

No.	Submitter Name	Provision of Plan	Support/Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested
1	Brenda Mary Nettle	Section 4.3.4 Potential conflict between rural land uses	Oppose	Oppose removal of reference to kennels as a non-complying activity in Nodal Areas, specifically the Nodal Area within 1km of Pohangina Hall. There are already quite a few dogs in this Nodal Area and the number of barking and aggressive dogs is increasing. When walking around the 'big block' loop of Pohangina, Kuku and Finnis Roads, the number of barking and aggressive dogs rushing up and barking at pedestrians is increasing. This creates fear of attacks and intimidation by dogs, and a lack of doggy-do bags also creates issues. Worsened by dog owners taking unrestrained dogs for walks in the Nodal Area, including people who drive to the Pohangina Nodal Area to walk their dogs around the Nodal Area because of restrictions in other areas for dogs, sections too small to exercise dogs, or roads not pleasant nor safe for dog-walking. The number of dogs in Pohangina Nodal Area in public streets and amenities is already disproportional to the number of dogs living there. The fear and intimidation of dogs rushing up to people is causing some residents to cease walking around the nodal area. Can not find any reasoned arguments for removing reference to kennels as a non-complying activity in the Nodal Areas. The Pohangina Nodal Area does not need any more dogs than it already has. No objection to Plan Change 64 but strongly disagrees with removing reference to kennels as a non-complying activity in the Nodal Area within 1km of Pohangina Hall (and possibly other Nodal Areas).	Remove the consequential amendment to the Explanation for the Rural Zone and Nodal Areas in Section 4 of the District Plan to remove reference to kennels as a non-complying activity in the Nodal Areas.
2	Ministry for Primary Industries, Animal Health and Welfare, Attention: Tamara Diesch	3H.1 Introduction	Support	Note that reference to animal welfare requirements has now been included. Also include reference to the regulation that pertains to the provision of dry and shaded shelter for dogs.	Include reference to the regulation that pertains to the provision of dry and shaded shelter for dogs.
3	Horizons Regional Council	Whole plan change	Support	Generally support the proposed changes. Consider that the proposals are not inconsistent with the One Plan.	Does not state.

4	Rob and Maree Duindam	3H.3 Objectives and Policies	Oppose	<p>There seems to be a disconnect between the policy/objective to manage the effects of kennels and the proposed guidelines stipulated for permitted activities in the rural area. Existing situation of neighbours with kennels 30 metres from submitter's property boundary. Noise issues have been ongoing with complaints made to Council. Noise reducing barriers between kennels and submitters house are largely ineffective. Keeping 5 dogs in these circumstances is adversely affecting amenity values and character of rural area. There has been a growth in rural housing development and an increasing number of small lot housing areas. Allowing people to have up to 5 dogs and as many puppies as they like living close to neighbours will create significant noise problems requiring ongoing Council intervention. What would stop people breeding, training and racing greyhounds setting up more small-scale kennels to reduce overheads and scrutiny, and swapping dogs and keeping more dogs than permitted knowing that Council enforcement would be sporadic or only occur when a noise complaint is made. Could be exacerbated by other dog breeders starting up small scale units and being lax about noise. Relying on dog control bylaws to manage noise complaints for when kennels have been permitted will be time consuming and places the burden on neighbours to complain when breaches occur. There will be several situations where it is clear that despite the Council permitting this activity, the siting of kennels and management of dogs too close to neighbours is not going to work. All boarding, breeding and training kennels should be designated as discretionary activities. People with dogs kept as domestic pets will remain unaffected. Council's noise expert downplays the noise created by five dogs including bitches with puppies. Our experience is that when puppies arrive the noise levels of the dogs increase considerably and can go on for months in between breeding cycles. It is the repetitive nature and ongoing presence that becomes a nuisance.</p>	<p>1. Withdraw the section for permitted activities. Irrespective of the number of dogs being kept, everyone using their property for boarding, breeding and training should be required to apply under the discretionary activity criteria. 2. If the permitted activity criteria remains, change the setback provisions to better reflect the plan change policies and objectives. Kennels in the rural area should be a minimum of 100 metres away from any neighbouring boundary, especially where a neighbouring dwelling exists close to the common boundary. Other conditions set out in the proposal to remain. 3. Consider strengthening enforcement provisions in the Dog Control Bylaw to target owners of boarding, breeding and training kennels who repeatedly breach compliance with the rules contained within the permitted activity and/or discretionary provisions of the plan change, particularly where that relates to breach of setbacks, dog numbers and noise.</p>
		3H.4.1 Permitted Activity			
		3H.4.2 Standards for Permitted Activities a - e			
		3H.4.3 Discretionary Activities			