

---

Monday, 7 September 2020

---

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*

**Hastings District Council**

**Hastings District Rural Community Board Meeting**

*Kaupapataka*

# Open Agenda

---

*Te Rā Hui:*  
Meeting date: **Monday, 7 September 2020**

---

*Te Wā:*  
Time: **2.00pm**

---

*Te Wāhi:*  
Venue: **Landmarks Room  
Ground Floor  
Civic Administration Building  
Lyndon Road East  
Hastings**

---

*Te Hoapā:*  
Contact: **Democracy and Governance Services  
P: 06 871 5000 | E: [democracy@hdc.govt.nz](mailto:democracy@hdc.govt.nz)**

---

*Te Āpiha Matua:*  
Responsible  
Officer: **Transportation Manager - Jag Pannu**

---

**Watch Council meetings  
streamed live on our website  
[www.hastingsdc.govt.nz](http://www.hastingsdc.govt.nz)**

**HASTINGS DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
207 Lyndon Road East, Hastings 4122 | Private Bag 9002, Hastings 4156  
Phone **06 871 5000** | [www.hastingsdc.govt.nz](http://www.hastingsdc.govt.nz)  
**TE KAUNIHERA Ā-ROHE O HERETAUNGA**

## Hastings District Rural Community Board – Terms of Reference

The Community Board is a separate entity to the Council. The role of the Community Board is set out in Section 52 of the Local Government Act 2002. The Council is authorised to delegate powers to the Community Board.

### **Membership (6 members)**

Chair (elected by the Board)

Deputy Chair (elected by the Board)

4 Elected Community Board Members

1 Mohaka Ward Councillor

1 Kahuranaki Ward Councillor

**Quorum** – 4 members

### **DELEGATED POWERS**

#### **General**

1. To maintain an overview of services provided by the Council within the Community Board's area.
2. To represent, and act as an advocate for, the interests of the community represented.
3. To consider and report on all matters referred to the Board by the Council, or any matter of interest or concern to the Community Board.
4. To communicate with community organisations and special interest groups within the community;
5. To undertake any other responsibilities that are delegated to it by the Council.
6. To appoint a member of the Community Board to organisations approved by the Council from time to time.

### **LONG TERM PLAN/ANNUAL PLAN/POLICY ISSUES**

7. Authority to make a submission to the Long Term Plan/Annual Plan process on activities, service levels and expenditure (including capital works priorities) within the Board's area or to make a submission in relation to any policy matter which may have an effect within the Board's area.

### **ROADING AND TRAFFIC**

8. Authority to exercise the Council's powers and functions in relation to roads within the Board's area under the following sections of the Local Government Act 1974:
  - Section 335 (vehicle crossings);
  - Section 344 (gates and cattle stops);
  - Section 355 (overhanging trees).
9. Authority to exercise the Council's statutory powers (including any relevant powers conferred by bylaw) over roads within the Board's area in respect of:
  - (i) Road user behaviour at intersections;
  - (ii) Controls on stopping or overtaking
  - (iii) Controls on turning
  - (iv) Pedestrian safety,
  - (v) Footpath maintenance and improvements.
  - (vi) Accident investigation studies, lighting and other safety works
10. For the avoidance of doubt, nothing in this delegation authorises a Community Board to deal with a matter, in the exercise of delegated authority, in a manner which is conflict with any policy or decision of the Council or any standing committee of the Council in relation to the same matter.

---

Monday, 7 September 2020

---

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*

**Hastings District Council**

**Hastings District Rural Community Board Meeting**

*Kaupapataka*

# Open Agenda

---

<i>Mematanga:</i>	<i>Heamana</i>
Committee Members:	<b>Chair:</b> Nick Dawson
	Marcus Buddo, Sue Maxwell and Jonathon Stockley
	Councillors Tania Kerr (Deputy Chair) and Sophie Siers

---

<i>Tokamatua:</i>	
Quorum:	4 members

---

<i>Apiha Matua:</i>	<i>Kaiwhakahaere Rōpū</i>
Officer Responsible:	Transportation Manager: Jag Pannu

---

<i>Te Rōpū Manapori me te</i>	
<i>Kāwanatanga:</i>	
Democracy &	Vicki Rusbatch
Governance Services:	

---





## *Te Rārangī Take*

# Order of Business

---

### **Apologies & Leave of Absence – Ngā Whakapāhatanga me te Wehenga ā-Hui**

- 1.0** At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.  
 At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.

---

### **2.0 Conflict of Interest – He Ngākau Kōnatunatu**

Members need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision-making when a conflict arises between their role as a Member of the Council and any private or other external interest they might have. This note is provided as a reminder to Members to scan the agenda and assess their own private interests and identify where they may have a pecuniary or other conflict of interest, or where there may be perceptions of conflict of interest.

If a Member feels they do have a conflict of interest, they should publicly declare that at the start of the relevant item of business and withdraw from participating in the meeting. If a Member thinks they may have a conflict of interest, they can seek advice from the General Counsel or the Manager: Democracy and Governance (preferably before the meeting).

It is noted that while Members can seek advice and discuss these matters, the final decision as to whether a conflict exists rests with the member.

---

### **Confirmation of Minutes – Te Whakamana i Ngā Minitī**

- 3.0** Minutes of the Hastings District Rural Community Board held Monday 15 June 2020.  
*(Previously circulated)*

- 
- |            |                              |          |
|------------|------------------------------|----------|
| <b>4.0</b> | <b>Forestry Slash Update</b> | <b>7</b> |
|------------|------------------------------|----------|
- 

- |            |   |           |
|------------|---|-----------|
| <b>5.0</b> | <b>Rating Area 2 - Financial Result for the year ended 30 June 2020</b> | <b>11</b> |
|------------|---|-----------|
- 

- |            |  |           |
|------------|--|-----------|
| <b>6.0</b> | <b>Provision of Security Cameras in Rural Locations Update</b> | <b>17</b> |
|------------|--|-----------|
- 

- |            |   |           |
|------------|---|-----------|
| <b>7.0</b> | <b>Waipatiki Permanent Recycling Facility Request</b> | <b>23</b> |
|------------|---|-----------|
-

---

<b>8.0</b>	<b>Animal Control Annual Report 2019/2020</b>	<b>27</b>
------------	---	-----------

---

<b>9.0</b>	<b>Five Year Review Hastings District Council Consolidated Bylaw 2016 Chapter 3 Dog Control &amp; Dog Control Policy</b>	<b>35</b>
------------	--	-----------

---

<b>10.0</b>	<b>Rural Transportation Activities Report</b>	<b>63</b>
-------------	---	-----------

---

<b>11.0</b>	<b>Minor Items – <i>Ngā Take Iti</i></b>	
-------------	--	--

---

<b>12.0</b>	<b>Urgent Items – <i>Ngā Take Whakahihir</i></b>	
-------------	--	--

---

---

Monday, 7 September 2020

---

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*

**Hastings District Council**

**Hastings District Rural Community Board**

Item 4

*Te Rārangi Take*

# Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

---

*Nā:*  
From: **Dean Ferguson, Project Manager**

---

*Te Take:*  
Subject: **Forestry Slash Update**

---

## **1.0 PURPOSE AND SUMMARY - TE KAUPAPA ME TE WHAKARĀPOPOTOTANGA**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update the Hastings District Rural Community Board on the progress made around Plantation Forestry monitoring subsequent to the recent appointment of a Forestry Compliance Officer, jointly funded between Hastings District Council (HDC) and Hawke's Bay Regional Council (HBRC).
- 1.2 Due to the substantial interruptions over the last 6 months, officers will be recommending to Council the funding for the Forestry Compliance Officer is extended for a further 12 months and be reviewed thereafter. A report will be going to Council in October/November.

## **2.0 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 Issues relating to forestry slash have been increasingly prevalent in the Hastings District and East Coast region in general over the last few years. It is anticipated that risks as a consequence of forestry slash are only likely to increase over the next few years.
- 2.2 Forestry slash is the scrap timber, branches and offcuts left behind in a felling area and can contain a mixture of small and large branches. Slash has the potential to damage or destroy Council owned roads, culverts and bridges among other assets as well as putting the community at risk of being isolated or sustaining damage to their properties.
- 2.3 There are two primary reasons driving concerns around forestry slash. Firstly the effects of climate change will mean that extreme rainfall events are likely to occur with greater frequency and

intensity. Second is that there is currently an intense period of forestry harvesting occurring on the East Coast. This is due to the high period of afforestation which occurred after Cyclone Bola in 1988. Harvesting of these plantations has been occurring over the last few years, and will continue to occur over the next 5 to 10 years.

- 2.4 Further to this, Hastings District has steep topography which is susceptible to erosion and run-off over many parts of the region, further adding to overall risk compared to other areas of the country.
- 2.5 With current forestry pruning and harvesting practices, a large amount of slash will remain after harvesting. Effectively managed, slash can be contained onsite within traps, and during storm events should be confined within existing harvesting areas. However poorly managed slash can run off into waterways and can cause significant damage downstream. Management of slash across the region can vary from operator to operator.
- 2.6 Examples of poorly managed slash have been particularly prevalent across the East Coast over the last two years. The Tolaga Bay event illustrated the damage that slash can cause to a community. Further to this the McVicar Road Bridge was badly damaged last year as a result of forestry run-off.
- 2.7 It is this desire to ensure that the environment, HDC's existing infrastructure as well as individual lives, homes and properties are protected, that has led to the need to put greater resources into forestry slash monitoring.
- 2.8 The National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) came into effect on 1 May 2018. The National Standards were aimed at standardising provisions across regions for forestry operators, given that many operators and forestry blocks are located across regional boundaries. In Hawke's Bay the NES-PF led to a strengthening of rules, primarily for the Regional Council. The NES-PF has given them greater teeth to ensure compliance for all forestry operators, particularly with regard to slash management and waterway protection (both in terms of silt run-off and wildlife protection).
- 2.9 Notwithstanding this, while the NES-PF reduced the potential District Plan controls on forestry management (with only some small changes to District Plan requirements) it has raised questions how local authorities might have an influence on the downstream effects caused by forestry on communities and infrastructure.
- 2.10 Whilst in most instances it makes sense to control forestry at a regional level, Hastings District Council also has general obligations set out under Section 31 of the Resource Management Act (RMA), including the requirement to control the actual and potential effects on the land. Section 31(1) (b) (i) which requires the avoidance or mitigation of effects relating to natural hazards is particularly relevant with regards to slash management.
- 2.11 Further to the NES-PF, it requires HDC to review and monitor forestry management plans. It was considered that the most efficient method to meet RMA requirements would be to work collaboratively with the HBRC, which would ensure the HDC monitoring requirements can still be achieved without covering the same ground as the monitoring at a regional level.
- 2.12 The Hawke's Bay Regional Council had one full time equivalent (FTE) working on ensuring compliance of forestry operators with the NES-PF. The scope of this compliance was far greater than just slash, and also included checking compliance on management plans and waterway protection. The HBRC indicated that was not sufficient a resource to ensure adequate monitoring and compliance for all operators.
- 2.13 Subsequent to the events around Tolaga Bay and the Hastings District, HDC consulted with HBRC in managing the risks associated with forestry management and how we could work collaboratively on the issue. There were a number of matters discussed including online accessibility to best practice guidelines and relevant NES-PF provisions, creating GIS layers showing areas of vulnerable infrastructure downstream from existing forestry blocks, and areas identified for high erosion risk.

2.14

<https://webmaps.hdc.govt.nz/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=74b064782f23497b88703de9dea41126>

- 2.15 Also discussed was the need to ensure greater levels of monitoring and education for existing operators. As part of this the potential for Council providing funding for more resources was discussed. This was done with the recognition that better monitoring and compliance of forestry slash will provide greater protection of HDC owned assets.

### 3.0 CURRENT SITUATION

- 3.1 In November 2019, a new FTE commenced working as a joint HDC/HBRC Forestry Compliance Officer. It was initially agreed by Council that the role would be funded for a 12 month period and reviewed after that.
- 3.2 The first four months consisted of training with HBRC and familiarising the role with HDC systems and developing a work programme which took into considerations under the NES-PF as well as associated risks and interests from an HDC lens.
- 3.3 In February 2020, due to COVID-19 in China, plus an oversupplied market, the harvesting of plantation forestry in New Zealand were either cut back or completely stopped. That resulted in less forestry activity, which in turn resulted in less monitoring and creating a high level of uncertainty in the industry.
- 3.4 In March 2020, New Zealand went into a level 4 lockdown which suspended any forestry compliance activity until the transition into level 2 towards the end of May.
- 3.5 Although operating under extraordinary times, the Forestry Compliance Officer has received 43 applications for forestry activities, mainly afforestation or harvesting within the District.
- 3.6 The Forestry Compliance Officer has also undertaken 14 site visits to carry out the appropriate monitoring. The sites chosen were subject to a risk assessment. There were no issues specific to HDC that arose out of the site visits.
- 3.7 One of the main issues the Forestry Compliance Officer has been focussing on is forestry slash to ensure slash traps were adequate and culverts had safeguards.
- 3.8 Due to the substantial interruptions over the last 6 months, officers will be recommending to Council the funding for the Forestry Compliance Officer is extended for a further 12 months and be reviewed thereafter. A report will be going to Council in October/ November.

