
642	Mathew Williams	672	Suzanne	704	Emma Tierney
643	Elizabeth Christie	673	Duane	705	Marg Barr-Brown
644	Grant Ferreira	674	Karen Hollis	706	Riki Anderson
645	Rachael Hammon	675	Helen Hurst	707	Melissa Wong
646	Parke Englebretsen	676	Maria Loeb	708	Alex Dalzell
647	5323809 - no ID	677	Markelle Archer	709	Sheila Hart
648	Dawnus	678	Alastair Stewart	710	Sarah Moodie
649	Brad Gallen	679	Fred Anderson	711	Rachel Radford
650	Karen Kong	680	María Montero	712	Charlotte te Riet Scholten
651	Louise	681	Terence Davidson	713	Leigh-Anne Buxton
652	Derek R Lander	682	Tim Carthew	714	Kalameli
653	Kristin Grice	683	Latham Arnott	715	Nicola Macer
654	Jess Macauley	684	Judith riepl	716	Amanda Smith
655	Vanessa Martin	685	Alexandra Burton	717	Sarah Meek
656	Gwyneth Wills	686	5324052 - no ID	718	5324418 - no ID
657	Casey Hamilton Harrison	687	Jennifer Go	719	Mark Fahy
658	Peter Gare	688	5324097 - no ID	720	Barbara Eagle
659	Bruce Manners	689	David Cox	721	Penelope Louise Campbell
660	Zoe Read	690	Ewan Delany	722	patrik delaney
		691	Erin Krebs		
		692	Sarah Nightingale		

723	Nannette Dempsey	754	Karl Emson	785	Hannah Henderson
724	Jenny Peacock	755	Julie-Anne Lee	786	Chris O'Neale
725	Haley	756	Peter Stevens	787	Kate Lamport
726	Linda Glogau	757	Laura Deave	788	Kate Whitley
727	Rani	758	Kate Reddington	789	Katie Benson
728	5324466 - no ID	759	James graham	790	Jo Jamieson
729	Elizabeth Ward	760	David Webb	791	Jane
730	Michelle Moore	761	5324707 - no ID	792	Emma Mulhern
731	Kim Heron	762	John Lewis	793	Kate
732	Craig Goble	763	Jake Davis	794	Diane Kenwright
733	Ben Kelly	764	Sarah Meikle	795	Linda Barwick
734	Rebecca Duncan	765	Sharon Paine	796	Grant Burley
735	Justin Summers	766	Andrew Salt	797	Alice Conway
736	Lorna Brennan	767	James fenton	798	Alan Judge
737	Penelope angell	768	Carol Glover	799	Bonnie Coleman
738	Janet button	769	Marissa Oliver	800	Raoul Heller
739	Mariola Lane	770	Penelope Hobbs	801	Katie Harford
740	Michael Chambers	771	AJ Barty	802	Mel
741	Anthony Kerr	772	Melissa O'Carroll	803	Sara Mikaloff- Fletcher
742	Robert Caballes	773	Odette Anscombe Smith	804	Erroll Jacobsen
743	Hannah	774	Louise Greco	805	Paul Harford
744	Thea Lavis	775	Jessica Staniland	806	5325338 - no ID
745	Kate Teddy	776	Deborah East	807	E Cook
746	Cristina van Dam	777	Georgina Geotina	808	A C
747	Joss Debreceny	778	Helen Hodgins	809	Kiran Prisk
748	Ronald lob	779	Jane Leak	810	Alex
749	kim Muollo	780	Lena Salayeva	811	Svend Hansen
750	Bridget Cassie	781	caroline beresford	812	Phillippa Harford
751	Isabel Sanjuan	782	Martin Gordon	813	Jon Chung
752	Jolyon	783	Elizabeth Yeaman	814	Steph
753	Kirsten Mason	784	Narmada n Morar	815	Leanne Mildenhall

816	Leontine Van Manen-Esdaile	846	Marijke	878	AJ
817	Rachel Solomon	847	Matt oconnor	879	Robyn Brown
818	Sherryl Murphy	848	Lee McCauley	880	Amy Gunn
819	5325534 - no ID	849	Brenda Costeloe	881	Nicole boardman
820	Rebecca Tresch	850	Kathryne Fielding	882	Joanne Warrington
821	Neil Mayo	851	Kate Mulligan	883	Lisa Moore
822	Rebekah Swan	852	Paul TOUHEY	884	Jillian Talbot
823	Patrick Wijngaarden	853	David	885	Ben Hand
824	Paul Jonson	854	Ryan Brooks	886	Keri Porter
825	georgina	855	Anil Srinivasa	887	Natasha Eagle
826	Pip king	856	Karla Fisher	888	Sharon Lokum
827	Sarah	857	Derek	889	Tracy Kent
828	Peter Wierenga	858	Philippa Henwood	890	Dan Main
829	Ilona Harvey	859	Rebecca	891	Asha Surrey
830	Penny	860	Andrew Wharton	892	Jen Brennan
831	Sarah McKenzie	861	Jared Smith	893	Sophie Legge
832	Nicki Thomson	862	France Aziz	894	Caitlin Burnett
833	Jono	863	Stacey Perrett	895	Kate Ashby
834	Nick Pallin	864	Maggie McQuillan	896	Amanda Hargreaves
835	Fiona	865	Leigh Henderson	897	Sarah
836	Simon Harper	866	Angus Hodgson	898	Lihn Blumsohn
837	Alex	867	Stacey Wood	899	Michael Hudson-Doyle
838	Dani	868	Anita Kelsey	900	Victoria Barton-Chapple
839	David	869	Niroshi Singh	901	Anna Bradbury
840	Shannon Holdeman	870	Louise Currier	902	Nichole Hodges
841	Peni	871	Amanda Picken	903	Sarah
842	Kelly McDonald	872	Dave	904	Michael Railton
843	Katie Beswick	873	Jason Locke	905	Chris Jerram
844	Susan Zivkovic	874	Dairne Poole	906	Izzi Lithgow
845	Emma Hudson-Doyle	875	Rose Culver	907	Richard Sanders
		876	Sam Collard		
		877	Amy Smith		

908	Fran Smith	938	Donna Drinkwater	970	Suzanne Clarke
909	Bronwen Kelly	939	Matthew Searle	971	Reimo Geerts
910	5326309 - no ID	940	Sarah Halpin	972	Melissa
911	Jodi Radford	941	Francois Mindiel	973	April Xu-Holland
912	Lynda Moore	942	Juliaa	974	Georgia Freeman
913	Wendy Castle	943	Jim Baltaxe	975	Ruth
914	Miriam	944	Fiona Johnson	976	5327101 - No ID
915	Marina Barber	945	James Hare	977	David Healey
916	Claire colvin	946	Heena Ravji	978	Natalie Muir
917	Emma	947	Michael O'Neil	979	Nishtha Saini
918	Elli Benseman	948	Nina Russell	980	Kim Kershaw
919	Bevin Linkhorn	949	Stephanie	981	Sarah McKenzie
920	George bettle	950	Leo cromie	982	Mayumi Harada
921	Caroline Dumas	951	Richard Cromie	983	Leonie Wilson
922	Steve	952	Rich Ford	984	Leonie Hunter-Smith
923	Andrew Cooke	953	Kat Davis	985	Janet Valentine
924	Matt Ropiha	954	Louise Rider	986	Fiona Jackson
925	David Strong	955	Caroline	987	Ella Kahu
926	Harris Mackenzie Boock	956	Jaimee	988	Wendy Galvin
927	Alethea	957	5326801 - no ID	989	Kirstin Collier Gibb
928	STEPHANIE	958	5326810 - no ID	990	Rachael
929	Olivia	959	Kasiano Mita	991	Guillermo
930	Michael Anthony Krause	960	Beth Houston	992	Bob Coyle
931	Tara McGibbon	961	Sheila Hart	993	Clare MacMurray
932	Lara	962	M Besier	994	Quentin Johnson
933	Aiden Connelly	963	cait	995	Silvia Mellen
934	Emma Osmond- Wilson	964	Anna williams	996	Sam Matthews
935	Anneliese White	965	Ellen Godber	997	Shona Riddell
936	Lauri Sharp	966	Gina	998	sally king
937	GARY MCALPINE	967	Deborah	999	Brandon Skilton
		968	emily kerry	1000	Serena Lim
		969	Nerissa Smith		

