Region of Queens Municipality Special Council
Thursday, August 20, 2026
12:30 p.m.

Agenda

1.0 Call to Order and land Acknowledgement

2.0 Approval of Agenda

3.0 Introduction to Draft Bylaw No. 3 - Dogs

4.0 Adjournment

Region of Queens Municipality
Staff Report
For the Special Meeting of
August 20, 2026

Date: August 13, 2026

File No: 10350-50-2608-008

To: Mayor and Council

From: Willa Thorpe, CAO

Subject: Introduction of Draft Bylaw No. 3 – Dogs

Prepared by:	Supervisor:	CAO Concurrence:
Alexander Wilson *Policy Analyst & Strategic Initiatives Coordinator*	*Patrick Hirtle* *Deputy CAO*	*W. Thorpe* *CAO*

RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council for Region of Queens Municipality direct staff to update draft Bylaw No. 3 – Dogs with changes as outlined by Council at the August 20, 2026 Special Meeting prior to First Reading of the bylaw.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to present Council with a draft replacement for Bylaw No. 3 – Dogs for introductory review and discussion.

The proposed bylaw modernizes the Municipality's existing dog control framework by improving public safety, establishing clearer responsibilities for dog owners, providing additional enforcement tools, and incorporating current municipal best practices. The report also seeks Council's feedback on several policy matters prior to legal review and preparation of a final draft for Council's consideration and First Reading.

BACKGROUND

On October 28, 2025, Council directed staff to undertake a review of Bylaw No. 3 – Dogs and return with recommended amendments addressing dangerous and reactive dogs, barking deterrent devices, enforcement measures, penalties, and any required public consultation.

The current Dog Bylaw was last substantially updated in 2007 and consists of seven pages and 16 clauses. While the existing bylaw has provided a framework for dog licensing and animal control for many years, upon review staff identified several areas where the bylaw no longer reflects current best practices in municipal animal control or provides sufficient flexibility to respond to increasingly complex public safety concerns.

During the review, staff completed a jurisdictional scan of municipalities within Nova Scotia and across Canada, including Calgary, Toronto, Halifax Regional Municipality, and Colwood, British Columbia, as well as relevant provisions of the Municipal Government Act and guidance from the Nova Scotia SPCA.

Rather than making isolated amendments to the existing bylaw, staff prepared a comprehensive replacement bylaw that incorporates modern enforcement practices, a graduated approach to dangerous dogs, enhanced procedural fairness, and clearer responsibilities for dog owners while remaining behaviour-based rather than breed-based.

As this is an introductory presentation of the draft bylaw, staff are seeking Council's direction on a number of matters contained within the draft prior to legal review and preparation of a final draft for First Reading.

ALTERNATIVES/OPTIONS

1. Council provides policy direction on the following prior to First Reading:
    a. Whether a maximum number of dogs should be permitted per household;
    b. Whether the bylaw should establish restricted areas where dogs are prohibited or subject to additional controls;
    c. Whether the current provisions respecting Wolf-Dog Hybrids should be retained;
    d. Whether the scope of the bylaw should be expanded beyond dogs to become a Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw, similar to the City of Calgary; and

e. Any other direction from Council respecting other elements of the draft bylaw.

2. Proceed without direction - Council directs staff to proceed directly to legal review without providing additional policy direction.

3. Maintain the existing bylaw - Council directs staff not to proceed further with development of a replacement for Bylaw 3 at this time.

ANALYSIS

Comparative analysis of the existing and proposed Dog Bylaw

The current Dog Bylaw was last substantially updated in 2007 and was developed primarily as a traditional municipal animal control bylaw.

At the time of its adoption, the bylaw reflected the primary responsibilities of municipalities with respect to dog licensing, animals running at large, impoundment, nuisance complaints, and the administration of dangerous dogs.

While the existing bylaw has served the Municipality for nearly two decades, municipal practices, legislative expectations, enforcement philosophies, and public expectations surrounding responsible pet ownership have evolved significantly during that period.