### 4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS - NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA

That the Board receives the report titled Forestry Slash Update.

#### Attachments:

There are no attachments for this report.



---

Monday, 7 September 2020

---

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*  
**Hastings District Council**  
**Hastings District Rural Community Board**

Item 5

*Te Rārangi Take*

# Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

---

*Nā:*  
**From: Aaron Wilson, Financial Controller**

---

*Te Take:*  
**Subject: Rating Area 2 - Financial Result for the year ended 30 June 2020**

---

## **1.0 PURPOSE AND SUMMARY - TE KAUPAPA ME TE WHAKARĀPOPOTOTANGA**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform the Hastings District Rural Community Board (RCB) of the indicative rating result for the year ended 30 June 2020.
- 1.2 The indicative result for Rating Area 2 for the 2019/20 year is favourable to budget and is a \$68,934 rating surplus. The results are unaudited and indicative at this stage and consequently there may be some variation to the figures in the final result. This RA2 rating surplus is in the context of a \$269,655 overall rating deficit for Council.
- 1.3 This report concludes by recommending that the Hastings Rural Community Board recommend to the Operations and Monitoring Committee that \$8,375 be carried forward to fund the additional cost of the Rural Security Camera Trial with the remaining rating surplus allocated to the Rural Flood and Emergency Event Reserve.
- 1.4 The unaudited result for the year ended 30 June 2020 will be presented to the Operations and Monitoring Committee on 17 September 2020.
- 1.5 This report sets out the indicative rating result for the year ended 30 June 2020 for Rating Area 2.

## **2.0 The Rating Result**

- 2.1 The indicative rating result for the 2019/20 financial year is a positive result for Rating Area 2, a \$68,934 surplus.

- 2.2 A more detailed breakdown of this result is available in **Attachment 1**.
- 2.3 The overall rating surplus is due to savings across a number of Council activities.
- 2.4 The largest single contributor of the RA2 surplus was in the corporate services area with lower spend in contracted services costs along with favourable internal charges and recoveries. The rates revenue for RA2 had a surplus after rates remissions, penalties and doubtful debts were taken into account, and has contributed to the overall RA2 surplus.
- 2.5 Offsetting this was the RA2 share of the loss in the planning and regulatory area (\$174k). This was primarily driven by higher operational spends due to the very high volume of work with building and environmental consenting and associated costs that were above budget. Also contributing was the RA2 share of Community Facilities losses of \$43k which were impacted by Covid-19 with reduced revenues and higher costs.
- 2.6 The net rating result is shown in the attached schedule "Analysis of Year End Result for 2019/20 for Rating Area 2". This shows the budgeted and actual cost for the various activities and the amount requested to be carried forward. The final column shows the rating surplus or deficit (negative) for the activities.
- 2.7 The following table summarises the allocation of the 2019/20 Rating Area 2 surplus:

	\$
<b>RA2 Surplus on General Rate</b>	<b>68,934</b>
<b><u>Allocation of Surplus:</u></b>	
Rural Security Camera Trial	<b>8,375</b>
Rural Flood & Emergency Event Reserve	<b>60,559</b>
<b>Allocated Surplus</b>	<b>\$68,934</b>

### 3.0 Landfill Surplus allocation

- 3.1 In addition to the rating surplus, the Council has received for allocation, revenue from the surpluses generated at the Landfill totalling \$1,976,633 of which the RA2 share is \$395,332. Last year the RA2 share of the Landfill surplus was put towards the Rural Flood and Emergency Event Reserve with the RA1 share used to help fund the refuse collection changes.
- 3.2 The allocation of the RA2 share of the 2019/20 Landfill Surplus could be to either the Flood and Emergency Event Reserve or to the RA2 Capital Reserve. The 2020-30 Long Term Plan is going to present some challenges for RA2 with large increases in transportation renewals, a further contribution to the RA2 Capital Reserve could help smooth the impact of these increases and help transition the rural community to an increased level of expenditure on these assets.

### 4.0 Rural Flood and Emergency Event Reserve

- 4.1 The Rural Flood and Emergency Event Reserve has a balance of \$1,229,072 as at 30 June 2020. The Hastings District Rural Community Board on 21 September 2015 resolved:

*"That the Hastings Rural Community Board recommend to Council that a new target level for the Rural Flood and Emergency Event Reserve be established of \$2,000,000."*

- 4.2 The above resolution was subsequently approved by Council.
- 4.3 The following table summarises the cost of recent flood and emergency events and how they were funded which this year included a \$200,000 contribution to the Mayoral Drought Relief Fund and a small contribution towards the local share of flood damage costs that exceeded budget during 2019/20:



Total Funding from RA2 Rural Flood and Emergency Event Reserve as at 30 June 2020			
Forecast Reserve balance			
Closing Reserve balance 30 June 2019		\$	1,178,992
Surplus from Landfill 2018-19		\$	151,581
Surplus from 2018-19		\$	107,188
Opening Reserve balance 1 July 2020		\$	1,437,761
<b>Drought relief fund contribution</b>		\$	200,000
<b>Flood damage Costs</b>			
Actual 2019/20 Flood costs	\$ 342,900	\$	342,900
Less Budget for major reinstatement		\$	296,000
Total unbudgeted Cost		\$	46,900
<b>Local share</b>			
Actual 2019-20 Flood costs@46%	\$ 157,734	\$	157,734
		\$	136,160
Local share funded from Flood Damage reserve		\$	21,574
		\$	1,216,187
Interest on reserve		\$	12,885
Closing reserve balance 30-June -2020		\$	1,229,072

## 5.0 Allocation of Surplus

- 5.1 Council's Treasury Policy states the following on the allocation of surpluses:

*"The funds from all asset sales and operating surpluses will be applied to the reduction of debt and/or a reduction in borrowing requirements, unless the Council specifically directs that the funds will be put to another use."*

- 5.2 Whilst Rating Area 2 currently has debt of \$1.285m, incurred for capital works, the specific resolution by Council to build the Rural Flood and Emergency Event reserve up to a level of \$2m is considered a prudent one given the recent flood events and the contribution to the Drought Relief Fund this year.
- 5.3 The exact allocation of funds to reserve contributions may change if Council determine that additional funds be set aside from the RA2 2019/20 surplus to meet any other identified needs.
- 5.4 The Rating Area 2 reserve balances as at 30 June 2020 are as follows:

Reserve Description <i>(Interest bearing Y/N)</i>	Balance (\$)
Rural Flood and Emergency Event Reserve (Y)	1,229,074
Rural Fire Contingency Fund (N)	6,457
General Purpose Reserve - Rating Area 2 (N)	666,870
Capital Reserve - Rating Area 2 (N)	1,778,708
Transportation NZTA Fund Reserve Rating Area 2 (N)	399,789

- 5.5 It is recommended that the rural flood and emergency reserve be increased from the 2019/20 surplus to enable Council to help mitigate the cost of another event occurring.

5.6 The following table is a summary of the recommended allocations of the 2019/20 RA2 surplus:

2019/20 RA2 Rating	Surplus
RA2 Surplus on General Rate	\$68,934
- Allocation to Rural Flood & Emergency Event Reserve	\$60,559
- Allocation to Rural Security Camera Trial	\$ 8,375

## 6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS - NGĀ TŪTOHUNGA

- A) That the Board receives the report titled Rating Area 2 - Financial Result for the year ended 30 June 2020
- B) That the Board recommends to Council that the Rating Area 2 Rating Surplus of \$68,375 be allocated as follows, noting that the value of the surplus available may change.

2019/20 RA2 Rating	Surplus
RA2 Surplus on General Rate	\$68,934
- Allocation to Rural Flood & Emergency Event Reserve	\$60,559
- Allocation to Rural Security Camera Trial	\$ 8,375

- C) That the Board recommends to Council that the Rating Area 2 share of the Landfill Surplus of \$395,332 be allocated to the Rural Flood and Emergency Event Reserve or the Rating Area 2 Capital Reserve.

### Attachments:

1 [↓](#) RA2 Financial Result for year ended 30 June 2020      FIN-09-3-20-344

GENERAL RATE 2019/20 YEAR-END ANALYSIS BY RATING GROUPS		Rating Area Two		
Activity	Budgeted Net Cost	Actual Net Cost	C\Forwards to 20/21	19/20 Result Surplus(deficit)
Corporate and Customer Services	485,894	434,413	0	51,481
Rural Community Board	43,599	41,545	0	2,054
Finance Services	127,254	126,901	0	354
Community Facilities and Programmes	1,235,175	1,270,547	8,334	-43,706
Planning and Regulatory Services	1,168,089	1,342,513	0	-174,424
Economic Growth & Organisation Improvement	953,254	883,228	21,572	48,453
Parks and Property Management	773,293	756,317	10,322	6,654
Transportation	6,432,980	6,084,830	390,540	-42,389
Landfill	-3,804	-12,293	0	8,489
Stormwater	72,988	21,026	20,000	31,962
Recycling Depot & Trsfr Stn	50,126	68,946	0	-18,819
Contingency Fund	10,000	10,000	0	0
<b>Surplus on General Rate</b>				<b>-129,891.48</b>
<b>Plus Other Revenue &amp; Expenditure Adjustments</b>				
Other Expenditure	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
General Purpose Reserve (Surplus Allocation)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Petrol Tax	-75,983.96	-78,571.91	0.00	2,587.95
Wastewater Levy to Reserves (UAGC)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wastewater Targeted Rate to Reserves	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wastewater Levy to Reserves	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2018/19 Brought Forwards	-236,583.66	-236,583.66	0.00	0.00
	-312,567.62	-315,155.57	0.00	2,587.95
<b>Rates Revenue Surplus</b>				
Provn for Doubtful Debts	35,000.00	-10,051.57	0.00	45,051.57
Rates Penalties	-30,600.00	-60,320.74	0.00	29,720.74
Rate Remissions	71,722.00	7,505.35	0.00	64,216.65
Rates Revenue (after Remissions)	-11,062,993.07	-11,416,309.06	0.00	353,315.99
Less extra rates levied for Separate Rates & UAC's	0.00	0.00	0.00	-296,067.28
<b>Rates Revenue Surplus</b>	<b>-10,986,871.07</b>	<b>-11,479,176.02</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>196,237.67</b>
<b>Total General Rates Surplus</b>				<b>68,934.14</b>



---

Monday, 7 September 2020

---

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*  
**Hastings District Council**  
**Hastings District Rural Community Board**

Item 6

*Te Rārangi Take*

# Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

---

*Nā:*  
**From: Clint Adamson, Security Manager**

---

*Te Take:*  
**Subject: Provision of Security Cameras in Rural Locations Update**

---

## **1.0 Executive Summary – *Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga***

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update the Rural Community Board on the progress with regards to installing a trial Rural Community Crime Prevention/Detection camera.
- 1.2 The Rural Community Board considered the budget at its meeting of 2 March 2020 and requested the addition of \$10,000 to fund a pilot security camera installation.
- 1.3 Taihape Road, next to the recycling facility, was chosen as the trial site.
- 1.4 A site assessment has been completed and the actual cost for installing a camera and associated infrastructure has been confirmed at \$18,375.

## 2.0 Recommendations – Ngā Tūtohunga

- A) That the Board receives the report titled Provision of Security Cameras in Rural Locations Update.
- B) That the Board considers the additional cost involved in installing the CCTV camera in Taihape Road.
- C) That if the Board recommends to Council that the installation of a CCTV system on Taihape Road, and close to Matapiro Road, is to proceed, that the additional cost in providing the CCTV system being funded is met by the Rating Area 2 2019/20 surplus.
- D) That if this Rural Security Camera trial proves successful, a more permanent and appropriate funding regime for the installation of any further CCTV cameras is to be explored by the Committee through the Long Term Plan and in consultation with the community.

## 3.0 Background – Te Horopaki

- 3.1 At the Rural Community Board meeting of 2 March 2020, the Hastings RCB received the report titled Provision of Security Cameras in Rural Locations – Addendum Report.
- 3.2 This report outlined how 14 rural sites had been identified as potential locations for the installation of CCTV systems. These sites had been selected after consulting with Police and were subsequently assessed as to their suitability and the practicality of installing CCTV in those locations.
- 3.3 When taking into account issues such as connectivity for camera monitoring, how the system could be powered, general security of the system once installed, and relative isolation, Taihape Road – near Matapiro Road – was selected as the best option for a trial.
- 3.4 The estimated cost at that point to install a CCTV system in this area was \$10,000. A budget of \$10,000 was provided for in the Rating Area 2 Unsubsidised Transport budget for the capital costs of the CCTV installation.
- 3.5 The RCB recommended to Council the installation of a security camera on Taihape Road and close to Matapiro Road for an appropriate trial period to assess effectiveness and community benefit.
- 3.6 A progress report on the operation of the camera was to be reported to a future meeting of RCB.
- 3.7 After Covid-19 related delays, Council has then organised a detailed site assessment of the Taihape Road location with its preferred supplier of CCTV services, Advanced Security.
- 3.8 In June 2020, Advanced Security made an initial quote of \$32,014 (plus GST) for a CCTV system at the location that would have included cameras covering Taihape Road, the Recycling Centre and the entrance to the stockyard.
- 3.9 In consultation with Council's Animal Control team, a decision was made that the camera covering the stockyard was not required.
- 3.10 Council's Solid Waste team have agreed to fund \$4,250 to cover the cost of the camera overlooking the recycling centre.
- 3.11 A remaining amount of \$18,735 (plus GST) is required to complete the scope of work needed to install the camera and related infrastructure.