1001 Kathleen reece	1033 Ryan Nelson	1063 M
1002 Sarah Cull	Gray-McCoy	1064 Ellen
1003 Rodney Craig	1034 Matthew Yates	1065 Phil Valentine
1004 Olivia Walker	1035 5327586 - no ID	1066 Justin Webster
1005 Ellen Thomson	1036 Phoebe Webster	1067 Grace
1006 Anton Hart	1037 Joanna Colton	1068 Toni Jack
1007 Tarin Walker	1038 Rory Spray	1069 Sally Hume
1008 Sarah Day	1039 Ali Clareburt	1070 Sue Valentine
1009 Teresa McCloat	1040 Lisa de Gregorio	1071 Shelley Currier
1010 Tania	1041 Stuart Maxwell	1072 Tahnee Le Pine
1011 Tom Womack	1042 Sander Wissing	1073 Sarah-Jane Black
1012 Emma Bell	1043 Sabrina Grabow	1074 Dave
1013 Tristan Patterson	1044 Caitlin cherry	1075 Philippa Yasbek
1014 Amy Tarleton	1045 Dave Drane	1076 Amber parry strong
1015 Jess	1046 John Humphrey	1077 Robyn Locke
1016 Sue Barker	1047 E Horner	1078 Vivian Stephens
1017 Dave Clarke	1048 JULiana Radaich	1079 Thomas
1018 Tracey	1049 Paula	1080 Rosie
1019 Vicki Kennedy	1050 Deepa Gaur	1081 Gwen Thompson- Wellington
1020 Jazmine Ropner	1051 Sam Valentine	1082 Anita Brady
1021 Yvette Elliston	1052 SARAH BRITTAIn	1083 Vanessa Cole
1022 Shannon	1053 Theresa	1084 5327748 - no ID
1023 Bonnie Tonkin	1054 Barbara Janet Moses	1085 Jake silson
1024 Trish Wheeler	1055 Saskia Savea	1086 Lorraine Christie
1025 Charlotte	1056 5327646 - no ID	1087 Tom Greally
1026 Loren Stepkowski	1057 Simon Gow	1088 Georgia Bell
1027 Nat Woodhall	1058 Gemma Poke	1089 Vandy Jane Pollard
1028 Tony Stone	1059 Vicky Douglas	1090 Stefanie Johnston
1029 Ian Sindlen	1060 Stephanie Coulman	1091 trish Keeper
1030 Toby Sorensen	1061 Sally Jackson	1092 Mary-Jane Baxter
1031 Tracey Young	1062 Laura Gow	
1032 Brenda Harkin		

1093	Simon Jackson	1124	Storm Sommerville	1151	Tina Mcanulty
1094	Amanda Wells	1125	Ran Gilboa	1152	Sarah Fussell- Quarmby
1095	Chelsea young	1126	Chris Davey	1153	Raewin Tipene- Clarke
1096	Rewa	1127	Trish	1154	Maisie Hance
1097	Veronika Harrison	1128	Judith Roberts	1155	Evert Van den Berg
1098	Jade Musther	1129	Simon Hogg	1156	Melinda Atkinson
1099	Chris Lipscombe	1130	Sonia Calvert	1157	Lisa Whittle
1100	Amy Robertson	1131	Stephen Coppard	1158	Georgia
1101	Tim Prebble	1132	Richard Hawkes	1159	Shannon Wallace
1102	Catherine Graham	1133	Sarah Oldershaw	1160	David Parry
1103	Helen Mackay	1134	Janelle Harland	1161	Alex
1104	Scott Diamond	1135	Georgina Workman	1162	Stefan de Jong
1105	Sam Bowman	1136	Lindsay Phillips	1163	Ben Paterson
1106	C Lovell	1137	Susannah Berry Brown	1164	simon Holst
1107	Scott Willson	1138	Nicky Smith	1165	Sophie Leonard
1108	GREGORY BINNING	1139	Catherine Louise English	1166	Cathy McNab
1109	stefan Vluggen	1140	Isolde Van den Berg	1167	Michelle Smits
1110	Louise seaton	1141	Tyler Dunkel	1168	Janet Purdey
1111	Chris Whyte	1142	Tara Terry	1169	Kelvin McGill
1112	Magdalena Cooke	1143	Melanie Hinchsliffe	1170	John Moore
1113	Sam Sandbrook	1144	Mike Thompson	1171	Anna O'Hagan
1114	Morgan Hopkins	1145	Raewyn Humphries	1172	Michal
1115	Pamela Braddell	1146	Kylie Law	1173	H.L. Geldof
1116	Jeanette Lane	1147	Phil Loizou	1174	John Wilkinson
1117	Danielle paul	1148	NATCHA TEPARAGUL	1175	Tim Dorrian
1118	Cathie Teagur	1149	Tom	1176	Deborah M Geels
1119	5327949 - no ID	1150	Susan Scott	1177	Kate Wareham
1120	Megan Turner			1178	N Ford
1121	Jason Baker			1179	Beth
1122	Nick			1180	Ann Jacobs
1123	Dion				