Staff determined that simply amending the existing bylaw would not adequately address the issues identified by during review or incorporate modern municipal best practices. Numerous provisions within the existing bylaw would require amendment, new definitions would need to be inserted throughout the document, enforcement authorities would require substantial revision, and entirely new administrative processes would need to be added. Staff concluded that these amendments would result in a fragmented document that would be increasingly difficult for residents, enforcement officers, and Council to interpret and understand.

Accordingly, staff determined that preparing a comprehensive replacement bylaw represents the most effective approach.

A replacement bylaw allows the document to be reorganized into a logical framework, incorporates consistent terminology throughout, improves readability, and ensures that enforcement provisions, procedural requirements,

and owner responsibilities operate together as a single regulatory framework rather than a series of amendments accumulated over time.

The proposed bylaw represents a significant shift in philosophy. The objective is not simply to respond when an incident occurs, but to provide both owners and enforcement officers with the tools necessary to reduce foreseeable risks before those incidents occur.

The following table summarizes the principal differences between the existing bylaw and the proposed replacement:

Area	Existing Bylaw (2007)	Proposed Replacement	Rationale
Overall Structure	7 pages, 16 clauses	22 pages, 52 clauses	Consolidates modern enforcement, administration, and public safety provisions into a single document
Regulatory Philosophy	Primarily reactive enforcement	Behaviour-based public safety framework	Focuses upon preventing incidents while maintaining proportionality
Definitions	Limited definitions	Comprehensive definitions throughout	Reduces ambiguity and improves consistency during enforcement
Owner Responsibilities	Basic care and control	Expanded duties including foreseeable risk management	Clarifies owner responsibilities before incidents occur
Public Safety	Primarily addresses incidents after they occur	Incorporates preventative measures and graduated interventions	Reduces risks before injuries occur

Area	Existing Bylaw (2007)	Proposed Replacement	Rationale
Dangerous Dogs	Single Dangerous / Fierce designation	Separate Dangerous and Fierce classifications	Allows enforcement measures to better reflect differing levels of risk
Enforcement Tools	Primarily offences and prosecution	Orders to Comply, licence conditions, graduated restrictions, enhanced investigation capabilities.	Encourages voluntary compliance while preserving enforcement authority
Lawful Entrants	Not specifically addressed	Delivery personnel, emergency responders, contractors, and others expressly recognized	Reflects changes in modern service delivery and public access to private property
Licensing	Basic licensing provisions	Expanded licensing conditions, suspension and revocation authorities	Improves administrative oversight and compliance
Appeals	Limited administrative review	Independent Appeal Committee established	Improves procedural fairness and transparency
Investigations	General enforcement powers	Expanded evidence collection and investigation provisions	Improves consistency and defensibility of decisions
Emergency Powers	Limited guidance	Clearly defined emergency authority and documentation requirements	Balances officer discretion with accountability

Area	Existing Bylaw (2007)	Proposed Replacement	Rationale
Animal Welfare	Primarily impoundment or euthanasia	Adoption, rescue transfer and euthanasia as a measure of last resort	Better balances public safety and animal welfare
Cost Recovery	Limited	Expanded cost recovery provisions	Ensures enforcement costs are recoverable where appropriate

The proposed bylaw does not represent a fundamental departure from the Municipality's authority to regulate dogs. Rather, it modernizes the manner in which those powers are exercised. Several policy themes emerge throughout the proposed bylaw:

First, the draft adopts a **behaviour-based approach** to regulation. The emphasis is placed upon the conduct of the individual dog and the actions of the owner rather than relying upon generalized assumptions regarding breed. Staff believe this approach better reflects contemporary municipal practice and provides greater flexibility to address circumstances on a case-by-case basis.

Second, the draft incorporates a **graduated enforcement framework**. The existing bylaw provides relatively few options between issuing a ticket and pursuing significant enforcement action. The proposed bylaw introduces a series of intermediate measures, including Orders to Comply, licence conditions, designation categories, and tailored restrictions, that allow enforcement responses to remain proportionate to the level of risk presented.

Third, the proposed bylaw places increased emphasis on **preventative public safety**. Rather than relying solely upon enforcement after an attack or injury has occurred, owners who know or reasonably ought to know that their dog presents an elevated risk are expected to implement reasonable measures to reduce foreseeable risks. Staff believe this approach better protects members of the public while providing owners with greater certainty regarding their responsibilities.