HDC Remote Cameras – Taihape Road

**Option1**

1. AXIS Q1700 Bullet camera, Specialised LPR Camera with 50M IR
2. AXIS Q1798 Bullet camera, High Resolution 10MP extreme low light IR camera
3. Cabinet containing Solar charger, batteries, Network switch
4. 3M Pole for gear to be mounted to

**Note:** 2xSolar Panels to be mounted to the top of the pole

#### 4.0 Discussion – *Te Matapakitanga*

- 4.1 The main risks involved in installing CCTV camera systems in rural areas were covered in the Provision of Security Cameras in Rural Locations report considered by the RCB on 02 March 2020.
- 4.2 In respect of the camera system installed in the Taihape Road location the main factors to be considered were;
  - Camera quality sufficient to visually capture licence plates of vehicles travelling on Taihape Road
  - Security of camera and related infrastructure
  - Ongoing servicing requirements
  - Power and connectivity issues.
- 4.3 The bullet camera selected is a specialised Licensed Plate Recognition camera fit for purpose.
- 4.4 The pole required to be erected to place the camera and related infrastructure on has been selected on the basis that it is both more difficult to scale than a standard pole, and also has a locking pivot point (with removable winch) so that there is no need to hire a scissor lift every time the camera requires servicing. The pivoting pole price alone is \$6,292.74.
- 4.5 While the assessment has considered security, the relatively isolated location of the camera means that wilful damage/attempts at theft cannot be completely ruled out.
- 4.6 Given the lack of mains power options, a solar charging and battery storage solution has been included with solar panels installed on the top of the pole.
- 4.7 To ensure the signal from the camera can be received by the Council CCTV monitoring station, a Permaconn Data connection and associated plan (based on 5GB per month) has been included.



- 4.8 The 12 month Data plan will mean an ongoing annual cost of approximately \$1,260.00 with normal CCTV servicing costs to be included over and above that amount.
- 4.9 A budget of \$10,000 was provided for in the Rating Area 2 Unsubsidised Transport budget for the capital costs of this CCTV system. With the cost estimate coming in at \$8,735 more than that approved by Council, there is a funding gap that needs to be bridged.
- 4.10 Given that this installation is anticipated to be a trial for rural security camera effectiveness, it is recommended that the Rating Area 2 2019/20 surplus is used to cover the funding gap of \$8,735.
- 4.11 If the trial is proven to be a success, then a more permanent and appropriate funding regime will need to be explored which may include the creation of targeted rates for the areas benefiting. This will need to be done through the Long Term Plan process and in consultation with the community.
- 4.12 In respect of rural CCTV cameras in general, subsequent to this proposal being considered by the RCB there have been several other requests made to Council by rural based communities wanting CCTV to be installed.
- 4.13 Advanced Security have previously supplied a quote for five locations in the wider Puketapu area. As a comparison with the trial site, those quotes included a standard galvanised 5.5m pole that costs \$2,555 but annual service costs then included hireage of a scissor lift and was a minimum of \$1,910.
- 4.14 For further comparison, site visits and assessments have also been done at Waimarama (quote received for \$28,011), Maraetotara Falls (\$22,156), Ruahapia Road (\$17,534) and Te Awanga (\$19,420). Each assessment included the same four main factors identified above in paragraph 4.2.

#### Attachments:

There are no attachments for this report.

---

## Summary of Considerations - *He Whakarāpopoto Whakaarohanga*

---

### Fit with purpose of Local Government - *E noho hāngai pū ai ki te Rangatōpū-ā-Rohe*

The Council is required to give effect to the purpose of local government as set out in section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. That purpose is to enable democratic local decision-making and action by (and on behalf of) communities, and to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future.

### Link to the Council's Community Outcomes – *Ngā Hononga ki Ngā Putanga ā-Hapori*

This proposal promotes the social wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future.

---

### Māori Impact Statement - *Te Tauākī Kaupapa Māori*

N/A

---

### Sustainability - *Te Toitūtanga*

N/A

---

### Financial considerations - *Ngā Whakaarohanga Ahumoni*

As outlined in the report.

---



---

**Significance and Engagement** - *Te Hiranga me te Tūhonotanga*

---

**Consultation – internal and/or external** - *Whakawhiti Whakaaro-ā-roto / ā-waho*  
N/A

---

**Risks**

---

**Rural Community Board** – *Te Poari Tuawhenua-ā-Hapori*

This matter was previously discussed by the Rural Community Board on 02 March 2020.

---



---

Monday, 7 September 2020

---

Item 7

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*  
**Hastings District Council**  
**Hastings District Rural Community Board**

*Te Rārangi Take*

# Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

---

**Nā:** Angela Atkins, Waste Planning Manager  
**From:** Danny McClure, Solid Waste Operations & Contract Manager

---

**Te Take:**  
**Subject:** Waipatiki Permanent Recycling Facility Request

---

## 1.0 Executive Summary – *Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga*

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek support from the Rural Community Board to install a permanent rural recycling facility at Waipatiki.
- This matter arises from a Waipatiki community request to increase the recycling level of service and is in line with the Joint Waste Management Minimise Plan.

## 2.0 Recommendations – *Ngā Tūtohunga*

- A) That the Rural Community Board receives the report titled Waipatiki Permanent Recycling Facility Request.
- B) That the Board approve the establishment of a rural recycling facility at Waipatiki for a 12 month trial period. The success of the trial will be measured on participation, contamination and illegal dumping at the site.

## 3.0 Background – *Te Horopaki*

- 3.1 Council currently provide a seasonal recycling service for Waipatiki residents and the visitors to the beach for four months of year (over the summer period) in the form a 20ft “Green Bin” six-cell bin with steps on both side of ease of access.

- 3.2 Rural recycling facilities provide a drop off service for common recyclables; glass, plastics, cans, paper and cardboard.
- 3.3 Several requests have been received by Council Officers from the residents in the Waipatiki Community to have access to a recycling service/facility year round. The reasons provided from the community for this are;
- Increased permanent residents in the community, of the 80 properties 23 are permanent residents and there are 60 lifestyle and farming properties within a 20km radius that would also utilise this service.
  - Increase in visitor numbers, both at peak times and throughout the year.
  - Recent closure of the public drop off facility in Onekawa Napier requires northern Hastings District Residents to travel further to another Napier City Council facility (Redcliffe Refuse Transfer Station) – currently there are no Hastings recycling services for residents in this area of the district.

#### 4.0 Discussion – *Te Matapakitanga*

- 4.1 In the 2014/2015 Annual Plan, Council resolved to proceed with the development of rural recycling facilities, looking at a potential eight sites across the district. Since then five permanent sites have been established.
- 4.2 In 2019 a new recycling service contract was procured and this new contract allows for additional sites to be serviced under the contract.
- 4.3 The current annual budget for servicing the five rural recycling sites is \$35,000 pa. There is sufficient funds to cover estimated additional servicing costs in the 20/21 budget for rural recycling.
- 4.4 The bin will be positioned on HDC road reserve, approval will be obtained from the Transportation Manager prior to works commencing. No resource consent is required.
- 4.5 If a larger recycling facility is installed in the Eskdale area, this site may not be required, however this decision would be at least 12 months away from planning stage. The community see a need for the service immediately.

#### 5.0 Options – *Ngā Kōwhiringa*

Option One - Recommended Option - Te Kōwhiringa Tuatahi – Te Kōwhiringa Tūtohunga

- 5.1 Install a rural recycling drop off facility at Waipatiki on the road reserve of Waipatiki Road, opposite the driveway to 529 Waipatiki Road, where the temporary summer bin has been placed for the past 4 years.
- 5.2 The facility will be installed for a 12 month trial period during which time participation, contamination and illegal dumping will be monitored and assessed. This option also allows for the assessment of other possible locations that could serve a broader area of the district in the wider Eskdale area.

Advantages

- Provides a permanent service to residents in the Waipatiki and wider rural community.
- Minimises/mitigates the public leaving recyclables next to toilets, public litter bins and in car parks reducing Council clean-up costs.
- Community to monitor and “own” to ensure the site is looked after.
- Bin provision will be covered using the existing fleet of green bins and with no purchase required.

- The site would not have to be set up/removed annually and would provide continuity or service throughout the year.

#### Disadvantages

- Cost to service increase 50% during off peak times, circa \$1700.00 for 7 months. This would be in addition to the \$3300.00 already allocated to the site.
- Contamination of product within bins with visitors using site/bin as dumping ground for rubbish (as it's unmanned).
- The site may have to be closed down if contamination levels become a problem.

Success of the trial will be assessed on the following points;

- Participation / use of the facility measured through number of times the bin is serviced over the quiet winter period.
- Contamination of recycling material, to be less than 2% at all times.
- No illegal dumping of rubbish at the site.

#### Option Two – Status Quo - Te Kōwhiringa Tuarua – Te Āhuetanga o nāiane

Continue to provide the temporary Green Bin Recycling service for 4-5 months over the busiest period of summer – November through to March.

- Costs to service would remain unchanged at approximately \$3300.00.
- The service operated successfully with few problems as it is currently set up.

## 6.0 Next steps – *Te Anga Whakamua*

6.1 Support for the installation a rural recycling facility at Waipatiki is requested from the Hastings District Rural Community Board.

- If support is received, installation will be undertaken during September and October 2020 with the intention to have the site operational for the Hawke's Bay Anniversary weekend.

### Attachments:

There are no attachments for this report.

---

## Summary of Considerations - *He Whakarāpopoto Whakaarohanga*

---

### Fit with purpose of Local Government - *E noho hāngai pū ai ki te Rangatōpū-ā-Rohe*

The Council is required to give effect to the purpose of local government as set out in section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. That purpose is to enable democratic local decision-making and action by (and on behalf of) communities, and to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future.

### Link to the Council's Community Outcomes – *Ngā Hononga ki Ngā Putanga ā-Hapori*

---

This proposal promotes the local public services wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future supporting a community which wastes less.

### **Māori Impact Statement - *Te Tauākī Kaupapa Māori***

This initiative will have no direct impact on the Maori community.

### **Sustainability - *Te Toitūtanga***

The establishment of a permanent rural recycling facility at Waipatiki aligns with Action 4E of the Joint Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 -2024; Expand recycling drop off stations to communities where feasible.

### **Financial considerations - *Ngā Whakaarohanga Ahumoni***

Additional Installation costs will be an education sign detailing use of the facility. As this service is being undertaken as a 12 month trial, a concrete pad will not be required.

### **Significance and Engagement - *Te Hiranga me te Tūhonotanga***

This decision/report has been assessed under the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy as being not of significance.

### **Consultation – internal and/or external - *Whakawhiti Whakaaro-ā-roto / ā-waho***

Consultation regarding rural recycling facilities was undertaken as part of the 2014/2015 Annual Plan, no further consultation is required.

### **Risks**

Opportunity: to extend rural recycling services in line with action 4E of the Joint Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

REWARD – <i>Te Utu</i>	RISK – <i>Te Tūraru</i>
Increased accessibility to recycling facilities to support the aims and targets of the Joint Waste Management and Minimisation Plan, to increase recycling by 20%.	There is a risk that the site may be subjected to dumping of rubbish or contamination of recyclable material. There is no higher risk at this site than any other rural recycling site. The community will be responsible for the management and oversight of use of a daily basis.  Additional cost to service may exceed existing budget.

### **Rural Community Board – *Te Poari Tuawhenua-ā-Hapori***

This request is being presented to the Rural Community Board for consideration.

---

Monday, 7 September 2020

---

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*  
**Hastings District Council**  
**Hastings District Rural Community Board**

Item 8

*Te Rārangi Take*

# Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

---

*Nā:*  
**From: John Payne, Regulatory Solutions Manager**

---

*Te Take:*  
**Subject: Animal Control Annual Report 2019/2020**

---

## **1.0 Executive Summary – *Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga***

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update the Board on the dog control statistics for the annual Dog Control Report for the year 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020.
- Section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996 requires Council adopt and publish an annual report on the administration of Council's Dog Control Policy and Practises
- 1.2 This report contributes to the purpose of local government by primarily promoting regulatory performance and more specifically through the Council's strategic objective of community safety.

## **2.0 Recommendations – *Ngā Tūtohunga***

That the Board receives the report titled Animal Control Annual Report 2019/2020.

## **3.0 Background – *Te Horopaki***

- 3.1 Annually the Council adopts the animal control statistics Report. The report must include information relating to:
- The number of registered dogs
  - The number and type of dog and dog owner classifications

- The number infringements
- The number and nature of dog related complaints:

#### 4.0 Discussion – *Te Matapakitanga*

- 4.1 The effects of Covid-19 are obvious when analysing some of the data. Complaint numbers are down by 220 despite dog numbers being up. During lockdown dogs were less inclined to roam or bark, however it will be interesting to see if there has been an increase in ACC figures relating to attacks. Research suggests that more than eighty percent of dog attacks are by the victims' family dog. The injury requires medical attention but the incident is not reported to Council.