1181 Deborah Titchener	1211 Liz morgan	1241 Madeline Ann Smith
1182 T.P.	1212 Barbara Murphy	1242 Sally Hill
1183 Wendy Marshall	1213 Olivia Worboys	1243 Rachel Hamilton-Williams
1184 Nick du Bern	1214 Rachel Howe	1244 Elaine
1185 P Edwards	1215 Karen	1245 Kevin Reynolds
1186 Kathryn Geddis-Marks	1216 Tanya Barrett	1246 Valda Scheckter
1187 Tammy Lemire	1217 Susan Gill	1247 Lottie Lynch
1188 Martin Glaeser	1218 Susan van Daatselaar	1248 James Brown
1189 Sam Halstead	1219 Sam Wilton	1249 Susanne Smith
1190 T Leitch	1220 Teresa Christianson	1250 Archie Pararasasingam
1191 Gabrielle M	1221 Vicki Poole	1251 Nicole
1192 5328668 - no ID	1222 Kate Allan	1252 RWG
1193 Lucy	1223 Nine	1253 Nicky Pitcher
1194 Sarah Jeffares	1224 Magdalena Lischka	1254 Baden Vertongen
1195 Tom Wild	1225 Rob gillies	1255 Clark Stiles
1196 Jodie Botica	1226 Rochelle Style	1256 John Millward
1197 Prue Isaacs	1227 Rhys Phillips	1257 Sharon Sa
1198 rob brown	1228 Maryse Arnell	1258 Sara Filoche
1199 Johanna	1229 Eryl Jones	1259 Steffen Sorensen
1200 Linda-Jane Richan	1230 Charlotte	1260 Nick Houston
1201 Sharon Bulmer	1231 Tyra Basilicata	1261 Susette Goldsmith
1202 5328775 - no ID	1232 Stephanie Preston	1262 Pam Robertson
1203 Will Duynhoven	1233 Jessie Gibbs	1263 Alastair Foster
1204 Tania Waugh	1234 venessa stables	1264 Graham Joe
1205 Jen Duff	1235 Sherylene Orsborn	1265 Rachael Reid
1206 Fi Becker	1236 5329364 - no ID	1266 Snehal Poojary
1207 Julie Piper	1237 Stephen Bates	1267 Karis galbraith-Smith
1208 5328815 - no ID	1238 Emma Sutich	1268 kate brazier
1209 Amy Zeilstra	1239 Pennie Little	1269 Rufus Brady
1210 Kayleigh Wang	1240 Steve Cochran	1270 Jeni Peacey

1271	Jo Matheson	1301	Megan Ferris	1331	Yuri Sakashita
1272	Steph Knight	1302	Anita	1332	Andrew Matthews
1273	Becky	1303	Evie Tucker	1333	Laurel Barr
1274	Natasha Archipow Mclean	1304	Joe Harbridge	1334	Sarah Lockley
1275	Marc Piercey	1305	Nicola rolfe	1335	Nici Gibbs
1276	Jennifer Nolan	1306	Fleur	1336	Taryn Penfold
1277	Jane Hazelton	1307	Anna Gandy	1337	Storm stanley
1278	Nicole Browuer	1308	Eleanor Smith	1338	Tracey Piper
1279	Shayna Hingston	1309	Tom Campbell	1339	Steve Barnett
1280	Helen Paul	1310	Jonathan Tiffen	1340	5331812 - no ID
1281	Christine Crampton	1311	Amanda king	1341	Emma
1282	Simon	1312	Hamish King	1342	Brian Lynch
1283	Lisa	1313	Katherine Littler	1343	Anne
1284	Justin Lane	1314	Robin Wilson- Davey	1344	Melissa Andrews
1285	Elaine Cook	1315	Rebecca Sore	1345	Myffanwy Williamson
1286	Daisy K	1316	Mrs K Durrant	1346	Ian Robertson
1287	Sharron Mihailoff	1317	Srinivasa Prasad Gazula	1347	Kate Blincoe
1288	PETER NICHOLAS SUPYK	1318	Wendy Kemp	1348	Sarah Neal
1289	Richard Herbert	1319	Jason Lang	1349	Colin Matcham
1290	Tessa Didsbury	1320	Marg Hawthorne	1350	Andrew Miller
1291	Rachel Hird	1321	Wesley Hutton	1351	Michele Irving
1292	Stephen Murrey	1322	Susanne Ames	1352	Laura greensmith
1293	Lisa Bragg	1323	Josh McLeod	1353	Conrad MacCormick
1294	Heidi Irion	1324	Margot Farrell	1354	Roger Shackelford
1295	Azeem Raziff	1325	Jonathan	1355	Melanie Parkin
1296	Sophie	1326	Beverley Thomson	1356	Martin Kaulback
1297	Elizabeth Millward	1327	Elese Tibbitts	1357	5332721 - no ID
1298	Juliet Sorensen	1328	5331445 - no ID	1358	Rachel Garner
1299	Gary Bradshaw	1329	Fiona	1359	Geoff Nicholls
1300	Nathan	1330	Julie Williams	1360	Alan

1361 Bronwen Shepherd	1392 Janine Hancock-Lamb	1422 Patrick King
1362 Andrea Skews	1393 Jennie Kerr	1423 Amanda
1363 Michele	1394 Andrew Crampton	1424 Paul Dalley
1364 Sarah Cromarty	1395 Victoria Ussher	1425 Euan Galloway
1365 Emily	1396 Michael Cameron Drawbridge	1426 Arshini
1366 Cathy	1397 Tracey Bridges	1427 Catharine Underwood
1367 Katherine Manson	1398 Natalie Bowie	1428 Nick Major
1368 Victoria Young	1399 Cheryl Spain	1429 Andrew Dinsdale
1369 Jill Hulmston	1400 Leah Fitzpatrick	1430 Anita
1370 Daan Kolthoff	1401 Grant Foothead	1431 Sam Chambers
1371 Jeremy Macey	1402 GD McDonald	1432 Nicholas Williamson
1372 Sue Gray	1403 david humble	1433 Liane Powell
1373 Jo PRESCOTT	1404 Tui McInnes	1434 Marianne Burt
1374 Frances	1405 Maddi	1435 Jane Knight
1375 Sonia	1406 Robyn Mary Gimblett	1436 Amanda Burgess
1376 Sian	1407 Bonita Cooper	1437 Elena Moretti
1377 Alice Handcock	1408 Carolyn Renata	1438 Helen Colebrook
1378 Jon Harris	1409 Stephanie Frame	1439 Cara
1379 Richard Pomstra	1410 Nicky Scott	1440 Margaret Crisp
1380 Marion Revelli	1411 Teresa Durham	1441 Ali Brown
1381 Andrew Hunt	1412 sarah	1442 Shannon Garland Duignan
1382 Hinrich Schaefer	1413 James Sullivan	1443 Mike Burrell
1383 Nicola Carvey	1414 Paul Sherris	1444 Rachel Allan
1384 Mary-Anne Borrowdale	1415 Jae Warrander	1445 Tim
1385 Alexia Cui	1416 Beth Cameron	1446 5338125 - no ID
1386 Megan richards	1417 Carla	1447 Geraldine Treacher
1387 5334512 - no ID	1418 Susan Raue	1448 Tracy Morley-Hall
1388 Kathrin Strati	1419 Kay Hodgetts	1449 Sophie Dawson
1389 Chris Lowrie	1420 Trent Witton	1450 Mary Brownlow
1390 Francesca Brice	1421 Susan Barrett	1451 Maia
1391 Merel Bats		