Finally, the proposed bylaw significantly enhances **administrative fairness**. Notice requirements, appeal rights, evidence provisions, written orders, review mechanisms, and clearly defined investigative authorities provide a more transparent decision-making framework. These provisions benefit not only residents but also enforcement officers by establishing consistent procedures capable of withstanding administrative or judicial scrutiny.

One thing that is important to note, should Council adopt the revised bylaw, Region of Queens Municipality will need to delay its effect until summary offence tickets can be updated with the Department of Justice. This process can take anywhere between a few weeks and several months.

Overall, staff are of the opinion that the proposed replacement bylaw reflects a comprehensive modernization of the Municipality's dog control framework. Rather than expanding municipal authority beyond traditional animal control, the draft reorganizes and strengthens existing regulatory powers, introduces modern administrative processes, and provides Council with a bylaw better suited to addressing contemporary public safety issues while maintaining fairness, flexibility, and proportionality.

Analysis of Option 1 – Provide Policy Direction Prior to Legal Review

Staff recommend that Council review the draft replacement bylaw and provide policy direction prior to legal review and First Reading.

Presenting the bylaw at this stage allows Council to consider significant policy questions while amendments remain relatively straightforward. Once legal review has been completed and the bylaw has proceeded to First Reading, substantial policy changes may require additional legal drafting and review, resulting in additional time and expense.

The draft bylaw presented to Council reflects staff's recommended policy approach based on a review of the existing bylaw, a jurisdictional scan of municipalities across Nova Scotia and Canada, current municipal best practices, and operational considerations.

While staff believe the proposed framework provides a balanced approach to public safety, responsible pet ownership, and procedural fairness, several policy matters require Council's consideration prior to finalizing the bylaw.

Obtaining Council's direction at this stage also ensures that legal counsel reviews a document that accurately reflects Council's policy intent. This

approach minimizes the likelihood of multiple rounds of legal revisions and provides greater certainty as the bylaw proceeds toward adoption.

The following policy considerations have been identified for Council's direction:

1) Maximum Number of Dogs Per Household

The proposed bylaw does not establish a maximum number of dogs that may be kept on a property. Instead, the draft regulates the behaviour of dogs and the conduct of owners regardless of the number of animals owned.

In considering whether a numerical limit should be established, staff recognize that Region of Queens Municipality contains a diverse range of communities. The Municipality includes more densely populated residential areas such as Liverpool, Brooklyn, and Milton, where neighbouring properties are often in closer proximity and issues such as barking, sanitation, and nuisance complaints may have a greater impact on surrounding residents. Conversely, the Municipality also encompasses large rural areas where properties are significantly larger, residences are more widely separated, and it is not uncommon for residents to own multiple dogs for hunting, farming, sporting activities, companionship, or property protection.

As a result, a single numerical limit would apply equally across substantially different land use patterns and community contexts. While a limit may address concerns in more urbanized areas, it could also unnecessarily restrict responsible ownership in rural areas where multiple dogs may be common and do not create adverse impacts on neighbouring properties.

Many municipalities establish limits ranging from three to five dogs per household. Such limits can simplify enforcement where excessive animal ownership contributes to nuisance complaints or animal welfare concerns. However, numerical limits are, by their nature, arbitrary and do not necessarily reflect responsible ownership. A household containing four well-managed dogs may present no public safety or nuisance concerns, while a household containing a single uncontrolled dog may require significant municipal intervention.

Staff believe the proposed replacement bylaw significantly strengthens the Municipality's ability to address the underlying issues that numerical limits are generally intended to resolve.

The draft expands enforcement powers respecting nuisance behaviour, dangerous and fierce dogs, owner responsibilities, Orders to Comply, and progressive enforcement measures. These provisions provide by-law officers with considerably greater flexibility to address problematic situations based on the conduct of the owner and the behaviour of the dogs rather than the number of animals present.

Accordingly, **staff recommend that a maximum number of dogs not be included within the replacement bylaw.** Staff are of the opinion that the enhanced enforcement authorities contained within the proposed bylaw provide sufficient tools to address circumstances where multiple dogs create legitimate public safety or nuisance concerns without imposing restrictions on responsible owners who may appropriately keep several dogs.

