

Survey Submissions

Comparing results to Bylaw

1. 8300 notifications allegedly sent out.

Total survey submissions - 338

= 4.07% uptake

* socialnorms.com has numerous scientific studies on survey results. They show that an uptake of anywhere between 25% and 75% can be normal. 4.07% seems far too low on which to base any meaningful results.

* If we include Facebook insights (as an example I will use Post 1) 5.8K reach. This would be a 2.39% uptake.

2. Survey questions show bias.

e.g. by the use of trigger words. "prohibited" 'desexed' 'neutered' 'tied up' 'muzzle' 'restricted'

A submitter would also require a working knowledge of the 2006 bylaw to answer knowledgeably. I would argue that many non dog owners do not have this.

3. **Submissions**. Attachment 3 - 2.1 States total submissions were 338. Whereas 3.2 states 234 unique and complete submissions were used for the survey. 104 less. What criteria were used to work this out. This also brings the uptake down to 2.8%. Again, if I use Facebook insights - Post 1 as an example it would bring the uptake down to 1.65%.

This alone points to huge flaws in the consultation process and begs the question - were 8300 notifications sent out?

Survey Results

Question 1

Impounding

81% agreed impounded dogs should be desexed or neutered before being released. (dog owners 75%. Non dog owners 97% in support) NOTE there was no mention in the survey of previous history, medical issues etc.

Proposed Dog bylaw - 8.0 - 9.3 Is completely ambiguous. Full of 'maybes' and leaves everything open to interpretation. Not good enough.

Question 2

Unattended dogs

Wording. Should we allow dogs to be unattended in a public place if they are tied up and muzzled. 47% said No. 50% Yes. 60% of non dog owners said Yes. There were no options given. We are told that muzzling is 'to reduce the likelihood of them biting'. I would question the likelihood of the vast majority of dogs biting and question the need for a muzzle. Is there any proof (not anecdotal) that tethered dogs attack, bite and bark. Again, bias question.

Proposed bylaw states that dogs must be muzzled if tethered.

Questions 3 and 4

Responsible Dog Owners

92% of all respondents supported creating a Responsible Dog Owner category (RDO) (Dog owners 91%. Non dog owners 95%)

85% of all respondents supported reduced fees for RDO (Dog owners 86%. Non dog owners 81%)

Proposed bylaw 1.1 - 1.8 Promote responsible dog ownership. What are these courses? Who runs them? What will they cost? Do they even exist? Even after you have done everything asked - if it is even possible - the council MAY approve RDO status.

I can find nothing to say the council would give a reduced fee for RDO status. Even though 85% stated this would be good.

Questions 5, 6 and 7

Dog Prohibition Times and Areas

Q5 Should dogs be prohibited from most beaches, during the day time, during summer. 51% said yes. However there was a difference between dog owners and non dog owners. With dog owners responding no - 59% and non dog owners responding 87% yes.

Q6 Should places dogs are prohibited be extended or reduced? 56% said keep same. There was a difference between dog owners and non dog owners (Dog owners 21% extend areas, Non dog owners 21% reduce areas)

Q7 Should the times that dogs are prohibited be changed? Largest response was keep same 42% The majority of dog owners - 53% stated times should be reduced. While 57% of non dog owners said the times should stay the same.

The upshot of the result is that times and areas could pretty much stay the same.

I would question the wording of the survey again. No times were given, no beaches were named, no reasons were given for restrictions.... the questions assumed a working knowledge of the existing bylaw. I would challenge any non dog owner to know the seasonal times dogs are allowed on beaches. There was no mention of wild life and birds in any of these questions. No mention of specific areas where dogs could be exercised away from people.

Proposed bylaw

On leash - all urban areas, all reserves, all beaches (1st May), Twin Coast Cycle Trail, Te Haumi Beach - Opuia trail.

Exercise areas off Leash	2006	proposed 2017
Kaikohe	old refuse site - Station Rd	Highway 12
Kerikeri	Reserve - Samaree Place Land behind crematorium - Wiroa Rd	X Wiroa Rd (cows)
Rolands Wood is mentioned as off leash for Kerikeri. I have taken this out of the equation as the council have nothing to do with it. They cannot include it here.		
Paihia/Te Haumi	All beaches excluding area known as Sullivans Beach + Te Haumi Beach (time restrictions)	Sullivans Beach
Russell	Long Beach at Eastern End	X
Kaitaia	Tangoing Domain Bonnett Rd	Empire Street
Opuia	?	Beauty Street Waterfront
Rangiputa	?	Rangiputa Beach

(Areas may be added 2016)

Russell now has nowhere to walk their dogs off leash. Kaikohe used to have an old refuse site and now has the ambiguous 'Highway 12'. How are people supposed to understand this?

Kerikeri has a cow paddock. Kaitaia has Empire Street? and Paihia has Sullivans beach which there have been questions about re wildlife. The whole of Opuia and Russell will converge on the

tiny strip of sand at Beachy Street. It is very clear the importance the council puts on dogs and their people. (cow paddock, old refuse site, nowhere)

We live in an area with lots of beaches and beautiful countryside and this is the best the FNDC can do? I should mention that all dog owners are happy to work with the endangered birdlife and see which areas will suit everyone. And again, question why no wild life was mentioned in the survey.

Questions 8, 9 and 10

Leashed Areas

Q8 Should other areas only allow dogs on leash? 50% no. 47% yes. (what other areas? what areas allow dogs now? Again this required a working knowledge of the existing bylaw)

Q9 should this restriction be removed outside the summer time? 61% responded yes. But there was a divide between dog and non dog owners. 74% of dog owners responded yes, while 73% of non dog owners responded no.