1452 Rebecca Bjarnesen	1481 Elizabeth Young	1511 sondra bacharach
1453 Monica Dunkley	1482 Richard Parry	1512 Ashleigh
1454 Tim Garvan	1483 Joanne	1513 Lauren Peatfield
1455 Eli	1484 aAnnette Flynn	1514 Seamus Kennedy
1456 Jacqueline Greening	1485 NA (ID: 5339585)	1515 Lauren Long
1457 Jane Duncan	1486 Christine Hyndman	1516 Claire Norris
1458 Tanya Ashken/Drawbridge	1487 Anna Butler	1517 Andrew Hutchinson
1459 isaac young	1488 Hannah Juchnowicz	1518 TANIA GRIEVE
1460 Felicity Gent	1489 Annaliese Wilson	1519 Steph boot
1461 Dhilum Nightingale	1490 Susan Iversen	1520 Elyana Ho-Ng
1462 Helen Salisbury	1491 Mckee	1521 Chris Clarke
1463 Anna Darling	1492 Elsje Marneweck	1522 Claire Janes
1464 Jason Aldous	1493 Matt Paterson	1523 Robert Cox
1465 Chet Leavai	1494 Catherine Sangster	1524 Steve Janes
1466 Lindy Jacomb	1495 Nicky	1525 Cilla Cairns
1467 Dan	1496 Gabe	1526 Steven Mooney
1468 Leanne Millward	1497 Deryn Hardie Boys	1527 Janine
1469 Rasma Vilkins	1498 C A Pratt	1528 Andrea Speir
1470 Stephanie Leatham	1499 Dacia Herbulock	1529 Chris Rosser
1471 Thomas Wills	1500 Amanda Holland	1530 Tony Scott
1472 Donna Williams	1501 Purnima Young	1531 Toni Ruawai
1473 Angela Rothwell	1502 June	1532 Rose Wilton
1474 John Burnet	1503 Abi laven	1533 Sue Esterman
1475 Rhys	1504 Heidi	1534 Vicky Reeve
1476 Paul Fraser	1505 Sarika	1535 Stephen May
1477 Yvonne Tippet	1506 Barry Burke	1536 David Anastasi
1478 Mark Peach	1507 Shelley Knox	1537 JJ
1479 Claire	1508 Vidhiya	1538 Sarah
1480 Sophie Yeoman	1509 Jithen Singh	1539 Lucy James
	1510 Marjory Embleton	1540 Michael Bruce thompson
		1541 Vicki Vertongen

1542	Danny Culling	1572	Margaret	1601	Ray Walker
1543	Maas Christoph Mollenhauer	1573	Hayden Sharpes	1602	Karen Baker
1544	Chrissie Drader	1574	Damion Ranger	1603	Susan Fullerton-Smith
1545	Terry Kelly	1575	Gary Scott	1604	Classified
1546	Jessi Morgan	1576	Emma Shields	1605	Catherine Skinner
1547	Tony Drawbridge	1577	Tamsin Royson	1606	Mary Wootton
1548	Thomas McGrath	1578	Alanna Forde	1607	Linda Gibson
1549	Peter Ramage	1579	Su Hucks	1608	Ellen Blake
1550	Caitlin Sinclair	1580	Hannah GREENWOLD	1609	Noriko Soga
1551	Sarah Christie	1581	Peter Ashby	1610	Rhia Williams
1552	Gary Collier	1582	Lynn C Cadenhead	1611	Sheila
1553	Anna Baines	1583	Bronwen Newton	1612	David and Caroline Thomas
1554	Bronwyn Barnard	1584	Ian Hammond	1613	Kirsty Smith
1555	Mark Henderwood	1585	jo bailey	1614	Aisling McCarthy
1556	Johanna kawana	1586	5342592 - no ID	1615	Jenny Moore
1557	Jane Patterson	1587	Isla	1616	Chris Wratt
1558	Justine Maddock	1588	Chris Molloy	1617	Logan Hull
1559	Paul Glover	1589	Sophia Kinane	1618	Navina Schulze
1560	K	1590	rowan Taylor	1619	Theodore
1561	Lisette Jacob	1591	Nicola Blake	1620	Samuel Major
1562	Katherine Nordmeyer	1592	Terri van Schooten	1621	Jacques Knudsen
1563	Maria Cross	1593	Kate Mathews	1622	Ted and Mary Hart (SR500150)
1564	Andrea McDonough	1594	Kylie	1623	Jane Moran
1565	Claire Macdonald	1595	Kate Roberts	1624	Sian Robertson
1566	Karen Martin-Bond	1596	Danielle	1625	K Ruch
1567	Alice Coppard	1597	Hayley Lampacher	1626	Catherine Dillon
1568	Robyn Lonergan	1598	Lisa walker	1627	Eleanor Carr
1569	Elloise Kidd	1599	beverley corin	1628	Leo Lonergan
1570	Millie lynskey	1600	Rachel Ann Steele	1629	Paula Mu
1571	Corinna Bennett			1630	Gavin Jolly

1631	Susan Belt	1663	David Hickey	1694	Eletra Turnbull
1632	Max Olijnyk	1664	Hannah Kim	1695	jan
1633	Amy	1665	Alison Abels	1696	5350340 - no ID
1634	Julie Yee	1666	Patrick Gerard	1697	Fiona
1635	Rosie	1667	Rex Nicholls	1698	Leighton Jones
1636	Jacob Pescini	1668	Patricia Gibbs	1699	Brenda Manchester
1637	Adele Broadbent	1669	J P CHUA	1700	Naomi
1638	Mary Raikes	1670	Katrina Watson	1701	M Newman
1639	Janine Mitchell	1671	Kate Berney	1702	Monica
1640	Natasha Naus	1672	Sue Kedgley	1703	Wessel Egas
1641	Nicole Howarth	1673	Rachael Herron	1704	Allan Smith
1642	Sally Mainland	1674	Dale Mitchell	1705	Paul Simpson
1643	Marion Wood	1675	Tanya Taylor	1706	Bonne Grut
1644	Richard Gale	1676	Alexandra Johnson	1707	Umair
1645	Megan Coffey	1677	Megan Browne	1708	Jodie
1646	Neil Cree	1678	Jo	1709	Kerry Sutherland
1647	Phil Edmonds	1679	Anna Collett	1710	Lydia Mishkin
1648	Margot Shepherd	1680	Glenn Horsfall	1711	Alexis Holden
1649	Tertuis Mostert	1681	Linda Fahey	1712	Merry
1650	Luke Troy	1682	Wade Reeve	1713	Thurl Hill
1651	Lexi	1683	Mark C	1714	Richard Jaine
1652	Claire Honeywill	1684	Briar Simpson	1715	Elliott Thornton
1653	Nicky Gardner	1685	Hollie Wright	1716	Matthew Plummer
1654	Jacqueline Miranda	1686	Rebecca Grace	1717	Mary McTavish
1655	Noel Miranda	1687	Gill	1718	Sarah Downs
1656	Deryn Scott	1688	Fiona Drummond	1719	Philippa Larkindale
1657	Pamela Lovis	1689	Gillian McCarthy	1720	James
1658	Duncan Shaw	1690	Sarah Nawalowalo	1721	M Waterman
1659	Samantha	1691	Sarah Fish	1722	Samantha Imogen Brown
1660	Brenden Crocker	1692	Emily	1723	Gareth Jardine
1661	Saera Chun	1693	Lauren		
1662	5348190 - no ID				