Should Council determine that a numerical limit remains desirable, staff recommend that consideration also be given to exemptions for agricultural properties, registered breeders, rescue organizations, foster homes, and other circumstances where additional dogs may be appropriate.

2) Wolf-Dog Hybrids

Council has requested that staff consider whether the existing provisions automatically classifying Wolf-Dog Hybrids as dangerous or fierce should be retained within the replacement bylaw.

One of the guiding principles of the proposed replacement bylaw is that regulation should be based upon the demonstrated behaviour of individual dogs rather than breed or appearance. From a policy perspective, automatically classifying a particular type of animal regardless of its behaviour introduces an exception to this behaviour-based approach.

However, staff also recognize that Wolf-Dog Hybrids occupy a unique regulatory position within Nova Scotia. The Province of Nova Scotia has included **all members of the family Canidae, with the exception of the domestic dog, on its Personal Pets Exotic Wildlife Prohibition List.** As a result, wolves, coyotes, foxes, wolf-hybrids, and other non-domestic canids are generally prohibited from being kept as personal pets within the Province.

Given the Province's existing regulatory framework, staff question whether it remains necessary for the Municipality to maintain a separate provision automatically designating Wolf-Dog Hybrids as dangerous or fierce. Provincial legislation already significantly limits the ability of individuals to legally possess

such animals, thereby reducing the likelihood that the Municipality would encounter these circumstances through routine by-law enforcement.

Accordingly, **staff recommend that Council decline to include the automatic designation of Wolf-Dog Hybrids from the replacement bylaw.** Staff are of the opinion that this approach is more consistent with the behaviour-based philosophy adopted throughout the draft while recognizing that the Province has already established comprehensive restrictions respecting the possession of non-domestic canids. Should Council wish to retain the existing language for additional clarity or redundancy, staff can incorporate those provisions into the final draft.

3) Expansion to a Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw

During the jurisdictional review completed by staff, several municipalities were identified as regulating responsible pet ownership through a single comprehensive bylaw rather than maintaining separate bylaws for individual animal species. One example is the City of Calgary, whose Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw regulates both dogs and cats under a single legislative framework.

Expanding the scope of the proposed bylaw beyond dogs could provide several long-term benefits. A consolidated bylaw may improve administrative consistency, reduce the need for multiple standalone animal-related bylaws, and provide residents with a single point of reference respecting municipal expectations for responsible pet ownership.

However, staff are of the opinion that expanding the scope of the current review would substantially increase the complexity of the project. Additional research, consultation, legal review, and policy development would be required to appropriately regulate additional animal species.

Matters such as licensing, nuisance provisions, enforcement authorities, exemptions, and animal-specific standards would require independent consideration and consultation.

It is also noted that Council's original direction related specifically to a review of the Dog Bylaw. Expanding the scope to include additional species would represent a significant change in project scope and would likely delay completion of the replacement bylaw.

Accordingly, **staff do not recommend expanding the current review beyond dogs.** Should Council wish to pursue a broader Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw in the future, staff recommend that it be undertaken as a separate policy initiative with its own consultation process, jurisdictional review, and policy analysis.

4) Other Policy Direction

The draft presented to Council is intended as an introductory document. Staff recognize that Council may identify additional policy matters requiring further consideration prior to legal review.

Receiving this feedback at the introductory stage allows staff to incorporate Council's direction before legal review, reducing the likelihood of significant amendments following First Reading and improving the overall efficiency of the legislative process.

Option 2 – Proceed to Legal Review Without Additional Direction

Council may choose to direct staff to proceed immediately to legal review without providing further policy direction. While this option would advance the project more quickly, it may also result in additional revisions if Council later determines that substantive policy changes are required. This approach may increase both legal costs and staff time by requiring multiple rounds of review.

Option 3 – Maintain the Existing Bylaw

Council may choose not to proceed with the replacement bylaw and instead continue administering the existing 2007 Dog Bylaw. This option would avoid the immediate administrative work associated with legal review and implementation; however, it would also maintain the Municipality's existing regulatory framework, which lacks many of the modern enforcement tools, procedural safeguards, and preventative public safety measures contained within the proposed replacement. Staff are of the opinion that this option would not fully address the objectives identified during the review or provide the Municipality with the flexibility necessary to respond to contemporary animal control issues.

