Appendix 2: Animals Bylaw 2020 – summary of engagement feedback

Pre-engagement feedback	Officer response
Management of cats	
The SPCA and Companion Animals New Zealand (CANZ) provided feedback on the management of cats: The SPCA supports stronger cat management provisions, including mandatory desexing and microchipping by four months of age, registered microchips, reasonable limits on cat numbers, and criteria for approving any exemptions. It also supports measures to keep cats at home, improve monitoring of cat-related nuisance complaints, and promote responsible cat ownership through education and practical support. Companion Animals NZ (CANZ) - Feedback received identified a number of matters for consideration in relation to cat management within the district. The feedback highlighted concerns regarding cat population levels in New Zealand, including the interaction between companion, stray, and feral cats, and noted that free-roaming, non-desexed owned cats may contribute to unwanted litters. It recommended that Council consider the introduction of mandatory microchipping and registration, together with early desexing requirements, subject to appropriate exemptions for registered breeders and cats where desexing is not suitable for health reasons.	Regarding feral or stray cats, clause 7 of the Current Bylaw has provisions relating to the management of nuisances created by such animals. The Current Bylaw also notes that the Council will work proactively with the SPCA and other animal rescue organisations when dealing with stray or feral cats. The support for the limit on cats per dwelling in the Current Bylaw is noted. It is also noted that there is provision in the Current Bylaw (clause 8.3) to require such cat management approaches including desexing, as a condition of approval for a dwelling to have more than the allowed number of cats. Introducing more stringent cat management regulations including mandatory desexing, microchipping, registration and measures to keep cats at home would have wider levels of service, resource and budget considerations. This matter was considered during the previous bylaw review and not pursued by the Council. Officers advise that if these types of management and regulation tools were to be proposed, additional resource and budget considerations would be required for regulation, monitoring and enforcement of what would be an increase to the level of service

Pre-engagement feedback	Officer response
The feedback also expressed support for the current three-cat household limit and existing breeder requirements, and encouraged consideration of measures that support cats remaining closer to home to improve animal welfare outcomes and reduce impacts on wildlife and disease transmission.	for the management of cats in the district. Therefore, these matters are not recommended to be considered further within this review. Further, as a result, no changes to the Animals Bylaw 2020 have been proposed in relation to the management of cats at this time. If Council determined that it would like to further investigate options for an increase in cat management regulations, officers recommend that, subject to Council resolution, that this should be assessed and any budget or resource requirements to conduct and complete the review could be considered for inclusion into the Long-Term Plan 2027-2037. Officers intend to engage further with the SPCA and CANZ to review the information the Council provides in relation to the promotion of responsible cat ownership.
Animal welfare	
The SPCA provided feedback on the welfare of animals – the SPCA support bylaw provisions that promote appropriate husbandry and welfare standards for animals considered stock. This includes requirements for adequate space, shelter, shade, companionship, and suitable living conditions, as well as a prohibition on permanent tethering of livestock. They also support species-appropriate shelter and bedding requirements, and housing standards for pigs that align with relevant welfare codes, including sufficient space, ventilation,	The purpose of the Animals Bylaw 2020 is to control the keeping of animals within the district to ensure they do not create a nuisance or endanger health to neighbours and other members of the public, and to regulate the slaughtering of animals to avoid causing nuisance or offence. As such, though considered very important, animal welfare is outside of the scope of the Current Bylaw. Animal welfare is legislated by the Animal Welfare Act 1999 and the relevant Codes of Welfare. The Act is enforced by the Ministry of Primary Industries and the SPCA, with the Police in a

Pre-engagement feedback	Officer response
nesting material, and separate areas for resting, eating, and toileting.	supporting role. Council officers currently direct animal welfare matters to the SPCA/MPI and work closely with them as and when required. Any change to the Council's current regulatory approach in relation to animal welfare would require further assessment to confirm the Council's role in respect of the legislation and the other parties empowered to enforce animal welfare, as well as an assessment of the budget and resource requirements to provide animal welfare regulation. Officers intend to engage further with the SPCA to review the information the Council provides in relation to the welfare of animals.
Beekeeping	
Feedback was received from the Taranaki Beekeepers Club and New Zealand Beekeeping Incorporated on the beekeeping requirements in the Current Bylaw. The Taranaki Beekeepers Club was particularly interested in clause 11 of the Current Bylaw. They considered that they were satisfied with the Current Bylaw and could not identify any immediate concerns or matters requiring change at this time. They did request that should the drafting process result in any proposed changes that the club be notified and included in further consultation.	The proposed amendments to the Animals Bylaw 2020 are as a result of the feedback received from NZ Beekeeping Inc. The amendments to the beehive reference and the change to the Code of Conduct have been directly incorporated into the Animals Bylaw 2020. The change to the wording of 11.3 and the suggested removal of 11.3b) were further reviewed and discussed with NZ Beekeeping Inc.