1724	Kelsey Kuhn	1754	Harriet Litten	1782	Rachel
1725	Bryce Golden-Chen	1755	Warwick Glendenning	1783	Karl Fritsch
1726	Gavin Kane	1756	Selwyn	1784	Karl Fritsch
1727	sam stanley	1757	Neroli Dempsey	1785	Lorraine Edwards
1728	Tanya Early	1758	Barbara Fill	1786	Andrea flynn
1729	Brendan Holland	1759	Siân Andrews-Warmuth	1787	Daphne Dashfield
1730	Rachael Fleming	1760	Kylee Davidson-Corrin	1788	Scott Laing
1731	Haydon Rodrick	1761	David Schnellenberg	1789	Ann-Marie Keating
1732	Rebecca Sim	1762	David O'Grady	1790	Phillip
1733	Benhi Dixon	1763	Marc	1791	Vanessa Chee
1734	Tim Wright	1764	Sheryl	1792	Ariel Bartlett
1735	Mary Legg	1765	Bruce Carey	1793	Darren Hay
1736	5352083 - no ID	1766	Deirdre O'Connor	1794	Julia
1737	Rach Barr	1767	Puppy	1795	Clio Reid
1738	June Gibbons	1768	5354097 - no ID	1796	Steve James
1739	Michael Dutton	1769	5354102 - no ID	1797	J P CHUA
1740	Jack Wedde	1770	mark unsworth	1798	Nick Brown
1741	5352360 - no ID	1771	Andrew Dickinson-Smith	1799	Claire
1742	Hayley Bilton	1772	Tim	1800	Ellen Margaret Patterson
1743	Nicole Peurifoy	1773	A Unsworth	1801	Briony Pentecost
1744	Jennie Sim	1774	Jennifer Ferguson	1802	Maree Cordell
1745	Grace Chan	1775	Janette Thompson	1803	Emily Pfeffer
1746	Diana	1776	S Talbot	1804	Sylvie Gentry
1747	Sookie - Karen Gibson	1777	Katrina Burns	1805	Jonathan Hogan
1748	Nikki Hurst	1778	Kelley Barrett	1806	Cheryl
1749	Patrick Sawyer	1779	Duncan Ferner	1807	Charlotte Hassed
1750	Nicola	1780	Eleanor Stewart	1808	Leigh-Anne Wiig
1751	Fiona Beals	1781	Em	1809	Kate Harvey-Green
1752	Andrea Toews			1810	Patricia Briscoe
1753	Madeleine matthews			1811	Rebecca Kearns

1812	Tracy	1843	Desiree Watson	1872	Amy Robinson
1813	Scott BARKER	1844	Astrid an Huef	1873	5364441 - No ID
1814	Joanna Merwood-Salisbury	1845	Meg Larken	1874	Merja Howman
1815	BJ Pike	1846	Sasha Calhoun	1875	Evan Harrison
1816	Jan Chilton	1847	James Sergeant	1876	Anita anderson
1817	Katie Cross	1848	Tania McKenzie Bellam	1877	Dee Hawken
1818	Helen McDonald	1849	Waveney Parkinson	1878	denise
1819	Warren Tocker	1850	Sean Arnold	1879	Peter Cenek
1820	Teresa Smart	1851	Kelly Cenek	1880	Sarah
1821	Marilyn Marsh	1852	Malcolm McKinnon	1881	Lindsay Sturt
1822	Nick	1853	Donna Leddy	1882	ANNE TUFFIN
1823	Simon Marsh	1854	Christopher Picking	1883	Susan Kliffen
1824	Francesca	1855	Owen Watson	1884	John Kliffen
1825	Karen Hann	1856	Vanessa Harrold	1885	Mladen Ivancic
1826	Liz	1857	Rachel Baskerville	1886	Jenny Hodder
1827	Kim Heron	1858	Nicola Shorten	1887	Iain Fraser
1828	Anne Donovan	1859	Jeremy Blake	1888	Lorraine Phillips
1829	Philip Tremewan	1860	David Stevens	1889	Soraya Cottin
1830	Matt	1861	Jo Groarke	1890	Bess Kuo
1831	Demetrius Christoforou	1862	Wendy Sulzberger	1891	Joanne Morgan
1832	Ngaire Smidt	1863	Cassie Sutherland	1892	Paul Rutherford
1833	Tina Hakaraia	1864	Dante Legend	1893	Jeff Richter
1834	Scott Dudley	1865	Petra Solia	1894	Matt Sisson
1835	Bharat Patel	1866	Demian Dixon	1895	Stephan Caldis
1836	Helen Wareham	1867	Megan Evans	1896	Peter Nichols
1837	Bjorn Sutherland	1868	Ryco Drawbridge	1897	Tamara Gonzalez Buenosvinos
1838	Elaine M	1869	ramon wilson	1898	Melissa Robson
1839	Gavin	1870	S Bakker	1899	Freda Walker
1840	Kay Ryan	1871	Candice	1900	Karyn Cosgrave
1841	Robin naylor			1901	Lynne Bickley
1842	Kat			1902	John Marsh
				1903	Mark Farrar

1904	Joan McCarthy	1933	Samantha Barrass	1963	Barbara Allen
1905	Don MacKay			1964	Paul Nelson
1906	Paul Grover	1934	Kay Boot	1965	Angela Moroney
1907	Carol Blatch	1935	Anna Duncan	1966	Emma Aiken
1908	Matthew John Nichols	1936	Bonnie	1967	MICHAEL Bennet
1909	Anke Atkins	1937	Kimberley Stickney	1968	Maura Beattie
1910	Virginia Barton-Chapple	1938	Hanne Jøstensen	1969	Debbie santos
1911	Grace	1939	Keith Flinders	1970	Khrystyne
1912	Jenny Morel	1940	Dave	1971	Peter Cullen
1913	Everard Aspell	1941	Kate Rockpool	1972	Margaret Logan
1914	Anne Martin	1942	Duncan McDonald	1973	Sophie
1915	James Burke	1943	Victoria Anderson	1974	David Dobson
1916	Helen Foot	1944	Shaun Kelly	1975	Sue Abraham
1917	Tina Hepworth	1945	Hilary Eats	1976	Julie Williamson
1918	Molli Gibbs-Harris	1946	Samantha Jones	1977	Judy Hamer
1919	Lorraine Christie	1947	Alan Bollard	1978	Felicity Wong
1920	Eleanor Prendergast	1948	Cliff Pratt	1979	A Withers
1921	Frank Pearson	1949	Raewyn Tse	1980	Sandra Young
1922	Susan M Clarke	1950	Steve Dunn	1981	Rachel Wyatt
1923	Sue Delahunt	1951	kathryn walls	1982	Elizabeth Thomas
1924	Steve	1952	Peter Walls	1983	Jono
1925	Maria MacKay	1953	Richard	1984	Karyn Pulley
1926	Pauline Mitchell	1954	Deborah Cutfield	1985	Rachael Bell
1927	Diane Mackle	1955	Lynda Graham	1986	Ross Barr
1928	Gareth Smith	1956	Scott Farmer	1987	Donald Poirier
1929	Mary Elizabeth Young	1957	Richard Eats	1988	Patricia Fraser
1930	Linda Cowley	1958	Michael Miller	1989	Christine Hosking
1931	Elspeth White	1959	Suzie Bognar	1990	Natalie Lloyd
1932	Andrew Butler	1960	Nicola Jones	1991	Kerrin Allott
		1961	Andrew Meehan ONZM	1992	Hamish Hill
		1962	Jackie Pope	1993	Penelope Anne Griffith
				1994	Katy Lethbridge