IMPLICATIONS

Option 1 – Provide Policy Direction Prior to Legal Review

Providing policy direction at this stage will require staff to review Council's feedback, revise the draft bylaw as necessary, and submit the revised document for legal review prior to First Reading.

While this approach requires additional work in the short term, staff are of the opinion that obtaining policy direction before legal review will reduce the likelihood of significant revisions later in the legislative process, resulting in a more efficient use of staff time and legal resources.

Following legal review, staff will return the bylaw to Council for First Reading and, if subsequently adopted, prepare any required implementation materials, enforcement procedures, and public education resources.

Option 2 – Proceed to Legal Review Without Additional Direction

Proceeding directly to legal review would reduce the immediate workload associated with revising the draft following Council discussion. However, should Council identify substantive policy changes after legal review or First Reading, additional staff time and legal review may be required to incorporate those changes. This option has the potential to increase the overall project timeline and associated administrative effort.

Option 3 – Maintain the Existing Bylaw

Maintaining the existing bylaw would have minimal immediate administrative implications, as no further drafting, legal review, or implementation work would be required. Staff would continue administering the current bylaw using existing enforcement practices and resources. However, the operational limitations identified during the review would remain, and future concerns may continue to require staff to rely on a regulatory framework that has not been comprehensively updated since 2007.

COMMUNICATIONS

Should Council elect to

BYLAWS/PLANS/POLICIES

Bylaw 3 – Dogs

Council's 2026-2029 Strategic Plan – Goal 4.1: Improve transparency and Accountability

SUMMARY

The proposed replacement of Bylaw No. 3 – Dogs represents a comprehensive modernization of the Municipality's existing dog control framework. While the current bylaw has served the Municipality since 2007, the proposed replacement introduces a behaviour-based approach to regulation, expanded enforcement tools, enhanced procedural fairness, and additional public safety measures that reflect current municipal best practices.

This report presents the draft bylaw as an introduction only. Staff are seeking Council's policy direction on several outstanding matters prior to legal review, including the potential establishment of a maximum number of dogs per household, the designation of restricted areas, the treatment of Wolf-Dog Hybrids, and whether the scope of the bylaw should be expanded beyond dogs. Obtaining Council's direction at this stage will allow staff to incorporate any required policy changes before legal review and return the bylaw for First Reading.

Staff recommend Council provide feedback prior to legal review of the draft bylaw, as it represents the most efficient and effective approach to finalizing the replacement bylaw while ensuring the final document reflects Council's policy objectives.

ATTACHMENTS/REFERENCE MATERIALS

- Bylaw No. 3 – A Bylaw Respecting Dogs (2007)
- Draft Bylaw No. 3 – A Bylaw Respecting Dogs (2026)

BYLAW NO. 3 *DRAFT*
A BYLAW RESPECTING DOGS

BE IT ENACTED by the Council of Region of Queens Municipality, Under the authority of the Municipal Government Act, S.N.S 1998, Chapter 18 as follows:

Part I- GENERAL

1. This Bylaw Shall be known as Bylaw Number 3 and may be cited as **"The Dog Bylaw."**
    a. **Application**. This Bylaw applies throughout the Municipality and to all Owners and Guardians of Dogs within the Municipality.
    b. **Authority**. This Bylaw is enacted pursuant to Sections 175 and 176 of the Municipal Government Act, S.N.S. 1998, c. 18, as amended (the "MGA"), and any successor legislation.
    c. **Purpose**. The purpose of this Bylaw is to promote public safety, responsible dog ownership, and humane treatment of dogs, and to regulate dogs within the Municipality.
    d. **Guiding Principles**. This Bylaw adopts a graduated, behavior-based approach.
    e. **Interpretation**. Headings are for convenience only. The singular includes the plural and vice versa. "Includes" is not limiting. If any provision is held invalid, the remainder continues in effect.
    f. **Conflict**. Where this Bylaw conflicts with a policy or guideline, this Bylaw prevails.
    g. **Paramountcy of Other Laws**. This Bylaw is enacted pursuant to the authority of the Municipal Government Act and shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with all applicable federal and provincial enactments. Where a

DRAFT

conflict exists, the higher authority legislation prevails to the extent of the conflict.