I would question who, apart from dog owners, is walking on the beach over most of the non summer months

Q10 Are there any other areas suitable for public dog exercise? This result was split between dog and non dog owners. 82% of non dog owners believed there were no further areas suitable for dog exercise areas. 58% of dog owners believed there was.

Attachment 3 lists the recommended areas suggested by respondents.

These have been completely ignored by the council. I understand some of the suggestions only

Question Ten (A) - If you answered yes to Question Ten, please list any other area(s) would you recommend as suitable for public dog exercise?			
Multiple Responses		Single Response	
Location	Count	Locations	Count
Don't know/ Unrelated Response	18	A&P Show Grounds	1
90 Mile Beach	15	Allen Bell Drive park (Kaitaia)	1
Te Haumi	14	Cable Bay	1
All Beaches	13	DoC Land	1
Parks or Sports-fields	11	Donkey Bay	1
Sullivans Beach	11	English Bay	1
Ahipara	7	Koutu Beach	1
Kerikeri Domain	5	Lindvark Park	1
Hongi Hika Recreation Reserve	4	Ngati Kahu road taipa	1
Paihia	4	Omapere	1
Stone Store	4	Oneroa Beach	1
Taumarumaru pa	4	Pipiroa Beach	1
Coopers Beach	3	Pipis	1
Rangikapiti Pa	3	Puketotara Reserve	1
Tauranga Bay	3	Tapeka Beach	1
Cycle Trials	3	Te Ngaere Bay	1
Anywhere/ Everywhere	2	Te Tii	1
Haruru Falls	2	Tokerau reserve	1
Kaitaia (generally a dog park)	2	Waione Road	1
Lake Ngatu	2	Waitangi Forest	1
Rainbow Falls Track	2	Waitotara reserve and river walking path	1
Russell Beaches	2		
Taipa Beach	2		

have a small number of votes. However, see table for Q 12. This table has suggestions of urban areas that respondents thought should be included in dog number restrictions and it would appear these suggestions have been taken seriously. This shows a complete bias. (also most are not urban, but rural areas)

82% of non dog owners stated that they believed there were no more suitable areas for dog exercise areas. I would argue that as a non dog owner they would have had no reason to look for or consider said areas.

Proposed Bylaw - 2006 mentioned all beaches by name. The proposed new bylaw states All beaches, urban areas, All reserves (except dog exercise areas, of which they are none) Twin Coast Cycle trail and Trail from the Haumi to Opuia.

Questions 11, 12

Urban dog ownership

Q11 Should the number of dogs per household be restricted in urban areas? Results showed that 65% of respondents supported keeping the current number of dogs per household in urban areas. (69% of dog owners and 53% of non dog owners) It is interesting how the *results* are written “.... supported keeping the current 2 dogs per household” as if this was apparent from the survey. The survey never mentioned what the actual number of dogs was. How many people who answered know what the present numbers are?

Q12 Over 70% responded No when asked if there were any other suitable urban areas where dog numbers should be restricted.

Areas were put forward for **urban** areas, that these under 30% of respondents, thought could have number restrictions.

Question Twelve (A) - If you answered yes to Question Twelve, please list the urban area(s) you believe should be included:			
Multiple Responses		Single Response	
Location	Count	Locations	Count
All Urban Areas	10	Cape Reinga Settlements	1
Don't know/Unrelated	8	Doves Bay Road	1
Everywhere (Whole District)	4	Kaimaumau	1
Kaeo	4	Opuia	1
Waipapa	3	Rangiputa	1
Anywhere near Kiwi Zones	2	Skudders Beach	1
Awanui	2	Taipa	1
Hihi	2	Takahui	1
Karikari	2	Taupo Bay	1
Okaihau	2	Totara North	1
Opito Bay Road	2	Waimate North	1
Rangitane Road	2	Waipapakauri	1
Tauranga Bay	2	Whangaroa	1

The vast majority of places mentioned here are **RURAL** and not **URBAN**, yet no mention of this anywhere in the results. *see Rural Areas

Proposed Bylaw - Remains maximum limit of 2 dogs over three months ...in urban areas.

However - in the 2006 bylaw there was a permit that could be applied for to allow you to increase this number. This has completely disappeared and was never mentioned in the survey.

Rural Areas

There were NO questions in the survey that related to dog ownership in rural areas, Yet in the new bylaw the whole of the east coast from Mangonui to Russell will now have number restrictions. As of now we don't know what that entails as the bylaw states Policy 7 - 8.6 - limit one dog per household in kiwi concentration zones OR No dogs will be newly registered. Presently there are no number restrictions in these rural areas.

Schedule C - map of limit of dogs per household shows whole of East coast

Schedule D - map of DOC prohibited areas does not match schedule C map at all.

Schedule E - map of kiwi concentrated areas has about a 30% match.

Schedule C (limitation map) had no bearing on the Schedule D and E maps.

Who is making this up?

Where has the open and transparent consultation been?

Summary

The survey questions cover

1. Impounding of dogs
2. Unattended dogs in public places
3. Responsible dog owners and fees
4. Dog prohibition times and areas
5. Dogs on leash areas

This survey was supposedly our consultation process. It had an uptake of 2.8%. This shows it was flawed from the start.

It only covers the above points.

There is no mention of

1. Wildlife
2. Kiwi areas
3. Dotterels
4. Bird life on beaches
5. Predators
6. Rural areas

The list goes on.

The 72 page document is full of things that were not part of the open consultation process. There has been no right to reply re. flawed information given on birds.

It is clear that there is far too much going on behind the scenes, a bias and a fixed agenda.