1995	Andrew Mellanby	2026	Marius Bornman	2058	Ashleigh Smith
1996	Jay Nielson	2027	U Egan	2059	Kevin Kelly
1997	Meighan Ragg	2028	Rory O'Logan	2060	Philippa van Bunnik
1998	Nick Rinehart	2029	Nick	2061	Christoph Gerds
1999	Ian Patience	2030	Maria Cotter	2062	Margot Dow
2000	SL	2031	Sal	2063	Angela Wooford
2001	Michael McCormack	2032		2064	Ellen Irwin
2002	Jenny	2033	Stephanie Skinner	2065	Rupert Johnson
2003	Caitlin	2034	Peter James Horo	2066	Penny Wyatt
2004	Alejandra Mercado	2035	Claire Goodlet	2067	John Callinan
2005	Natasha	2036	Jessica Matcham	2068	Gavin Griffith-Jones
2006	D Spargo	2037	Tessanna	2069	Rhea Fitzpatrick
2007	Hayley Adams	2038	Ben Koloto	2070	Melissa
2008	Lindsey Birnie	2039	Nevin McLeod	2071	Stuart Smith
2009		2040		2072	Fiona McDiarmid
2010	Rose Dryland	2041	Russell Silverwood	2073	Mary
2011	Tomas Borsje	2042	Sankalp Bansal	2074	Jane Turner
2012	Simon Sharpe	2043	Thomas Dwan	2075	Miriam Moore
2013	B & G Levick	2044	Alison Borbely	2076	5371780 - no ID
2014	Robin Halse	2045	Penny Krieg	2077	Paris
2015	Asha Fernandez	2046	Anthony Webb	2078	Jessica Aiken
2016	Linda	2047	Martin Dyer	2079	Gary Beecroft
2017	Joe Lenihan	2048	Lydia Hayward	2080	Sonia Clark
2018	Devin Prouty	2049	Owen West	2081	Zen Yates-Fill
2019	Jessica Ellison	2050	Tim Ramsden	2082	Kerry Shaw
2020	Pip Climo	2051	Tom Mayo	2083	Mary Cull
2021	Melissa Davey	2052	Nicholas Parker	2084	Karen Janssen-Bould
2022	Nikki Mann	2053	Abi chilcott	2085	Julie Mudge
2023	Annie Yeates	2054	Myfanwy Hill	2086	Peter Holman
2024	Janine Hyde	2055	ben	2087	Sam Donald
2025	Philip Cleaver	2056	Jackie Ellis		
		2057	Jo Ledington		

2088	Steve Glassey	2120	Laurie Powell
2089	Sara Gardner	2121	Grant Brown
2090	Graham Holmes	2122	Virginia Carpenter
2091	Michael Clark	2123	Fakiki Repoama
2092	Hanako Yoshida	2124	Cristina van Dam
2093	Judie Alison	2125	Phil Greville
2094	Julia Quickenden	2126	Nicole Robertson
2095	Rhonda Findlay	2127	Bruce Patterson
2096	Craig McKendry	2128	Tony Cooke
2097	J Miller	2129	Phillipa Bascand
2098	Myfanwy Hill	2130	Montgomery
2099	Caroline Speight	Harte	
2100	Mikayla Hopkins	2131	Arnja Dale
2101	marie watson	2132	Carol West
2102	Jan Voss	2133	Fiona Drummond
2103	Claire Bibby	2134	Caroline Wahid
2104	Jan Voss	2135	Kate Littin
2105	Emily Macdonald	2136	Susan Keall
2106	Helen Challands	2137	Alina Manko
2107	Hamish Conway	2138	Louisa Picker
2108	Joan McCarthy	2139	Pamela Cureen
2109	Sherilyn Evans	2140	John Howell
2110	HH	2141	Jonathan
2111	Ruth Sligo	Anderson	
2112	Tracey Mauchlen	2142	Amanda Campbell
2113	Phil Krieg	2143	David Chickering
2114	K Evans	2144	Belinda Hodson
2115	Claudia Boyles	2145	Stephanie Curran
2116	Anna Wallace	2146	Helen McLean
2117	David Harkness		
2118	Lisa Snow		
2119	Ari Ray Podmore		

Cats

1	Susannah Donovan	32	Rhys Hurley
2	Jenny Jebson	33	Helen Davey
3	Emily Davidow	34	David Morris
4	Peppa	35	Emma Wright
5	Ange	36	Amanda
6	Faye Goggin	37	Lauree Rickard
7	Margaret	38	Amy
8	Lydia Talbot	39	Sarah
9	Rhys	40	SL
10	Emma	41	Justine
11	Gabrielle Redmond	42	Melanie McKeown
12	Daniel	43	Kornelia
13	Alicia	44	Natasha
14	Mark	45	Dan
15	Chris	46	Antonio Cacciamani
16	Fred Albert	47	Rachael cook
17	Wren Glover	48	Ali
18	Michele McGaughran	49	
19	Dana	50	Rachel Hansen
20	Hayley Rose	51	Ruth Harper
21	Anne	52	J Iles
22	L Tong	53	
23	Verity Schommer	54	Thomas Kay
24	Helen	55	Claire Walker
25	Carlie Uivel	56	Chris Stevenson
26	Charlotte	57	Greer Mathers
27	David Scott	58	Briony Ellis
28	Jon Iyall	59	Fiona Mathers
29		60	Rachel Dawson
30	Karl Yager	61	alex
31	Alex Vakhrousheva	62	Marta Zanetti
		63	Kirill

64		97	
65	Melanie Vivian	98	Dan gyles
66	Maurice Horner	99	Raquel Gunman
67	Susie	100	Sarah
68	Chris	101	Beth
69	Arlene McMorran	102	Sophie Mormede
70	Cathy Scott	103	Thomas Guldberg
71	Craig Forbes	104	Zahra Hosseinzadeh
72	Adam G	105	Emma Kerr-Laurie
73	Bernadette Staal	106	Emily Willard
74	Lucy	107	Lorraine
75	Lorraine Chin	108	Bella Nolan
76	AnneMarie Curtis	109	
77	Kat Grayston	110	Mara Wilson
78	Monique Tuifao-Jenkinson	111	Charlotte
79	Simmonne	112	Stuart
80	Alistair	113	Andrew
81	Terry	114	Meegan Walker
82	Rachel Swift	115	Susan Pryor
83	Andrea	116	Ceedee Doyle
84	Rachel Allan	117	Ness Simons
85	Ellie	118	Anna Anderton-Lum
86	Glenn Wilson	119	Angela Evans-Morgan
87	Nicole Stanton	120	Adrian Brown
88	Rachel	121	Stewart Alderson
89	Khoi	122	Iiz Arko
90	Brooke	123	
91	Claire Regnault	124	Annabel Acland
92	Debbie Bidlake	125	Casey Batchelor
93	Michael Pringle	126	Rebecca Jackson
94	Christine Dee	127	Diana Noyce
95	Megan Burnett	128	Steve
96	Mat	129	Belinda Hussey