We continue to see steady growth in the dog population 2.1 percent.

There was an unprecedented spate of stock attacks experienced in the district. This was touched on in the previous report as the attacks started in June 2019. Where dogs were caught, owners identified and there was sufficient evidence to gain a conviction, legal proceedings were undertaken.

Legal costs	\$29,000
Reparation awarded to stock owners	\$8,000
Fines	\$4,200

Reparation in some cases was not ordered because arrangements had been made between the offender and the stock owners' insurance company. There have been 10 destruction orders made, however in some cases the offending dogs were destroyed before the case was prosecuted.

#### 5.0 Options – *Ngā Kōwhiringa*

There are no options with regard to this report as it is information only.

#### 6.0 Next steps – *Te Anga Whakamua*

- 6.1 Once the report is adopted it must be:
- Publicly notified (Website & Newspaper)
  - A copy is sent to the Secretary for Local Government

#### Attachments:

1 [↓](#) Annual Report Animal Control 2019/2020

REG-1-14-20-99

---

## Summary of Considerations - *He Whakarāpopoto Whakaarohanga*

---

### Fit with purpose of Local Government - *E noho hāngai pū ai ki te Rangatōpū-ā-Rohe*

Council is required to give effect to the purpose of local government as set out in section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. That purpose is to enable democratic local decision-making and action by (and on behalf of) communities, and to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future.

---



---

**Link to the Council's Community Outcomes** – *Ngā Hononga ki Ngā Putanga ā-Hāpori*

This proposal promotes regulatory compliance wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future by reducing public nuisance and threats to public health and safety.

---

**Māori Impact Statement** - *Te Tauākī Kaupapa Māori*

N/A

---

**Sustainability** - *Te Toitūtanga*

N/A

---

**Financial considerations** - *Ngā Whakaarohanga Ahumoni*

Nil

---

**Significance and Engagement** - *Te Hiranga me te Tūhonotanga*

This report has been assessed under the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy and does not trigger the threshold of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

---

**Consultation – internal and/or external** - *Whakawhiti Whakaaro-ā-roto / ā-waho*

Not required as the report is information only:

---

**Risks: Legal** - *Ngā Tūraru: Ngā Ture*

N/A

REWARD – <i>Te Utu</i>	RISK – <i>Te Tūraru</i>
[State the benefit, opportunity, innovation of the outcome & whether it benefits; Safety (public/ staff/ contractors), Finances, Service Delivery, Legal compliance, Reputation.]	[State the significant risks or threats (4 or 5 max) to the objective & whether they affect; Safety (public/ staff/ contractors), Finances, Service Delivery, Legal compliance, Reputation.]

---

**Rural Community Board** – *Te Poari Tuawhenua-ā-Hāpori*

Damage to stock from stray dogs.

---

10A Report 2019/2020

**Report on the Administration of  
Hastings District Council's  
Policy and Practices in Relation to the  
Control of Dogs for the year  
1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020**

Pursuant to:  
(Section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996)

REG-1-14-20-99



## 1. Background

The policy is made under section 10 of the Dog Control Act 1996. Council adopted the “Dog Control” Policy 6 August 2009. The policy underwent a review and public consultation in conjunction with the Dogs Bylaw and was submitted to Council for adoption on 25 August 2016. The policy is currently under a five year review in conjunction with the Consolidated Bylaw 2016 as required under section 158 of the Local Government Act 1974 and section 10AA of the Dog Control Act 1996.

The purpose of the policy is to provide a framework for the care and control of dogs throughout Hastings District with regard to:

- a) *“the need to minimise danger, distress and nuisance to the community generally; and*
- b) *the need to avoid the inherent danger in allowing dogs to have uncontrolled access to public places that are frequented by children, whether or not the children are accompanied by adults; and*
- c) *the importance of enabling, to the extent that is practicable, the public (including families) to use streets and public amenities without fear of attack or intimidation by dogs; and*
- d) *the exercise and recreational needs of dogs and their owners”*

### The anticipated outcomes of the policy are:

- 1. Minimising the potential for danger, distress and nuisance to the community from dogs;
- 2. Promoting responsible dog ownership;
- 3. Promoting effective dog control, particularly in public places where children or families are present;
- 4. Minimising the risk of intimidation and attacks by dogs;
- 5. Promoting positive interaction between dog owners and members of the community;
- 6. Providing for the exercise and recreational needs of dogs and their owners.

Section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996 requires Territorial Authorities to publically report each financial year on the administration of their dog control policy and practices.

## 2. Dog Prohibited Areas

Dogs are prohibited from the following areas:

- 1. Hastings District Council Civic Building
- 2. Hastings District Council Public Libraries

3. Hastings District Council Swimming Pools
4. Children's playing areas under the control of Hastings District Council
5. All areas under the control of Hastings District Council set aside for organised games or sports and all other areas zoned as sports parks in the Hastings District
6. Rangaiika Beach at Ocean Beach / Cape Kidnappers.

Prohibited areas are established to prevent conflict with other users, or areas with sensitive ecological value. Very few complaints are received regarding non-compliance as the majority of dog owners are responsible people and comply with the requirements.

### 3 Dog Exercise and Leash Control

There are currently areas where dogs are required to be leashed and areas where they may free run (under control of the owner). Council does not provide specific dog exercise areas. The majority of dog owners are responsible and considerate.

Council has the philosophy that dogs which have easy access to open spaces and are exercised regularly are less likely to display anti-social behaviour such as aggression and excessive barking. To achieve this, there is a limited number of dog prohibited areas and leash control areas other than areas of high public usage or biodiversity significance.

### 4 Dog Aggression

A focus is on encouraging dog owners to understand the true nature of dogs, to recognise the potential that all dogs have and to comply with their obligations under the Dog Control legislation, in particular Section 5(f) –

*to take all reasonable steps to ensure that the dog does not injure, endanger, intimidate, or otherwise cause distress to any person.*

All complaints of aggression reported to Council are given priority and are thoroughly investigated. Action ranges from written warning, infringements, menacing dog classification, dangerous dog classification or prosecution.

### 5 Dog Control Statistics

Year	% increase	Registered	Impound	Claimed
<b>19/20</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>12,769</b>	<b>947</b>	<b>69.8%</b>
18/19	1.6%	12,640	1,131	64%

NB: Impounded does not include dogs relinquished

The increase in the number of dogs is simply in line with the increase in growth in the area.

The decrease in the number of impounded dogs is also attributed to Covid-19.

The claim rate is a reflection of the number of dogs suitable for adoption.

<b>Complaints</b>	<b>18/19</b>	<b>19/20</b>
Person Attacked	52	<b>67</b>
Person Rushed	90	<b>129</b>
Animal Attacked	135	<b>147</b>
Roaming	2,033	<b>1,701</b>
Barking	604	<b>487</b>
Fouling	2	<b>6</b>
Other	262	<b>194</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,178</b>	<b>2954</b>

Complaint numbers are down however complaints of aggression are slightly up. The Person attacked & rushed records can fluctuate without any justified reason.

Animal attack records reflect an unprecedented spate of stock attacks experienced in the district from July 2019 to June 2020.

Roaming dog and barking dog complaints are down because of Covid-19

Other complaints are made up of several miscellaneous topics like unleashed dogs in leash control areas, reported unregistered dogs, dangerous dogs, unmuzzled etc.

<b>Owner Classification</b>	<b>18/19</b>	<b>19/20</b>
Probationary owners s21	0	<b>0</b>
Disqualified owners s25	5	<b>9</b>
Menacing s33A 1b(i) – (Behaviour)	27	<b>25</b>
Menacing s33A 1b(ii) – (Breed Characteristics)	0	<b>0</b>
Menacing s33C – (Government listed breeds)	190	<b>181</b>
Dangerous s31 (1)(a) – (Conviction under s57)	0	<b>1</b>
Dangerous s31 (1)(b) – (Sworn evidence)	11	<b>10</b>
Dangerous s31 (1)(c) – (Owner admits in writing)	22	<b>19</b>

	<b>Infringements</b>	<b>Prosecutions</b>
<b>19/20</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>18/19</b>	691	15

As mentioned above, there was an unprecedented spate of stock attacks. Several of these incidents resulted in summary prosecution involving multiple dogs and multiple offences. Of the 49 charges there were only 19 dogs involved and 15 people were prosecuted.

<b>Offence</b>	Attack Stock	Attack Person	Rushing	Failing to Control	Unreg	Unmuz
<b>Number</b>	13	4	3	19	9	1

Infringement offences are down as staff shortage and Covid-19 prevented processing unregistered dogs, hence the lower percentage of registration compliance.

### Registration categories

Category	18/19	19/20
Urban	6,828	<b>7,126</b>
Rural	6,524	<b>6,518</b>
Other	16	<b>16</b>
Total	13,368	<b>13,660</b>

## 6 Fees

Dog registration fees are set by Council resolution.

Dog registration fees, fines and impound fees are used to fund dog control.

A reduced dog registration fee is offered to those who register their dogs before 1 August and a reduced fee is offered to those owners on the Selected Owner Scheme.

27% of the dog control activity is funded from the general fund in recognition of the public good benefit.

## 7 Education

Education is offered to all offenders by way of one-on-one consultation and a series of educational brochures are available.

Dog bite prevention and responsible dog ownership addresses are undertaken free of charge to schools, kindergartens and any other community groups. This training is also offered contractors and internally to HDC staff.

A copy of Council's dog control policy is available on our website together with other educational material.



---

Monday, 7 September 2020

---

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*  
**Hastings District Council**  
**Hastings District Rural Community Board**

Item 9

*Te Rārangi Take*

# Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

---

*Nā:*  
**From: John Payne, Regulatory Solutions Manager**

---

*Te Take:* **Five Year Review Hastings District Council Consolidated Bylaw**  
*Subject:* **2016 Chapter 3 Dog Control & Dog Control Policy**

---

## **1.0 Executive Summary – *Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga***

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek feedback from the Board on the proposed minor changes to the Dog Control Bylaw and Dog Control Policy.
- 1.2 This report contributes to the purpose of local government by primarily promoting performance of regulatory functions for the purpose of reducing public nuisance and more specifically through Council's strategic objective of community safety through appropriate bylaw controls.
- 1.3 This report concludes by recommending that the report be received and that the Community Board discuss the matters raised and provide comment back to staff.

## **2.0 Recommendations – *Ngā Tūtohunga***

- A) That the Board receives the report titled Five Year Review Hastings District Council Consolidated Bylaw 2016 Chapter 3 Dog Control & Dog Control Policy.
- B) That the Board discuss the matters raised in the report and provide comment back to staff.

## **3.0 Background – *Te Horopaki***

- 3.1 Section 158 of the Local Government Act 1974 requires that a local authority must review a bylaw made under the Local Government Act 1974 no later than 5 years after the bylaw was made. The

Dog Control Bylaw was formulated in 2016 to form the new Hastings District Council Consolidated Bylaw 2016. The bylaw is therefore due for review.

3.2 In addition to the bylaw review, section 10AA of the Dog Control Act 1996 requires the local authority must review its policy if the bylaw implementing the policy requires review.

3.3 Attached is a copy of:

- Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Bylaw 2016 Dog Control, and
- The Dog Control Policy 2016, and
- Miscellaneous Bylaws

#### 4.0 Discussion – *Te Matapakitanga*

4.1 Staff have reviewed the current Dog Control Bylaw and the only changes proposed are:

- To amend the time restriction for dog exercise in Ebbett Park to 5.00pm to 8.00am all year round.

##### Comment

As part of the adoption of the Raureka Parks Management Plan Council agreed to support an amendment to the bylaw regarding the provision of dog exercise areas within Ebbett Park.

- Change the description of the off leash area of Keirunga Gardens to - along the extent of the western boundary walkway accessed from Tanner Street, and including the open grass areas at the southern and northern ends of the Park.

##### Comment

This description is in line with the current signage in the Gardens.

4.2 Staff have reviewed the current Dog Control Policy and the following changes are proposed:

- Policy 4 – amend the Ebbett Park and Keirunga Gardens changes as proposed in the bylaw; and
- Policy 10 – Dog adoption – add the word ‘potential’

##### Comment

Dogs are a product of their present environment, temperament is a snap shot of ‘now’. Potential behaviour should be factored into the evaluation.

- Add Clause 10.2 No dogs will be released for research, testing or teaching purposes; and
- New Policy 13 – Add a clause about chained dogs

##### Comment

Council does not encourage restraining dogs by means of a chain or tether as a permanent means of controlling a dog.

##### ***Explanation***

Chaining or tethering a dog poses serious threats to its physical, psychological and emotional wellbeing. Research confirms that chained dogs are more aggressive. Chained or tethered dogs can feel threatened, fearful and frustrated, causing them to become antisocial and aggressive.