Part II- Definitions

2. Words and terms in this Bylaw shall take their meanings from their context and from dictionaries of the Canadian language expect as follows.
    a. **"At Large"** means a Dog that is off the Owner or Guardian's property, not on a leash, held by a Competent Person, at least 18 years of age or on the Owner or Guardian's property without Secure Containment and without Direct Supervision by a Competent Person, and includes a Dog controlled solely by an operational Invisible Fence system.
    b. **"Appeals Committee"** means the Dog Bylaw Appeal Committee established under
    c. **"Attack"** means to attack, bite, wound, injure, seize, or otherwise cause physical harm to a person or animal, or to act in a manner that a reasonable person would believe poses an imminent risk of biting or causing injury.
    d. **"Bite Incident"** means any incident in which a Dog bites or attempts to bite a person or domestic animal, whether or not injury results.
    e. **"Bylaw officer"** means a person(s) appointed by the Municipality to administer and enforce this Bylaw and includes a Dog Control Officer and any person acting under the authority of the Municipality for dog control purposes.
    f. **"Clear and Present Danager"** means an immediate and substantial risk of serious bodily harm or death such that delay would likely result in injury, including circumstances where safe capture or safe retreat is not reasonably available.
    g. **"Competent Person"** means a person physically capable of controlling a Dog, having regard to the Dog's size, strength, and temperament, and able to promptly intervene to prevent aggressive behavior and is at least 18 years of age.
    h. **"Dangerous Dog"** means a Dog designated under ***Part IX-*** as a Dangerous Dog.
    i. "**Fierce Dog**" means a Dog designated under ***Part IX-***as a Fierce Dog.
    j. "**Direct Supervision**" means the continuous presence and active supervision of a Competent Person who can immediately intervene to control the Dog.
    k. "**Dog**" means a domesticated canine and includes a puppy.

DRAFT

l. "**Dwelling**" means a building or portion of a building used as a residence.

m. "**Guardian**" means a person who has care, custody, or control of a Dog at a particular time, whether or not that person is the Owner.

n. "**Impound**" means to confine a Dog in a Pound or other facility approved by the Municipality, impoundment begins once the dog is placed into the vehicle of the Bylaw Officer

o. "**Invisible Fence**" means any operational electronic, radio, GPS, satellite, wireless, or similar system intended to contain a Dog without a physical barrier, including collar-based systems and buried-wire systems.

p. "**Lawful Entrant**" includes delivery personnel, postal workers, couriers, utility workers, municipal employees and contractors, emergency responders, and any person lawfully attending a property for lawful business.

q. "**Dog License"** Also know as dog tags mean that the dog is registered with the municipality as required in section clause 12 of this bylaw.

r. "**Order**" means an Order to Comply issued under Part VIII-

s. "**Owner**" includes any person who owns a Dog, possesses a Dog, harbors or keeps a Dog, permits a Dog to remain on premises occupied by that person, or otherwise has care or control of a Dog, and includes a Guardian unless the context requires otherwise.

t. "**Pound**" means a facility operated or designated by the Municipality for the temporary holding of Dogs.

u. "**Public Place**" means any place to which the public has access as of right or by invitation, express or implied, including streets, sidewalks, parks, trails, beaches, public buildings, and private businesses that allow public access.

v. "**Secure Containment**" means physical containment sufficient to prevent a Dog from leaving the property or contacting members of the public, including a securely fenced enclosure, building, or another physical barrier, and expressly excludes an -Invisible Fence.

w. "**Serious Injury**" means an injury that may require professional medical or veterinary treatment, or resulting in disfigurement, fracture, puncture wounds, significant tissue damage, hospitalization, or death.

x. "**Service**" means delivery of a document by a method permitted in ***Part VIII-***