130	David Phipps	163	elsie diderichsen
131	Andrea Brown	164	Greer Nehoff
132	Michael Gray	165	Tim Ng
133	Deb Jones	166	Michael Green
134	Amanda Beauchamp	167	Dion Peat
135	Lee Rowland	168	Jane O'Shea
136	Chloe	169	Gina Thurman
137	Lynette Thomson	170	Peter Deefholts
138	Rissa Williams	171	Jack
139	moana	172	Jane Clunies-ross
140	Benny Jennings	173	Pam Francombe
141	Anne Dowden	174	Dana Cameron
142	Crystal Payne	175	Georgie
143	Dijon O'Kelly	176	Karli
144	Elle	177	Domino Lee
145	Chris Daly	178	
146	Andrew Baker	179	Jane-Marie Kerslake
147	Morgan Parker	180	Kris O'Brien
148	Alan Bailey	181	Leanne Bowden
149	Susan	182	Harriet Neely
150	Brigid Jenkins	183	Renee Louise (Louise) Pieterse
151	David Dougherty	184	Mairead de Roiste
152	Susan Elliot	185	Matthew Puttock
153	Everett Toews	186	Kyla Vaughan
154	Y Lee	187	Mahana
155	Alice Twitchell	188	H Gilbert
156	Eleanor Ainsworth	189	Michael Christoffel
157	Andrea Toews	190	Neil Dixon
158	Angelique Stanton	191	Kate
159	Dave Watson	192	Michele Morris
160	Erin Henderson	193	Libby Carson
161	Emma Parker	194	Alister
162	Erin Brown	195	Katharine Miller

196	Richard Thwaites	229	
197	Claire Jensen	230	Mark Fahy
198		231	Barbara Eagle
199	Dee	232	Linda Glogau
200	Martin Lewington	233	Elizabeth Ward
201	C Heather Fussell	234	Ben Kelly
202	Harley	235	Madeleine Drew
203	Kirsten	236	Isabel Sanjuan
204	Katie wheeler	237	Cristina van Dam
205	Louisa Rimmer	238	Peter Stevens
206	Lindsay	239	
207	Liz Lander	240	Marissa Oliver
208		241	Melissa O'Carroll
209	Dawnus	242	Joe Kearns
210	Derek R Lander	243	E Cook
211	Gwyneth Wills	244	Sarah Newman
212	Bruce Manners	245	Deborah East
213	Nicole van der Laak	246	Katie Benson
214	Nick willard	247	Kate Whitley
215	Paloma Bruce	248	Kate
216	Gillian Warren	249	Diane Kenwright
217	Suzanne	250	Erroll Jacobsen
218	Karen Hollis	251	Sara Mikaloff-Fletcher
219	Maria Loeb	252	Svend Hansen
220	Alastair Stewart	253	Rachel Solomon
221	Terence Davidson	254	
222	Ewan Delany	255	georgina
223		256	Nick Pallin
224		257	Dani
225	AnnieN	258	Katie Beswick
226	Kathleen Skudder	259	Lee McCauley
227	Nicole Skews-Poole	260	Paul TOUHEY
228	Nicola Macer	261	Philippa zhenwood

262	Andrew Wharton	295	Anton Hart
263	Leigh Henderson	296	Tania
264	Claire	297	Sarah Day
265	Vanessa	298	Jazmine Ropner
266	Robyn Brown	299	Bonnie Tonkin
267	Dan Main	300	Joanna Colton
268	Caitlin Burnett	301	
269	Sophie Legge	302	Trish Wheeler
270	Tracy Pattle	303	Tracey Young
271	Michael Hudson-Doyle	304	Kent Barber
272	Michael Railton	305	Stephanie Coulman
273	Diane Shaw	306	M
274	Michelle Botterill	307	Philippa Yasbek
275	Alethea	308	Vivian Stephens
276	Sharon Lokum	309	Simon Jackson
277	Anneliese White	310	Tim
278	Francois Mindiel	311	Pamela Braddell
279	AJ	312	Jeremy McMinn
280	Fiona Barr	313	Sarah Oldershaw
281		314	Georgina Workman
282	Fiona	315	Susannah Berry Brown
283	Faith Roberts	316	Samuel Marment
284	Nina russell	317	Sarah Fussell-Quarmby
285	Reimo Geerts	318	Lisa Whittle
286	Natalie Muir	319	Shannon Wallace
287	Leonie Hunter-Smith	320	EvertVan dn Berg
288	Janet Valentine	321	Cathy McNab
289	Bob	322	Kelvin McGill
290	Sean Hedley Rāhui	323	
291	Sally Beccard	324	Sheila Hart
292	sally king	325	Richard Herbert
293	Kathleen reece	326	Ann Jacobs
294	Brandon Skilton	327	Wendy Marshall

328	Nick du Bern	361	Michele
329	Steven	362	Victoria Young
330	t leitch	363	Jeremy Macey
331	Jodie Botica	364	Sue Gray
332	Tom wild	365	Jo PRESCOTT
333	rob brown	366	Nigel Woolf
334	Sharon Bulmer	367	Richard Pomstra
335	Graham	368	Nicola Carvey
336	Olivia Worboys	369	Mary-Anne Borrowdale
337	Susan van Daatselaar	370	Andrew Hunt
338	Teresa Christianson	371	Francesca Brice
339	Elizabeth	372	Andrew Crampton
340	venessa stables	373	Elodie
341		374	Bonita Cooper
342	Stephen Bates	375	James Sullivan
343	Archie Pararasasingam	376	Catharine Underwood
344	Nicole	377	Andrew Dinsdale
345	Pam Robertson	378	Jane
346	Alastair Foster	379	Marianne Burt
347	Rachael Reid	380	Amanda Burgess
348	Shayna Hingston	381	Tim
349	Lisa Bragg	382	russell Obee
350	Gary Bradshaw	383	Mary Brownlow
351	Joanna Newman	384	Val
352	Katherine Littler	385	Maree Spence
353	Wesley Hutton	386	Karen McCarthy
354	Jonathan	387	Ella Culver
355	Emma	388	Stephanie Leatham
356	Ian Robertson	389	Thomas Wills
357	Laura greensmith	390	Angela Rothwell
358	Melanie Parkin	391	Donna Williams
359	Rachel Garner	392	Catherine Graham
360	Bronwen Shepherd	393	Paul Fraser

394	Sophie Yeoman	427	Lynn C Cadenhead
395	Richard Parry	428	M J Frew
396	Ash McCrone	429	jo bailey
397	Geraldine Treacher	430	Isla
398	Elsje Marneweck	431	Kylie
399	Matt Paterson	432	Danielle
400	Nicky	433	Karen Baker
401	abi laven	434	Ellen Blake
402	Jean	435	Rhia Williams
403	Barry burke	436	William Braddell
404	sondra bacharach	437	Kirsty Smith
405	F Cash	438	Jacques Knudsen
406	Katrina Fowler	439	Eleanor Carr
407	Fernah	440	Janine Mitchell
408	Yes desexing should be mandatory.	441	Natasha Naus
409	Radford Hurn	442	Megan Coffey
410	john mccarten	443	Jan Macandrew
411	Claire Janes	444	Jane Craven
412	Amber	445	Saera Chun
413	Patty Zais	446	Lynne White
414	Sue Esterman	447	Katrina Watson
415	JJ	448	Jo
416	Jessi Morgan	449	Linda Fahey
417	Richard Braddell	450	Hollie Wright
418		451	Sarah Fish
419	K	452	Tim Priest
420	Katherine Nordmeyer	453	Rhonda Findlay
421	Karen Martin-Bond	454	Anna Grant
422	Amber Sweet	455	M Newman
423	Corinna Bennett	456	Wessel Egas
424	Margo	457	Monica
425	Gary Scott	458	Bonne Grut
426	Hannah GREENWOLD	459	