Other reasons why you should not tether your dog for long periods:



- Without the physical barrier of a cage, tethered dogs can feel threatened
- Natural instincts of survival, fight and flight are disengaged
- Can easily tip over their water container
- Have been known to die from strangulation
- Can get easily tangled
- More likely to get parasites, disease, injuries and infections
- Lunging or pulling against the chain can cause abrasions to the neck
- Forced to defecate and urinate in the same place they sleep, eat and run
- Barking continuously from boredom and frustration

## 5.0 Options

Not Applicable

## 6.0 Next steps – *Te Anga Whakamua*

6.1 The next steps are:

- Once a draft bylaw is developed incorporating all the proposed changes of the Consolidated Bylaw, a workshop will be held with Council 22 September 2020.
- The draft will then be sent for a legal review before being reported to Council 1 December 2020 to adopt the draft for public consultation.
- A copy of the finalised proposals will be sent to the Chairman and members of the Rural Community Board as part of the public submission process.

### Time Line

Notify District Planning and Bylaws Subcommittee of the process	12 June 2020 <b>Memo dated 18 June 2020</b>
Receive feedback/information from (internal stakeholders)	10 July 2020
Notify HBRC, Police, Community Groups, and Business Associations.	1 July 2020 Feed Back by 31 July 2020 <b>Letter dated 1 July 2020</b>
<del>Report to District Planning and Bylaws Subcommittee</del>	<del>12 August 2020</del> <b>Report 12 August 2020</b>
Notify Rural Community Board	7 September 2020 <b>Report 7 Sept 2020</b>
Council Workshop	22 September 2020
Legal review & Statement of Proposal	15 October 2020
Report to Council	1 December 2020
Advice out with rates –	Post out 29 Jan 2021
Submission forms to: <a href="http://www.myvoicemychoice.co.nz">http://www.myvoicemychoice.co.nz</a> Hastings Customer Service Centre Flaxmere, Hastings and Havelock North Libraries	21 January 2021
Newspaper advertisement	27 & 30 January 2021
Public consultation opening date	1 February 2021
Public consultation closing date	5 March 2021
Staff comment on public submissions	12 March 2021
Submissions heard by Council	April 2021
Report to Council for final adoption	August 2021

**Attachments:**

1↓	Review Copy Dog Control Bylaw RCB	CG-16-7-00017
2↓	Review Copy Dog Control Policy RCB	CG-16-7-00018
3↓	Miscellaneous Bylaws RCB	CG-16-7-00016

---

## Summary of Considerations - *He Whakarāpopoto Whakaarohanga*

---

### **Fit with purpose of Local Government - *E noho hāngai pū ai ki te Rangatōpū-ā-Rohe***

The Council is required to give effect to the purpose of local government as set out in section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. That purpose is to enable democratic local decision-making and action by (and on behalf of) communities, and to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future.

### **Link to the Council's Community Outcomes – *Ngā Hononga ki Ngā Putanga ā-Hapori***

This proposal promotes the performance of regulatory functions for the purpose of reducing public nuisance and threats to public health and safety through appropriate bylaw controls and for the wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future.

---

### **Māori Impact Statement - *Te Tauākī Kaupapa Māori***

No known impacts for mana whenua / iwi / tangata whenua above and or beyond the general community population.

---

### **Sustainability - *Te Toitūtanga***

The bylaw is being reviewed after the initial five years. It is not required to be reviewed again until after 10 years (2031).

---

### **Financial considerations - *Ngā Whakaarohanga Ahumoni***

The bylaw process will incur legal fees for legal review. These will be sourced from existing Planning & Regulatory budgets.

---

### **Significance and Engagement - *Te Hiranga me te Tūhonotanga***

This decision/report has been assessed under the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy as being of Moderate significance.

---

### **Consultation – internal and/or external - *Whakawhiti Whakaaro-ā-roto / ā-waho***

The proposed/amended bylaws must follow the Special consultative procedure required under section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002.

---

---

**Risks: Legal - Ngā Tūrarū: Ngā Ture**

The bylaw is required to undergo a five year review under Section 158 of the Local Government Act 1974: Council risks the existing bylaw being unenforceable if it fails to go through this process.

REWARD – <i>Te Utu</i>	RISK – <i>Te Tūrarū</i>
[State the benefit, opportunity, innovation of the outcome & whether it benefits; Safety (public/ staff/ contractors), Finances, Service Delivery, Legal compliance, Reputation.]	[State the significant risks or threats (4 or 5 max) to the objective & whether they affect; Safety (public/ staff/ contractors), Finances, Service Delivery, Legal compliance, Reputation.]

---

**Rural Community Board – *Te Poari Tuawhenua-ā-Hapori***

The Rural Community Board will have an interest in the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy, however the Board will also have an opportunity to submit to the public consultation process:

---



**Hastings District Council**

**Consolidated Bylaw**

TRIM Ref: LEG-02-3-20-449

Page 1

Item 9

Attachment 1

INDEX

CHAPTER 3 DOG CONTROL ..... 3

TRIM Ref: LEG-02-3-20-449

Page 2

Item 9

Attachment 1

**CHAPTER 3 DOG CONTROL****3.1 Authority**

3.1.1 This part of the Bylaw is made under s 20 of the Dog Control Act 1996

**3.2 Definitions**

3.2.1 In this part of the Bylaw

"at large" means that the dog is not under leash control when required under this bylaw"

"DCA" means the Dog Control Act 1996

"dog exercise area" means an area within the district where dogs may be exercised off leash and includes the areas listed in Schedule A to this chapter and any other area of the district designated by the Council, by publicly notified resolution as a dog exercise area.

"dog prohibited area" means an area within the district listed in Schedule B to this chapter, and any other area of the district designated by the Council by publicly notified resolution as an area prohibited to dogs

"leash controlled area" means:

- any public place or private way within the urban area of the district; or
- any park, reserve, beach, walkway or cycleway within the rural area of the district; or
- the beach front of the Ocean Beach settlement north to the surf club during daylight saving hours between 7.30am and 7.30pm and during the remainder of the year between 7am and 6pm; or
- the beach front at Waipatiki Beach Settlement, on the seaward side of the reserve, during daylight saving hours between 7.30am and 7.30pm and during the remainder of the year between 10.00am and 4.00pm; and

not otherwise being an area or place referred to in Schedules A or B to this Chapter)

"neutered" means spayed or castrated

"owner" has the same meaning as in s 2 of DCA

"private way" has the same meaning as in s 315(1) of the Local Government Act 1974

"road" has the meaning given to it in Chapter 1 but extends to include a state highway or a motorway

"special purpose dog" means all working dogs other than dogs kept principally for the purposes of herding or driving stock

"working dog" has the same meaning as in s 2 of DCA

**3.3 Dog prohibited areas**

3.3.1 An owner must not allow a dog to enter, or take a dog into, a dog prohibited area.

3.3.2 Nothing in clause 3.3.1 applies to the owner of a special purpose dog.

**3.4 Leash control**

3.4.1 An owner must keep a dog under leash control at all times when:

- (a) within a leash controlled area
- (b) the dog is in some other place and is causing or is likely to cause danger, distress or nuisance to a person or another animal

3.4.2 Nothing in clause 3.4.1 (a) applies to the owner of a special purpose dog or to the owner of a dog which is kept solely or principally for the purposes of herding or driving stock when the dog is engaged in that activity.

3.4.3 An owner must not leave a dog unattended within, or on the open tray of, a vehicle without ensuring that the dog is restrained by a leash, or some other effective means, from leaving the vehicle and lunging or snapping at people passing by the vehicle.

**3.5 Limiting the number of dogs kept**

3.5.1 A person must not keep, or allow to be kept, more than two dogs on any premises within the urban area, without an approval.

3.5.2 Nothing in clause 3.5.1 applies to a dog under the age of 3 months.

**3.6 Dog fouling**

3.6.1 An owner of a dog which fouls in a public place, private way or on premises which are not occupied by the owner must immediately remove the faecal matter and carry it away for sanitary disposal.

3.6.2 An owner who takes a dog outside the owner's premises must at all times carry a suitable receptacle to enable compliance with clause 3.6.1.

3.6.3 For the avoidance of doubt, placing a dog's faeces in a securely tied plastic or leak proof bag in a disposal bin or a litter bin provided in a public place by the Council will satisfy the owner's obligation under clause 3.6.1.

**3.7 Bitch in season**

3.7.1 An owner of every bitch in season must keep it confined, but adequately exercised, while in season.

**3.8. Impounding and neutering**

3.8.1 A dog found at large in breach of this bylaw may be impounded by the Council.

3.8.2 The Council may give written notice to an owner of a dog which has been impounded by the Council under clause 3.8.1 on more than 3 occasions within a continuous period of 24 months, requiring that dog to be neutered at the owner's expense (whether or not the owner of the dog has been convicted of an offence against sections 52A or 53 of the Dog Control Act 1996).

3.8.3 An owner given notice under clause 3.8.2 must produce to ~~the~~ Council, within one month after service of the notice a certificate issued by a registered veterinarian that the dog has been neutered.

3.8.4 An owner who fails to comply with clauses 3.8.2 and 3.8.3 commits an offence under this bylaw.

**3.9 Care and accommodation of dogs**

3.9.1 An owner of a dog which is suffering from a communicable disease or infection must ensure that the dog is properly treated for the disease or complaint and, except for taking the dog for treatment, must ensure that the dog is confined to the owner's premises while it is so affected.

3.9.2 An owner of a dog must ensure that it is accommodated in a manner, and in a location, on the premises whereby the presence of the dog does not give rise to noises (other than barking) or smells which are a nuisance or annoyance to the occupier of adjoining premises.

TRIM Ref: LEG-02-3-20-449

Page 5

Item 9

Attachment 1



## Schedule A to Chapter 3

## Dog Exercise areas

**Havelock North**

- Tainui, Tanner and Hikanui Reserves
- Tauroa Road Reserve
- Te Mata and Arataki Road Reserve
- Kingsgate Reserve from Te Mata Road to Reeve Drive, Ritchie Place, Fulford Place and Durham Drive
- The banks of the Karamu Stream, from a point adjacent to the southern most edge of Anderson Park, Havelock North to the vehicle over bridge on Havelock Road
- The southern boundary walkway of Keirunga Gardens on Tanner Street, Havelock North
- Te Mata Peak Park
- James Cook Street Reserve
- Palmbrook Reserve

**Commented [JRP1]:** A submission was received to change the description of the off leash area of Keirunga Gardens to – along the extent of the western boundary walkway accessed from Tanner Street, and including the open grass areas at the southern and northern ends of the Park.

**Comment**  
The description is more in line with the current signage in the Gardens

**Hastings**

- Karamu Road South, from Pattison Road south to Murdoch Road
- Ebbett Park during daylight saving hours between 7.30pm and 7.00am the following day, and between 6.00pm and 7.00am the following day during the remainder of the year.
- Duke Street Reserve.
- Pakowhai Country Park.

**Commented [JRP2]:** A submission was received to change the timing to 5.00pm to 8.00am all year round

**Comment**  
As part of the adoption of the Raureka Parks Management Plan Council agreed to support an amendment to the bylaw regarding the provision of dog exercise areas within Ebbett Park

**Flaxmere**

- Portsmouth Road, from Wilson Road, west to the end of Portsmouth Road
- The Flaxmere Green Belt to the west of Tarbet Street, Arklow Place and Frobisher Street between Kirkwood Road and Flaxmere Avenue.

**Haumoana and Te Awanga**

The Haumoana-Te Awanga coastal beach front area from the mouth of the Tukituki River south to the boundary of the Clifton No. 2 camp, Te Awanga, excluding the beach front between numbers 3 and 41 Clifton Road Haumoana.

**Waimarama and Ocean Beach**

- The beach front of the Ocean Beach settlement north to the surf club during daylight saving hours between 7.30pm and 7.30am the following day, and 6pm and 7am the following day during the remainder of the year
- Ocean Beach north of the surf life saving club to 100m south of the predator proof fence
- Waimarama Beach north to the Puhokio Stream river mouth during daylight saving hours between 7.30pm and 7.30am the following day, and during the remainder of the year 6pm and 7am the following day
- Waimarama Beach north of the Puhokio Stream river mouth to Pututaranui Point at any time

**Whirinaki and Eskdale**

- The North Shore and Whirinaki to Tangoio Beach road reserve
- Eskdale Park along the southern or right-hand side of, and to the end of the park driveway.

**Waipatiki Beach**

The beach front of Waipatiki Beach Settlement, coast-wards of the reserve, during daylight savings hours between 7:30pm and 7:30am the following day, and during the remainder of the year 4:00pm to 10:00am the following day  
Wapatiki beach north and south of the area referred to above

TRIM Ref: LEG-02-3-20-449

Page 7

Schedule B to Chapter 3

Prohibited Areas

- 1. The Hastings District Council Civic Building.
- 2. Public libraries.
- 3. Swimming pools and paddling pools.
- 4. Children's playing areas.
- 5. Sports fields.
- 6. Rangaiika Beach at Ocean Beach/Cape Kidnappers.

|

# DOGS POLICY 2021

(Made under s 10 of the Dog Control Act 1996)



LEG-02-3-20-447

Item 9

Attachment 2

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to provide a framework for the care and control of dogs throughout Hastings District. The policy is made under s-10 of the Dog Control Act 1996. Under s10(4) the Council is required when adopting a policy to have regard to:

- “(a) the need to minimise danger, distress, and nuisance to the community generally; and*
- (b) the need to avoid the inherent danger in allowing dogs to have uncontrolled access to public places that are frequented by children, whether or not the children are accompanied by adults; and*
- (c) the importance of enabling, to the extent that is practicable, the public (including families) to use streets and public amenities without fear of attack or intimidation by dogs; and*
- (d) the exercise and recreational needs of dogs and their owners.”*

The anticipated outcomes of this policy are:

1. Minimising the potential for danger, distress, and nuisance to the community from dogs
2. Promoting responsible dog ownership
3. Promoting effective dog control, particularly in public places where children or families are present
4. Minimising the risk of intimidation and attacks by dogs
5. Promoting positive interaction between dog owners and members of the community
6. Providing for the exercise and recreational needs of dogs and their owners.