Part III- Owners Duties, Prohibitions, and Nuisance

3. Duty of Owners and Guardians
    a. No Owner or Guardians shall permit a dog to be at large.
    b. Every Owner and Guardian shall exercise reasonable care, supervision, and control over a dog at all times.
    c. No Owner or Guardian shall permit a Dog to Attack, threaten, chase, or place at risk any person or animal.
    d. An Owner or Guardian is responsible for the actions of their Dog whether or not the Owner or Guardian is present.
    e. No person shall tease, provoke, or intentionally or not intentionally incite a Dog to Attack.
4. Cleanliness and Waste
    a. No Owner or Guardian shall permit a Dog to defecate on a Public Place or on private property other than the Owner's property unless the feces are immediately removed and disposed of in a sanitary manner.
    b. Notwithstanding Clause 4(A), a person who is blind, visually impaired, or has a disability that prevents them from physically removing waste is not required to personally remove the waste but remains responsible for ensuring that the waste is removed and properly disposed of.
5. Noise and Disturbance
    a. No Owner or Guardian shall permit a Dog to howl, bark, whine, or otherwise make noise in a manner that unreasonably disturbs the peace of others.
    b. In determining whether noise is unreasonable, the Municipality may consider duration, time of day, frequency, location, and corrective actions taken by the Owner or Guardian.
6. Rabies and Bite Reporting
    a. An Owner or Guardian shall ensure a Dog is vaccinated against rabies in accordance with veterinary standards unless a licensed veterinarian certifies in writing that vaccination is medically unnecessary.
    b. An Owner or Guardian shall immediately report to the Municipality any Bite Incident involving a person and shall provide contact information, circumstances of the incident and any other information required by the Municipality or their designate.

DRAFT

c. Upon request, an Owner or Guardian shall provide vaccination records and veterinary contact information for a Dog involved in a Bite Incident.

Part IV- Foreseeable Risk

7. Owner or Guardians' requirement to manage foreseeable risk:
    a. **Foreseeable Risk Standard.** Where an Owner or Guardian knows or reasonably ought to know that a Dog may behave aggressively or pose a heightened risk to Lawful Entrants, the public, and other animals, both at the owner's home, and in public, the Owner or Guardian shall implement reasonable measures to manage that risk.
    b. **Continuing Duty**. The duty in ***Part III-***applies whether or not the Owner or Guardian is present and whether or not a delivery or visit is scheduled.
    c. **Signage Not a Defense**. Warning signage does not relieve an Owner or Guardian of responsibility and does not convert Lawful Entrants into trespassers.
    d. **Failure to Implement Measures**. Failure to implement reasonable measures under this Part may be treated as an aggravating factor when the Municipality determines conditions, enforcement action, or designation under ***Part VII-***.
8. Reasonable Protective Measures
    a. Reasonable Protective Measures may include without limitation:
        i. clearly visible warning signage, utilizing words and symbols, at points of approach or entry to the property.
        ii. Secure Containment of the Dog when the Owner or Guardian is absent.
        iii. Direct Supervision by a Competent Person when the Dog is outdoors.
        iv. temporary confinement of the Dog during anticipated deliveries, visits, or service calls.
        v. alternative delivery arrangements, including a secure delivery box or drop location.
        vi. use of a muzzle in appropriate circumstances.
        vii. training or behavioral intervention.
        viii. communication to regular service providers and other entering the property about safe delivery or visiting procedures.
9. Running at Large
    a. No Dog shall be at large at any time.

DRAFT

b. A Dog on an Owner or Guardian's property shall be in Secure Containment or under Direct Supervision by a Competent Person
c. A Dog controlled solely by an invisible fence does not constitute Secure Containment unless combined with additional physical measures sufficient to prevent escape or contact with the public or other animals.
d. Tethering shall not be considered Secure Containment where it does not reasonably prevent escape or contact with Lawful Entrants, the public or other animals.
e. An Owner or Guardian shall ensure gates are kept closed and fences are maintained to prevent escape should a gate and/or fence be used as a means of Secure Containment.

10. Leashing off Property

a. No Owner or Guardian shall permit a Dog to be off the Owner or Guardian's property unless restrained by a leash, held by and under the control of a Competent Person, except in a designated off-leash area.
b. The leash shall be of sufficient strength and length to maintain effective control and shall not exceed two (2) metres in length except in a designated off-leash area, where the dog is permitted to be.
c. No person shall permit a Dog to run uncontrolled in a Public Place even if the Dog is friendly or accustomed to the area except in a designated off-leash area, where the dog is permitted to be.