460	Des Smith	493	Sue
461	James	494	ANNE TUFFIN
462	Samantha Imogen Brown	495	susan.kliffen@gmail.com
463	Gareth Jardine	496	John Gregson
464	Gavin Kane	497	Sean Broadley
465	sam stanley	498	
466	Brendan Holland	499	Kay Boot
467	Rachael Fleming	500	Anna Duncan
468	Rebecca Sim	501	Mary Carlisle
469	Mary Legg	502	Shaun Kelly
470	Michael Dutton	503	Toby Donald
471		504	Rachael Bell
472	Nicole Peurifoy	505	Fumi Norman
473	Patrick Sawyer	506	Patricia Fraser
474	Nicola	507	Natalie Raquel Lloyd
475	Ruth James	508	Meighan Ragg
476	Julie Mathieson	509	Andrew Mellanby
477	Amanda Smith	510	Jay Nielson
478	Daphne Dashfield	511	Jenny
479	Scott Laing	512	SL
480	Phillip	513	Caitlin
481	Clio Reid	514	Elizabeth Underhill
482	e	515	D Spargo
483	Sherene Carpenter	516	Marisha Koh
484	Cheryl	517	Daphne Carvalho
485	Shaun McMaster	518	Tyrie Kelly
486	Francesca	519	Natalie Lewis
487	Liz	520	Sarah Scott
488	Demetrius Christoforou	521	Tracey
489	Gavin	522	Tamara Gonzalez
490	Astrid an Huef	523	Yvonne Weeber
491	Julia FitzGerald	524	Doreen
492	Demian Dixon	525	Devin prouty

526	Carley Ferris	557	Philippa van Bunnik
527	Jay Kenyon	558	Jessica Matcham
528	Waylon Kenning	559	Sarah Herbert
529	Tamara Strong	560	Elizabeth Antoun
530	Jordan	561	Helen McLean
531	Ria PARISH	562	Rhea Fitzpatrick
532	Graham Witts	563	Paris
533	Helen	564	David Scott
534	Michael McCormack	565	Steve Glassey
535	Tara Superstarr	566	Judie Alison
536	Maria Cotter	567	Gerry Macridis
537		568	J Miller
538	Tessanna Imrie	569	Julia Quickenden
539	Rochelle Dalziel	570	Myfanwy Hill
540	Russell Silverwood	571	Caroline Speight
541	Nevin McLeod	572	Mikayla Hopkins
542		573	Claire Bibby
543	Thomas Dwan	574	Emily MacDonald
544	Kok Hong Wan	575	K Evans
545	Alison Borbely	576	tracey mauchlen
546	Penny Krieg	577	Phil Krieg
547	Owen West	578	Sally Cory
548	Lydia Hayward	579	Ellen Irwin
549	Tom Mayo	580	eli foley
550	Stephanie Zhang	581	Angela Wooford
551	Myfanwy Hill	582	Ari Ray Podmore
552	Michael Fairhurst	583	Disee Anorpong
553	ben	584	Montgomery Harte
554	Robin Hodge	585	Arnja Dale
555	David Lloyd	586	Susan Keall
556	Jo Ledington	587	Amanda Campbell

Other animals

1

Jenny Jebson

2 Lydia Talbot

3 Emma

4 Wren Glover

5 Fred Albert

6 Anne

7 L Tong

8 Verity Schommer

9 Carlie Uivel

10 Charlotte

11 Dana

12 Karl Yager

13 Paul Surrey

14 Lauree Rickard

15 Justine

16 Natasha

17 Rachel Hansen

18 Marta Zanetti

19 Rachel Dawson

20 Cathy Scott

21 Lorraine Chin

22 Kat Grayston

23 Terry

24 Ellie abernathy

25 Christine Dee

26

27 Raquel Gunman

28 Emma Kerr-Laurie

29 Andrew

30 Angela Evans-Morgan

31 Leia Alannah Herbert

32 Casey Batchelor

33 Annabelle Batchelor

34 Belinda Hussey

35 Chloe

36 Amanda Beauchamp

37 Deb Jones

38 Benny jennings

39 crystalpayne@hotmail.co.nz

40 Chris Daly

41 David Dougherty

42 Annette Colls

43 Erin Henderson

44 Tim Ng

45 Ben

46 Dana Cameron

47 Jacqui Lane

48 Kat Whitney

49 Harriet Neely

50 Mahana

51 Helen Gilbert

52 Neil Dixon

53 Michele Morris

54 Claire Jensen

55 Kate ogilvie

56 Harley

57 Kirsten

58 Louisa Rimmer

59 Nicole van der Laak

60 ANN TOD

61 Paloma Bruce

62 Maria Loeb

63		96	baz
64		97	georgina workman
65	Sarah Nightingale	98	Sarah Fussell-Quarmby
66	AnnieN	99	Evert Van den Berg
67	Barbara Eagle	100	Cathy McNab
68	Linda Glogau	101	Sharon Bulmer
69	Kim Heron	102	Olivia Worboys
70	Cristina van Dam	103	Julia Porter
71	Katie Benson	104	Susan van Daatselaar
72	Kate	105	venessa stables
73	Diane Kenwright	106	Stephen Bates
74	Svend Hansen	107	Jayne Krisjanous
75	Michaela Manley	108	Archie Pararasasingam
76	georgina	109	Jennifer Nolan
77	Lee McCauley	110	Shayna Hingston
78	Paul TOUHEY	111	Wesley Hutton
79	Ratepayer	112	Emma
80	Michael Hudson-Doyle	113	Michele
81	Michael Railton	114	Jeremy Macey
82	Steve	115	Sue Gray
83	Alethea	116	Nicola Carvey
84	Francois Mindiel	117	Andrew Crampton
85	Fiona Barr	118	Nicholas Williamson
86	Fiona Campbell	119	Marianne Burt
87	Faith Roberts	120	russell obee
88	Reimo Geerts	121	Mary Brownlow
89	Natalie Muir	122	Florence Cook
90	Leonie Wilson	123	Lindy Jacomb
91	Jazmine Ropner	124	Catherine Graham
92	Stephanie Coulman	125	Nicky
93	Vivian Stephens	126	Sue Esterman
94	Lucy Jorgensen	127	JJ
95	baz	128	Maas Christoph Mollenhauer

129	Katherine Nordmeyer	153	Tessanna Imrie
130	Hayden Sharpes	154	russell silverwood
131	Ellen Blake	155	Alison Borbely
132	Aisling McCarthy	156	Penny Krieg
133	Bill Viggers	157	Tom Mayo
134	Saera Chun	158	Myfanwy Hill
135	Kirsty Ferguson	159	Elodie Urlacher
136	Samantha Imogen Brown	160	Helen McLean
137	Gareth Jardine	161	Rhea Fitzpatrick
138	Nicole Peurifoy	162	Paris
139	Nicola	163	Julia Quickenden
140	Clio Reid	164	Marie Watson
141	Owen Watson	165	Myfanwy Hill
142	Sue	166	Caroline Speight
143	Bob	167	Mikayla Hopkins
144	Sean Broadley	168	J Miller
145	Kay Boot	169	Claire Bibby
146	Anna Duncan	170	Karin Kos
147	Jay Nielson	171	Angela Wooford
148	Andrew Mellanby	172	Ari Ray Podmore
149	D Spargo	173	Arnja Dale
150	Devin Prouty	174	Natasha Abram
151	Jay kenyon	175	Amanda Campbell
152	John Burnet		