## POLICIES

### **POLICY 1 – Nature and Application of Bylaws**

1.1 Council will make and enforce bylaws for the following matters covered by this policy:

- Dog prohibited areas (Policy 2)
- Leash control (Policy 3)
- Dog exercise Areas (Policy 4)
- Limiting the number of dogs kept (Policy 6.1 )
- Dog fouling (Policy 6.2)

LEG-02-3-20-447

- Confining bitches in season (Policy 6.3)

#### **Explanation**

Council may make Bylaws in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002 and Dog Control Act 1996. These bylaws give legal powers necessary to implement and enforce the Dogs Policy within Hastings District.

### **POLICY 2 – Dog Prohibited Areas**

2.1 The Council will make a bylaw prohibiting dogs from the following areas:

1. The Hastings District Council Civic Building.
2. Public libraries.
3. Swimming pools and paddling pools.
4. Children's playing areas.
5. Sports fields.
6. Rangaiika Beach at Ocean Beach/Cape Kidnappers.

#### **Explanation**

Dogs are prohibited from areas where the presence of dogs is likely to interfere with the use of public amenities or are frequented by children or are areas of high ecological sensitivity.

### **POLICY 3 – Leash Control**

3.1 The Council will make a bylaw which requires that dogs be under leash control:

- in all public places and private ways in the urban areas of the district and in parks, reserves, beaches walkways and cycle ways in the rural area which are not otherwise designated as a dog exercise area under the bylaw and
- in any other place if the dog is causing or is likely to cause danger, distress or nuisance to a person or another animal.

#### **Explanation**

Uncontrolled dogs can have a significant impact on the community. Leash control of dogs assists to minimise danger, distress and nuisance to the community generally and to achieve the other matters in s-10(4)(b) and (c) of the Dog Control Act 1996 without affecting the exercise and recreational needs of dogs and their owners.

LEG-02-3-20-447

Allowing dogs to roam without owner control contributes to:

- Dog aggression, resulting in fear and intimidation of the public
- Faeces contamination of public places
- Traffic hazards
- Stock worrying
- Dog fights
- Unwanted puppies
- The spread of disease
- Increased level of complaints requiring investigation

The infringement penalties under the Dog Control Act 1996 are substantial.

Infringement fees for offences relevant to this policy are set by Parliament:

- |   |       |
|---|-------|
| • Failure to carry a leash - s54A                           | \$100 |
| • Dog not controlled or confined on its own property – s52A | \$200 |
| • Dog not under control - s53(1)                            | \$200 |
| • Dog in a public place in contravention of bylaw – s20(5)  | \$300 |
| • Dangerous or menacing dog at large – s32(2) & s33EC(1)    | \$300 |

#### **POLICY 4 – Dog Exercise Areas**

4.1 The Council will make a bylaw allowing the exercise of dogs off leash in the areas listed below. Two of the areas are time limited, depending on the time of the year:

##### **Havelock North**

- Tainui, Tanner and Hikanui Reserves
- Tauroa Road Reserve
- Te Mata and Arataki Road Reserve
- Kingsgate Reserve from Te Mata Road to Reeve Drive, Ritchie Place, Fulford Place and Durham Drive
- The banks of the Karamu Stream, from a point adjacent to the southern most edge of Anderson Park, Havelock North to the vehicle over bridge on Havelock Road
- The southern boundary walkway of Keirunga Gardens on Tanner Street, Havelock North
- Te Mata Peak Road and Te Mata Peak Park
- James Cook Street Reserve
- Palmbrook Reserve

##### **Hastings**

- Karamu Road South, from Pattison Road south to Murdoch Road
- Ebbett Park during daylight saving hours between 7.30pm and 7.00am the following day, and between 6.00pm and 7.00am the following day during the remainder of the year.

LEG-02-3-20-447

**Commented [JRP1]:** A submission was received to provide a better description of the off leash area of Keirunga Gardens.

Keirunga Gardens, Havelock North, along the extent of the western boundary walkway accessed from Tanner Street, and including the open grass areas at the southern and northern ends of the Park.

**Commented [JRP2]:** A submission was received to change the time from 7.30pm to 7.00am to 5.00pm to 8.00am

##### **Comment**

As part of the adoption of the Raureka Parks Management Plan Council agreed to support an amendment to the bylaw regarding the provision of dog exercise areas within Ebbett Park

- Duke Street Reserve.
- Pakowhai Country Park.

#### Flaxmere

- [Along](#) Portsmouth Road, from Wilson Road west to the end of Portsmouth Road
- The Flaxmere Green Belt to the west of Tarbet Street, Arklow Place and Frobisher Street between Kirkwood Road and Flaxmere Avenue.

#### Haumoana and Te Awanga

The Haumoana-Te Awanga coastal beach front area from the mouth of the Tukituki River south to the boundary of the Clifton No. 2 camp, Te Awanga, excluding the beach front between numbers 3 and 41 Clifton Road Haumoana.

#### Waimarama and Ocean Beach

- The beach front of the Ocean Beach settlement north to the surf club during daylight saving hours between 7.30pm and 7.30am the following day, and 6pm and 7am the following day during the remainder of the year
- Ocean Beach north of the surf lifesaving club to 100m south of the predator proof fence
- Waimarama Beach north to the Puhokio Stream river mouth during daylight saving hours between 7.30pm and 7.30am the following day, and during the remainder of the year 6pm and 7am the following day
- Waimarama Beach north of the Puhokio Stream river mouth to Pututaranui Point at any time

#### Whirinaki and Eskdale

- The North Shore and Whirinaki to Tangoio Beach road reserve
- Eskdale Park along the southern or right-hand side of, and to the end of the park driveway.

#### Waipatiki Beach

- The beach front of Waipatiki Beach Settlement, coast-wards of the reserve, during daylight savings hours between 7:30pm and 7:30am the following day, and during the remainder of the year 4:00pm to 10:00am the following day
- Wapatiki beach north and south of the area referred to above

#### **Explanation**

There are many areas where dogs can be exercised in the district. Council accepts that the majority of dog owners are responsible people. Dogs are able to be exercised off a leash in all public places in the district other than the prohibited areas and leash control areas.

LEG-02-3-20-447



**POLICY 5 – Menacing Dogs**

- 5.1 The Council will require that all dogs classified by it as menacing under sections 33A or 33C of the Dog Control Act 1996 be neutered under section 33E(1)(b) of the Dog Control Act 1996.
- 5.2 The Council will require that dogs classified as menacing under section 33A or 33C of the Dog Control Act 1996 by any other territorial authority are required to be neutered under section 33EB(2) of the Dog Control Act 1996 if the dog is transferred to the Hastings District.

**Explanation**

Section 33A(1)(b) of the Dog Control Act 1996 allows Council to classify dogs as menacing if it considers the dog *"may pose a threat to any person, stock, poultry, domestic animal, or protected wildlife because of:*

- (i) *Any observed or reported behaviour of the dog.*
- (ii) *Characteristics typically associated with the dog's breed or type."*

Section 33C of the Dog Control Act 1996 requires that Council must classify the breeds or types of dogs listed in Schedule 4 of the Dog Control Act 1996 as menacing. Currently those breeds or types are:

**Breeds:**

Brazilian Fila  
Dogo Argentino  
Japanese Tosa  
Perro de Presa Canario

**Type:**

American Pit Bull Terrier

Council believes it is appropriate that dogs classified as menacing be required to be neutered. Neutered dogs appear to feature less in reported dog bite statistics.

**POLICY 6 – Other matters**

- 6.1 The Council will make a bylaw which limits the number of dogs over the age of 3 months that may be kept on any premises within the urban areas of the district.
- 6.2 The Council will make a bylaw which requires a dog owner to remove, carry away and dispose of in a sanitary manner, any faeces which may be left in a public place, private way or other premises not occupied that owner.
- 6.3 The Council will make a bylaw which requires the owner of a bitch in season to keep it confined, but properly exercised, while in season.

LEG-02-3-20-447

**Explanation**

Minimising nuisance to the community generally is one of the matters to which the Council must have regard under s 10(4) of the Dog Control Act 1996. Each of the matters covered by this policy are addressed to that issue:

- The more dogs on an urban property the greater the potential for escape, complaints about barking and complaints about nuisance caused by smell and flies;
- The fouling of public places by dog faeces is a general community nuisance issue. It is also a public health issue, arising from the fouling of footpaths and sports fields and the insanitary disposal of dog faeces;
- If bitches in season are allowed to roam freely there is increased risk of aggressive behaviour from any male dogs which are also roaming at the same time. Many people find the sight of dogs coupling in public places to be offensive. If bitches remain confined the risk of unplanned pregnancies is largely removed. Again this policy is aimed at minimising nuisance to the community.

**POLICY 7 - Fees**

- 7.1 Dog control fees will be set by Council resolution having regard to the levels of service in the Council's Long Term Plan and the costs actually incurred by the Council to provide the dog control function.
- 7.2 Dog registration fees will be set based on the location where the dog is normally kept. Fees for dogs kept in the urban area will be higher than for dogs kept in the rural area.
- 7.3 The proportion of the funding of Dog Control operations to be borne by rates, and the proportion to be borne by dog owners will be determined based on a public and private benefit assessment made by the Council.
- 7.4 Pound fees will be set to recover costs and encourage retrieval of impounded dogs.
- 7.5 Pound fees will be increased for any subsequent impounding of that same dog to impose a greater penalty element.
- 7.6 Sustenance charges will be set to recover all the costs of feeding and care.
- 7.7 A lesser dog registration fee will be offered to those who register their dogs before 1 August.
- 7.8 A reduced dog registration fee will be offered to owners approved under the Selected Owner Policy.

**Explanation**

The dog control fees reflect the costs of the dog control service, less a small element of public good which is subsidised by rate funding.

LEG-02-3-20-447

Because the majority of the work undertaken by the Dog Control staff occurs in urban areas, it is considered fair and reasonable that a greater cost is carried by those dog owners.

Impounding fees and sustenance charges are user-pays charges and lie with the owner of the dog. These fees will not be subsidised by ratepayers.

### **POLICY 8 - Public Education**

- 8.1 Council will encourage responsible dog ownership through education programmes and seminars which will be particularly targeted at dog owners and schools. Dog owners will be encouraged to attend puppy socialisation and dog obedience courses.
- 8.2 Media publicity and Council's website will be used to promote public awareness of dog registration obligations, this policy and the Dog Control Bylaw.
- 8.3 Counselling and consultation will be undertaken with alleged offenders by dog control staff.

#### **Explanation**

A strong focus is placed on providing dog owners with the necessary knowledge to better manage their dogs. An education focus is a crucial first line approach to compliance, however there are some instances where enforcement action is required.

Through public and school education, people will be given the knowledge to deal with some of the situations and nuisances that they may come in contact with, including advice on "bite prevention". That education may also lead to a more responsible attitude towards dog ownership in the future.

### **POLICY 9 – Enforcement**

- 9.1 Council will actively enforce the statutory obligations of dog owners under the Dog Control Act and under the Dog Control Bylaw. When offences are committed infringement notices and/or prosecutions will be commenced of dogs which have been classified as menacing under the Dog Control Act 1996.
- 9.2 The following infringements fees are set under the Dog Control Act 1996. Council has no discretion to alter these fees:

Offence	Penalty
Wilful obstruction of a Dog Control Officer	\$750
Failure or refusal to supply information or providing false particulars	\$750
Failure to supply information or providing false particulars about a dog	\$750
Failure to comply with any Dog Control Bylaw	\$300

LEG-02-3-20-447

Failure to undertake education programme or obedience course	\$300
Failure to comply with obligations of probationary owner	\$750
Failure to comply with the effects of disqualification	\$750
Failure to comply with requirements of dangerous dog classification	\$300
Fraudulent sale or transfer of a dangerous dog	\$500
Failure to comply with requirements of menacing dog classification	\$300
Failure to advise person of muzzle and leashing requirements s33F(3)	\$100
Failure to implant a microchip transponder in dog	\$300
False statement relating to dog registration	\$750
Falsely notifying death of dog	\$750
Failure to register dog	\$300
Fraudulent procurement or attempt to procure replacement dog registration label or disc	\$500
Failure to advise change of dog ownership	\$100
Failure to advise change of address	\$100
Removal, swapping, or counterfeiting of registration label or disc	\$500
Failure to keep dog controlled or confined	\$200
Failure to keep dog under control	\$200
Failure to provide proper care and attention, to supply proper and sufficient food, water, and shelter, and to provide adequate exercise	\$300
Failure to carry leash in public	\$100
Failure to comply with barking dog abatement notice	\$200
Allowing a known dangerous dog at large unmuzzled or unleashed	\$300
Failure to advise person of muzzle and leashing requirements s62(5)	\$100
Releasing dog from custody	\$750

### **POLICY 10 - Dog Adoption**

- 10.1 The adoption of any dog from the Animal Welfare Centre will be subject to:
- the dog remaining unclaimed more than seven days after impounding;
  - the dog having a suitable temperament/potential for adoption and being healthy, neutered, vaccinated, wormed, flea treated, registered and micro-chipped;
  - approval of the new owner by the Council;
  - Payment of an adoption fee.