Pre-engagement feedback	Officer response
New Zealand Beekeeping Incorporated (NZ Beekeeping Inc) provided feedback on several parts of the Current Bylaw under clause 11. NZ Beekeeping Inc suggested adding the following wording (shown as underlined text) to clause 11.3: '*If, in the opinion of the Council, bees cause a nuisance to or may be dangerous or injurious to the health of any person, the Council may issue direction to the beekeeper or the landowner.*' NZ Beekeeping Inc also suggested removing clause 11.3b) as they considered it to be too prescriptive and that it risked preventing a business owner (beekeeper or farmer/landowner) from utilising their property as intended. NZ Beekeeping Inc also stated that the recommended change would leave room to negotiate an outcome that would be acceptable to the landowner and neighbours while allowing the Council the ability to direct if all other negotiations fail. They also considered that the proposed change would cover the requirement to abate the nuisance without pre-determining what the nuisance might be. NZ Beekeeping Inc identified that the Code of Conduct in 11.3b) i) had been updated to the New Zealand Honeybee Care Code™. NZ Beekeeping Inc also suggested amending the term 'hives' and replacing it with 'beehives' to ensure consistency with the	Officers noted that clause 11.3a) had been useful to resolve several nuisances with the assistance of an experienced beekeeper without the need to formally invoke clause 11.3b). Officers considered that it was beneficial to retain the detail of 11.3b) while amending the wording of 11.3b) to remove the prescriptive nature of the clause and clarify that the mitigation measures listed are examples of what the Council could require and not an exhaustive list. NZ Beekeeping Inc considered that the changes proposed by officers aligned with their feedback and they were happy to accept the proposed changes from officers as included in the updated Animals Bylaw 2020. Officers do not propose any updates to clause 11.6 in relation to the suggestion from NZ Beekeeping Inc to change the beehive density. Over the last five years, very few complaints received have been directly related to the number of hives on a property. Of the complaints that have been received, most were in breach of the bylaw with larger hive numbers then permitted by clause 11.6, or where located in the rural area which has no maximum number of hives (clause 11.7 of the bylaw). Two complaints were received with hive density not in breach of clause 11.6. While the mitigation measures for both of the complaints included reducing the number of hives along with other site-specific measures to address nuisances, there is unclear documentation regarding urban section size and number of

Pre-engagement feedback	Officer response
Biosecurity (National American Foulbrood Pest Management Plan) Order 1998 which is also referenced in clause 11.5. NZ Beekeeping Inc also considered that the hive density based on section size in clause 11.6 does not account for factors contributing to bee behaviour. They think that the proposed limits are at the upper end of desirability and that given some hobbyist beekeepers may have limited experience in managing potential nuisances, they recommend that the number of beehives on an urban section be no greater than 4 to 5 and larger sections (e.g. orchards) at the discretion of the Council in consultation with the beekeeper. NZ Beekeeping Inc stated that the changes would allow for the enjoyment of the hobby while minimising the impact on neighbours in an urban environment.	hives. The low number of complaints also suggests that generally, the urban hive density rules are working. Nuisances in relation to beehives have been addressed in negotiation with the beekeeper, regularly guided by expert advice under clause 11.3a) and have included measures like relocating beehives on a property to mitigate any nuisance. Given the low level of issues relating to the number of hives in urban areas and the positive engagement of expert advice in determining solutions to address the nuisances, officers do not consider there is justification for change to the density of beehives at this stage. Officers will continue to monitor and collect data on nuisances relating to hive density in the urban area including specifically recording section size and hive density. This will improve knowledge and understanding of hive density issues in the urban area in relation to section size and help inform future reviews of the urban hive density requirements in the bylaw.