#### **Explanation**

LEG-02-3-20-447

**Commented [JRP3]:** Add the word potential

#### **Comment**

Dogs are a product of their present environment, accordingly temperament is a snap shot of 'now'. Potential behaviour should be factored into the evaluation.

**Commented [JRP4]:** Add 10.2 No dogs will be released for research, testing or teaching purposes.

#### **Comment**

Although this is the normal practise it is considered appropriate to include it in the policy

The Dog Control Act 1996 allows Council to sell, destroy or otherwise dispose of an impounded, unclaimed dog after the expiration of seven days.

Adoption fees will be set to recover the costs incurred under Policy 10.1(b), without deterring purchasers.

### **POLICY 11 - Unwanted Dogs**

- 11.1 Council may accept unwanted dogs into the pound for disposal either by adoption or by euthanasia subject to a payment of the fee for the service

#### **Explanation**

This policy is intended to prevent the release of unwanted dogs into the community, or to solve a problem where the owner is having difficulties managing or caring for the dog. If euthanasia is the only option for disposal owners will be encouraged to use veterinary practices in the first instance.

### **POLICY 12 - Selected Owner Policy**

- 12.1 Dog owners who demonstrate through a dog ownership scheme run by the Council (the Selected Owner Scheme) that they are responsible owners will receive a reduction in registration fees payable for their dogs. The Selected Owner Scheme is not available to:

- An owner of a dangerous dog
- A dog owner who does not complete the requirements of the scheme and/or pay the scheme fee before 31 March in each year;
- A dog owner who has been disqualified under policy 12.2 within the preceding two registration years

- 12.2 A dog owner will be disqualified from membership under the Selected Owner Policy immediately upon the occurrence of any of the following events:

- The owner is convicted of an offence under the Dog Control Act 1996 or the Dog Control Bylaw, or
- The owner is convicted of an offence under the Animal Welfare Act 1999 in respect of a dog, or
- A dog belonging to the owner is impounded, or
- A dog belonging to the owner is the subject of more than one complaint, which upon investigation by the Council is found to be justified, in any registration year, or
- A dog belonging to the owner remains unregistered after the penalty date in any registration year.

#### **Explanation**

LEG-02-3-20-447

Owners who can demonstrate that they are responsible dog owners should be rewarded by a reduction in dog registration fees.

#### Conservation Controlled Dog Areas and National Parks

There are currently no controlled dog or open dog areas under section 26ZS of the Conservation Act or national parks constituted under the National Parks Act 1980 in the Hastings District.

**Commented [JRP5]:** Add Policy 13 and explanation - Tethering of Dogs

Council does not encourage restraining dogs by means of a chain or tether as a permanent means of controlling a dog.

#### Explanation

Chaining or tethering a dog poses serious threats to a dogs physical, psychological and emotional wellbeing. Research confirms that chained dogs are more aggressive. Chained or tethered dogs can feel threatened, fearful and frustrated, causing them to become antisocial and aggressive.

Other reasons why you should not chain or tether your dog for long periods:

- Without the physical barrier of a cage, tethered dogs can feel unprotected
- Natural instincts of survival, fight and flight are disengaged
- Dogs can easily tip over their food and water
- Have been known to die from accidental strangulation
- Can get easily tangled
- More likely to get parasites, disease, injuries and infections
- Lunging and pulling against the tether can cause abrasions to the neck
- Forced to defecate and urinate in the same place they sleep, eat and run
- Barking continuously from boredom and frustration

LEG-02-3-20-447



## Hastings District Council

### Consolidated Bylaw

Item 9

Attachment 3

LEG-02-3-20-451

## CHAPTER 2 PUBLIC PLACES

### 2.8 DAMAGE

2.8.1 A person must not:

- (a) dig up, disturb, damage or remove the surface of any public place;
  - (b) affix any signs or posters to any structure in or about a public place;
- without an approval.

### 2.14 REFUSE DISPOSAL

2.14.1 A person must not dispose of any household refuse, hazardous substance, commercial waste or offensive matter in a Council refuse receptacle provided in a public place.

### 2.17 STOCK

2.17.1 A person in charge of stock must:

- (a) take all reasonable steps to ensure that they do not wander onto a public place;
- (b) ensure that they are under proper control and supervision at all times when driven or passing across or along a road;
- (c) not drive stock along or across a carriageway when a reasonable alternative is available;
- (d) not lead, ride or swim any stock on a beach in circumstances where a nuisance, danger or inconvenience is or may be created for other users of the beach;
- (e) not lead, drive or permit stock to go along or over any footpath, cycle path, or grass plot or flower bed within a public place;
- (f) not allow stock to graze on a public place without an approval from the Council, or as permitted under clause 2.17.2;
- (g) immediately dispose of any droppings left in a public place;
- (h) in any case where stock are driven or pass across or along a road on a recurring basis, ensure that there is no build up of mud or faecal matter on the carriageway over time;
- (i) immediately report any damage caused to road markers, road signs, culverts, water tables or other roading infrastructure and reimburse the reasonable cost of repair or replacement to the Council.

LEG-02-3-20-451



- 2.17.2 An approval to graze stock on a road in the rural area is not required under clause 2.17.1(f) if:
- (a) grazing is undertaken on the berm contiguous to premises:
    - (i) owned or occupied by the person in charge of the stock; or
    - (ii) owned by some other person who has given consent to that grazing;
  - (b) measures are taken (by means of tethering or the erection of temporary fences) to ensure that stock cannot graze within one metre of the carriageway;
  - (c) all other reasonable precautions are taken to ensure the safety and convenience of neighbours, people driving stock on the road and any other persons or traffic using the road;
  - (d) any other conditions, including the payment of grazing fees, laid down by the Council by publicly notified resolution are observed.
- 2.17.3 For the purposes of clause 2.17.1(b) stock is deemed to be under proper control and supervision if the guidelines in the New Zealand Transport Agency publication "Stock under control (crossing and driving)", or some other guideline approved by the Council by publicly notified resolution, have been observed.

## 10.2 NUISANCES

- 10.2.1 This part of the bylaw is made under s 64 of the Health Act 1956.
- 10.2.2 A person must not cause a nuisance, or allow a nuisance to be caused, on any premises.
- 10.2.3 Without limiting the generality of clause 10.2.2, a person must not cause a nuisance, or allow a nuisance to be caused, by any of the following:
- (a) the burning of any matter or thing on any premises;
  - (b) the emission of offensive odours, smoke, fumes, dust, sawdust or other matter from any premises;
  - (c) the deposit or accumulation of rubbish, recyclable material, inorganic material, dead animals, dung, manure or fertiliser on any premises;
  - (d) the failure to control or eradicate the conditions on any premises giving rise, or conducive to giving rise, to breeding by rats and other vermin, flies, mosquitoes, mites, ticks or any other insect capable of causing or transmitting disease;
  - (e) the failure to eradicate an infestation of rats and other vermin, or flies, mosquitoes, mites, ticks, cockroaches or other insects, on any premises;
  - (f) the failure to cleanse any drain, water closet, septic tank or outbuilding, including any outbuilding used to house animals, any premises;
  - (g) the keeping of an animal on any premises, notwithstanding that the keeping of that animal may be in accordance with clauses 10.4.3 to 10.4.6 (inclusive) of this Bylaw, or the undertaking of an activity related to the keeping of that animal.

LEG-02-3-20-451

## 10.4 STOCK, POULTRY AND BEES

- 10.4.1 The provisions in this part of the Bylaw are in addition to any rules in the district plan dealing with the keeping of pigs, poultry, stock or bees. In the event of conflict or ambiguity between a provision in this Bylaw and a rule in the district plan, the district plan rule will prevail.
- 10.4.2 A person must not keep stock on premises within the urban area without an approval.
- 10.4.3 A person must not keep on premises within the urban area:
- (a) a rooster; or
  - (b) more than 12 head of poultry.
- 10.4.4 If poultry are kept on premises within the urban area:
- (a) the premises must be adequately fenced to prevent escape; or
  - (b) if confined to a poultry house or poultry run, the house or run must be located more than 2 metres from any boundary of the premises and adequately enclosed to prevent escape.
- 10.4.5 A person must not keep bees on premises if the keeping of those bees is, or is likely to become, a danger to the public or a nuisance.
- 10.4.6 A person must not keep, provide food to or provide shelter for, on any premises:
- (a) if the premises are a stand-alone self-contained residential unit, more than four cats over the age of six months;
  - (b) if the premises are one of two self-contained residential units, more than two cats over the age of six months in each residential unit;
  - (c) if the premises are one of three or more self-contained residential units, more than one cat over the age of six months in each residential unit;
  - (d) subject to clause 10.4.7, if the premises are not used for residential purposes, more than four cats over the age of six months on those premises.
- 10.4.7 The prohibition in clause 10.4.6(d) does not apply to a veterinary clinic, a commercial cat boarding facility or an approved animal shelter.
- 10.4.8 A person who keeps a goat in the urban area must ensure that the goat is securely tethered at all times.
- 10.4.9 A person who grazes stock on any premises, or permits stock to graze on any premises, must ensure that the premises are fully enclosed by adequate stock proof fences and gates at all times.

LEG-02-3-20-451

Monday, 7 September 2020

Item 10

*Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga*  
**Hastings District Council**  
**Hastings District Rural Community Board**

*Te Rārangi Take*

# Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

*Nā:*  
**From: Adam Jackson, Transportation Operations Manager**

*Te Take:*  
**Subject: Rural Transportation Activities Report**

## 1.0 Executive Summary – *Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga*

- 1.1 This report is to update the Rural Community Board with the Rural Transportation Programmed Project Status and Activities Report.
- 1.2 This report concludes by recommending that the report be received.

## 2.0 Recommendations – *Ngā Tūtohunga*

That the Board receives the report titled Rural Transportation Activities Report.

## 3.0 2020/2021 Major Works Programme

- 3.1 The 2020/21 financial year is the final portion of the 2018-21 LTP programme.
- 3.2 Projects able to be completed in 2020/21 are often a result of programme changes during the first 2 years of the LTP programme and that has been the case during this LTP.
- 3.3 The following is the confirmed Area Wide Pavement Treatment programme for the 2020/21 financial year.

Road	Section	Status/Comment
Kereru Road	Kereru Road – Section 2	Design complete – shovel ready. Construction programmed to start in October

Road	Section	Status/Comment
Kereru Road	Kereru Road – Section 3	Design underway. Construction sequence will follow Kereru 2 project provided funding is available.

#### 4.0 Bridge Update

- 4.1 Ohara (Big Hill Road) and Riggirs (Maraetotara Road) strengthening works have finished. Moeangi (Waikare Road) strengthening work is expected to be finished by end of August.
- 4.2 Mangatahi Low Level (Mangatahi Road) enabling works are underway with a view to tender the project in October.
- 4.3 Taylors (Kikowhero Road) and Kuripapango (Taihape Road) are undergoing design.
- 4.4 Several bridges (Crystal No 1 and 2, St Georges, Poporangi and Farndon Overhead) are showing signs of meeting the required loading limit with no strengthening required.
- 4.5 Next set of bridges to start evaluations in the next quarter.
- 4.6 Turamoe No. 2 Bridge project is awaiting funding to be secured and to meet Council expectations prior to commencement:

#### 5.0 Provincial Growth Fund Projects (PGF)

- 5.1 PGF has allocated \$1.4M for roading projects in DRA2. These are 100% funded by the PGF, so do not have any impact on rates. These projects are ones that were considered shovel ready, and have been assigned to Contractors to start in Q3 of 2020. The projects are:

Road	Project	Status/Comment
Tukituki Road	AWPT	Assigned to Russell Roads as a variation to the existing Kahuranaki Contract. Construction to start in September 2020 and be complete by December 2020.
Taihape Road	Passing Lanes 1-4	Design complete. Assigned to Fulton Hogan as part of their Maintenance Works Contract. The pricing for these additional works are currently being finalised. Works to re-commence in September 2020 and are expected to be completed by December 2020.
Taihape Road	Bridge Guardrail Package 1 – 3.	Assigned to McNatty Construction who are currently finalising design and pricing for the three bridge sites. Works to commence in late September 2020 and are expected to be completed by December 2020.

#### 6.0 Delineation Review

- 6.1 We have recently established a delineation policy to ensure that our roads have markings and signage of a consistent standard throughout each of the road hierarchy levels.
- 6.2 A gap analysis is being done to identify the roads that currently do not meet the new standards.
- 6.3 Following the gap analysis we will programme improvements on the identified roads to get them up to the policy standards, beginning with NZTA identified High Risk Roads.
- 6.4 It is estimated that this work will take place throughout the next 3-4 years at current proposed funding levels:

## 7.0 Works Update

- 7.1 **Attachment 1** provides the Rural Community Board with a photographic snapshot of activities undertaken between June 2020 and September 2020.

### Attachments:

- 1 [↓](#) Transport (USE ROAD CONTAINER FOR INDIVIDUAL TR-8-20-9919  
ROADS) - Roads General (See notes) - Sept 2020  
RCB Photos

---

## Summary of Considerations - *He Whakarāpopoto Whakaarohanga*

---

### Fit with purpose of Local Government - *E noho hāngai pū ai ki te Rangatōpū-ā-Rohe*

The Council is required to give effect to the purpose of local government as set out in section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. That purpose is to enable democratic local decision-making and action by (and on behalf of) communities, and to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future.

### Link to the Council's Community Outcomes – *Ngā Hononga ki Ngā Putanga ā-Hapori*

This report promotes the performance of regulatory functions for the purpose of providing safe, reliable and efficient transport networks.

---

### Māori Impact Statement - *Te Tauākī Kaupapa Māori*

No known impacts for tangata whenua over and above the impact on the rural district as a whole:

---

### Sustainability - *Te Toitūtanga*

This is a progress report and sustainability issues are not addressed.

---

### Financial considerations - *Ngā Whakaarohanga Ahumoni*

The works identified within this report are within existing budgets.

---

### Significance and Engagement - *Te Hiranga me te Tūhonotanga*

This report has been assessed under the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy as being of minor significance. Individual projects will have been addressed under the significance and engagement policy during the planning and decision making phase of those projects.

---

### Consultation – internal and/or external - *Whakawhiti Whakaaro-ā-roto / ā-waho*

No consultation is required as part of this report.

---

---

### Risks

Risk management and mitigation issues have been addressed in project planning and organisational health and safety policies.

---

### Rural Community Board – *Te Poari Tuawhenua-ā-Hapori*

The Rural Community Board will have an interest in the operations and transportation activities within the DRA2 rating area.

---



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos

<div>Aropaoanui Road: Culvert Flushing</div> <div></div>	<div>Aropaoanui Road: Culvert Flushing</div> <div></div>
<div>Big Hill Rd: Slip Clearing</div> <div></div>	<div>Big Hill Rd: Slip Clearing</div> <div></div>
<div>Big Hill Rd: Slip Clearing</div> <div></div>	<div>Big Hill Rd: Slip Clearing</div> <div></div>

Item 10

Attachment 1









Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos	
<b>Berry Rd: Watertable maintenance</b>	<b>Berry Rd: Watertable maintenance</b>
	
<b>Crownthorpe Settlement Rd: Cut-out culvert install</b>	<b>Crownthorpe Settlement Rd: Cut-out culvert install</b>
	
<b>Crownthorpe Settlement Rd: Culvert stock gate</b>	<b>Crownthorpe Settlement Rd: Culvert stock gate</b>
	

Item 10

Attachment 1



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos	
Crystall Road: Bridge Repairs & Crack injection	Crystall Road: Bridge Repairs & Crack injection
	
Darkys Spur Road: Culvert headwalls	Darkys Spur Road: Culvert headwalls
	
Dartmoor Rd: Watertable Maintenance	Dartmoor Rd: Watertable Maintenance
	

Item 10

Attachment 1

Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos

<p><b>Dartmoor Road: Scour repair</b></p> 	<p><b>Dartmoor Road: Scour repair</b></p> 
<p><b>Dartmoor Rd: Watertable Maintenance</b></p> 	<p><b>Dartmoor Rd: Watertable Maintenance</b></p> 
<p><b>Dartmoor Rd: Culvert Base repairs</b></p> 	<p><b>Dartmoor Rd: Culvert Base repairs</b></p> 



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos	
Ellis Wallace Road: Watertabling	Ellis Wallace Road: Watertabling
	
Ellis Wallace Rd: New culvert and Watertables	Ellis Wallace Rd: New culvert and Watertables
	
Ellis Wallace Rd: Watertabling	Ellis Wallace Rd: Watertabling
	

Item 10

Attachment 1



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos	
Glengarry Road: Watertable scour repair	Glengarry Road: Watertable scour repair
	
Glengarry Road: Watertable scour repair	Glengarry Road: Watertable scour repair
	
Glengarry Road: Watertableing	Glengarry Road: Watertableing
	







Item 10

Attachment 1



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos







<p><b>Glengarry Road: Culvert replacement</b></p> 	<p><b>Glengarry Road: Culvert replacement</b></p> 
<p><b>Glenross Rd: Culvert Headwalls</b></p> 	<p><b>Glenross Rd: Culvert Headwalls</b></p> 
<p><b>Harper Rd: Bridge crack repairs</b></p> 	<p><b>Harper Rd: Bridge crack repairs</b></p> 

Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos	
Harper Rd: Bridge crack repairs	Harper Rd: Bridge crack repairs
	
Harper Rd: Bridge Repairs	Harper Rd: Bridge Repairs
	
Harper Rd: Bridge Dropper installation	Harper Rd: Bridge Dropper installation
	

Item 10

Attachment 1



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos	
Harper Rd: Bridge Dropper installation	Harper Rd: Bridge Dropper installation
	
Heays Access Rd: Bridge Repairs	Heays Access Rd: Bridge Repairs
	
Hedgeley Road: Watertabling	Hedgeley Road: Watertabling
	

Item 10







Attachment 1



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos

<p><b>Hedgeley Rd: Culvert Inlet Apron</b></p> 	<p><b>Hedgeley Rd: Culvert Inlet Apron</b></p> 
<p><b>Hukanui Rd: Bridge Maintenance</b></p> 	<p><b>Hukanui Rd: Bridge Maintenance</b></p> 
<p><b>Hukanui Rd: Bridge Repairs</b></p> 	<p><b>Hukanui Rd: Bridge Repairs</b></p> 



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos	
<div>Hukanui Rd: Bridge Repairs</div> 	<div>Hukanui Rd: Bridge Repairs</div> 
<div>Kahuranaki Rd: Bridge Maintenance</div> 	<div>Kahuranaki Rd: Bridge Maintenance</div> 
<div>Kahuranaki Road: Scour repairs</div> 	<div>Kahuranaki Road: Scour repairs</div> 

Item 10

Attachment 1

Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos	
Kahuranaki Rd: Crack injection Repairs	Kahuranaki Rd: Crack injection Repairs
	
Kereru Rd: Slip Removal	Kereru Rd: Slip Removal
	
Kereru Rd: Tomo Repairs	Kereru Rd: Tomo Repairs
	



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos

<p><b>Middle Rd: Culvert Cleaning</b></p> 	<p><b>Middle Rd: Culvert Cleaning</b></p> 
<p><b>McIntyre's Access Rd: bridge marker repairs</b></p> 	<p><b>McIntyre's Access Rd: bridge marker repairs</b></p> 
<p><b>Maraetotara Rd: Riggirs bridge strengthening</b></p>	<p><b>Maraetotara Rd: Riggirs bridge strengthening</b></p>



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos



Maraetotara Rd: Riggirs bridge strengthening



Maraetotara Rd: Riggirs bridge strengthening



Maraetotara Rd: Culvert Repairs



Maraetotara Rd: Culvert Repairs



Maraetotara Rd: Guardrail installation



Maraetotara Rd: Guardrail installation

Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos



Item 10

Attachment 1









Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos	
Maraetotara Rd: Guardrail installation	Maraetotara Rd: Guardrail installation
	
Ohiti Rd: Sump barrel replacement	Ohiti Rd: Sump barrel replacement
	
Old Coach Road: Culvert headwall installation	Old Coach Road: Culvert headwall installation
	

Item 10

Attachment 1



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos

<p><b>Okaihau Rd: Bridge Maintenance</b></p> 	<p><b>Okaihau Rd: Bridge Maintenance</b></p> 
<p><b>Okaihau Rd: Bridge Maintenance</b></p> 	<p><b>Okaihau Rd: Bridge Maintenance</b></p> 
<p><b>Okaihau Road: Deck repair</b></p> 	<p><b>Okaihau Road: Deck repair</b></p> 



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos	
Okaihau Rd: Tree removal	Okaihau Rd: Tree removal
	
Pakaututu Rd: Watertable Maintenance	Pakaututu Rd: Watertable Maintenance
	
Puketitiri Road: Culvert Maintenance	Puketitiri Road: Culvert Maintenance
	

Item 10

Attachment 1



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos	
<b>Puketitiri Rd: Watertable slip clearing</b>	<b>Puketitiri Rd: Watertable slip clearing</b>
	
<b>Puketitiri Rd: Watertable Maintenance</b>	<b>Puketitiri Rd: Watertable Maintenance</b>
	
<b>Rissington Bridge: Maintenance</b>	<b>Rissington Bridge: Maintenance</b>
	

Item 10

Attachment 1



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos	
Rissington Bridge: Concrete repairs	Rissington Bridge: Concrete repairs
	
Ridgemoor Rd: Culvert Headwall	Ridgemoor Rd: Culvert Headwall
	
Rukumoana Road: Watertableing	Rukumoana Road: Watertableing
	

Item 10

Attachment 1



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos

<p><b>Sandy Creek Road: Culvert &amp; Watertable maintenance</b></p> 	<p><b>Sandy Creek Road: Culvert &amp; Watertable maintenance</b></p> 
<p><b>School Road: Bridge Repairs &amp; Crack injection</b></p> 	<p><b>School Road: Bridge Repairs &amp; Crack injection</b></p> 
<p><b>Seafield Rd: Crack injection Repairs</b></p> 	<p><b>Seafield Rd: Crack injection Repairs</b></p> 



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos

<p><b>Springfield Road: Gate latch</b></p> 	<p><b>Springfield Road: Gate latch</b></p> 
<p><b>Taihape Rd: Watertable maintenance</b></p> 	<p><b>Taihape Rd: Watertable maintenance</b></p> 
<p><b>Taihape Road: Concrete Crack Repairs</b></p> 	<p><b>Taihape Road: Concrete Crack Repairs</b></p> 

Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos	
Taihapa Road: Concrete Crack Repairs	Taihapa Road: Concrete Crack Repairs
	
Tareha Rd: Slip removal	Tareha Rd: Slip removal
	
Te Aute Trust Rd: Sightrail Maintenance	Te Aute Trust Rd: Sightrail Maintenance
	

Item 10







Attachment 1



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos

<p><b>Te Mahanga Rd Bridge: Concrete Crack Repairs</b></p> 	<p><b>Te Mahanga Rd Bridge: Concrete Crack Repairs</b></p> 
<p><b>Te Mata Rd: Concrete footpath</b></p> 	<p><b>Te Mata Rd: Concrete footpath</b></p> 
<p><b>Te Waka Road: Bridge &amp; Sightrail Maintenance</b></p> 	<p><b>Te Waka Road: Bridge &amp; Sightrail Maintenance</b></p> 

Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos

Te Waka Rd: Scour repairs	Te Waka Rd: Scour repairs
	
Vicarage Rd: Bridge Joint repair	Vicarage Rd: Bridge Joint repair
	
Vicarage Rd: Bridge Joint repair	Vicarage Rd: Bridge Joint repair
	

Item 10

Attachment 1



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos

<p><b>Vicarage Rd: Bridge Joint repair</b></p> 	<p><b>Vicarage Rd: Bridge Joint repair</b></p> 
<p><b>Waikare Rd: Culvert Sump Replacement</b></p> 	<p><b>Waikare Rd: Culvert Sump Replacement</b></p> 
<p><b>Waimarama Road: Watertabling &amp; Scour repairs</b></p> 	<p><b>Waimarama Road: Watertabling &amp; Scour repairs</b></p> 



Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos

<p><b>Waimarama Road: Bridge Maintenance</b></p> 	<p><b>Waimarama Road: Bridge Maintenance</b></p> 
<p><b>Waimarama Rd: Sign installation</b></p> 	<p><b>Waimarama Rd: Sign installation</b></p> 
<p><b>Waimarama Rd (Harpers): Culvert Flushing</b></p> 	<p><b>Waimarama Rd (Harpers): Culvert Flushing</b></p> 

Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos

Waimarama Rd (Harpers): Culvert Flushing



Waimarama Rd (Harpers): Culvert Flushing



Waitara Rd Bridge: Steel Rust Repairs



Waitara Rd Bridge: Steel Rust Repairs



Waitara Rd: Slip clean up



Waitara Rd: Slip clean up





Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos

<p><b>Waipunga Rd: Slips &amp; Trees Down</b></p> 	<p><b>Waipunga Rd: Slips &amp; Trees Down</b></p> 
<p><b>Waihau Rd: Scour repairs</b></p> 	<p><b>Waihau Rd: Scour repairs</b></p> 
<p><b>Waitata Rd: Bridge Crack Sealing</b></p> 	<p><b>Waitata Rd: Bridge Crack Sealing</b></p> 

Rural Community Board – September 2020 Photos

<b>Whanawhana Rd: Slip removal</b>	<b>Whanawhana Rd: Slip removal</b>
	
<b>Willowford Rd: Sightrail replacement</b>	<b>Willowford Rd: Sightrail replacement</b>
	

Item 10

Attachment 1