11. Restricted Areas

a. Licenced service dogs accompanying a person with a disability are exempt from restrictions expect where required by law.
b. The Municipality may designate restricted areas by resolution and may impose conditions for use, including hours, signage, and waste removal.
c. The Municipality may designate off-leash areas by resolution and may impose conditions for use, including but not limited to hours, signage, and waste removal.
d. Provincial and federal parkland is exempt from any clause within this bylaw, and their rules and laws must be followed.

Part V- Licensing and Identification

12. Licensing and Identification Requirements

a. Every Owner shall obtain a Dog License for each Dog kept within the Municipality in accordance with this Bylaw and the Municipality's Fees Policy.

    i. Dogs with a provincial service dog license must register their dog with the municipality however they shall be exempt from licensing fees by providing documentation of proof of license at the time of registration.

    ii. For greater certainty for purposes of this bylaw, Only dogs registered under the Province of Nova Scotia's Service Dog Act (2016) are eligible for their licensing fees to be waived.

    iii. RCMP, and other law enforcement agencies are exempt from licensing.

b. A license shall be obtained within thirty (30) calendar days of acquiring a Dog or moving into the Municipality with a dog and shall be renewed annually by the date set by the Municipality.

c. The Municipality may refuse to issue or renew a Dog License where an Owner is in arrears for fees, fines, or costs under this Bylaw, or where Dog License conditions have not been met.

d. No person shall provide false information in an application for a Dog License.

e. Every licensed Dog shall wear a current license tag when off the Owner's property.

f. The Municipality may require microchipping as a condition of licensing, including for Dangerous Dogs and Fierce Dogs.

g. No person shall remove a current license tag from a Dog except the Owner or as authorized by a Bylaw Officer.

h. An Owner shall notify the Municipality of any change of address or transfer of ownership within fourteen (14) calendar days of the change occurring.

13. License Conditions and Administrative Actions

a. The Municipality may impose conditions on a Dog License to protect public safety, including leashing requirements, muzzle requirements, Secure Containment upgrades, signage, training, microchipping, and restrictions on public access.

b. The Municipality may suspend or revoke a Dog License where the Owner contravenes this Bylaw, fails to comply with an Order, or where public safety requires.

DRAFT

c. A Dog License suspension or revocation shall be in writing and shall include reasons and appeal rights under ***Part XII-***

d. Refusal, suspension, or revocation does not prevent enforcement for underlying offences.

Part VI- Administration, Fees, and Designations

14. Fees
    a. Fees for Dog Licenses, Impoundment and related services shall be as established by council by resolution and/or a fee policy established by the Municipality, as may be amended from time to time.
    b. A Bylaw Officer shall require payment of applicable fees prior to redemption of a Dog, subject to appeal rights where applicable.
15. Designation Register
    a. The Municipality may maintain an administrative register of Dangerous Dogs' and Fierce Dogs' designations and applicable conditions for enforcement purposes, subject to privacy laws.
    b. The register is an internal enforcement record and is not intended to be a public registry unless required by law or Council decision.

Part VII- ENFORCEMENT POWERS, INVESTIGATION, AND INSPECTION

16. Appointment and Authority
    a. The Municipalities Chief Administrative officer, or their designated may appoint Bylaw Officers for the purpose of administering and enforcing this Bylaw.

    b. Bylaw Officers may request RCMP assistance for enforcement where public safety risks are present, including Dangerous dog of Fierce Dog at-large calls and seizures.

    c. The Municipality may request RCMP accompaniment for calls involving a Dog believed to be Dangerous or Fierce and reported At Large where Bylaw Officer safety requires.

17. Inspection and Entry (non-dwelling)
    a. For the purpose of administering and enforcing this bylaw, a Bylaw Officer may enter onto lands, other than a Dwelling, at reasonable times.

    b. A Bylaw Officer may inspect any non-dwelling structure used for keeping Dogs and may examine containment, sanitation, and records.

c. A Bylaw Officer may take photographs, videos, notes, and other reasonable documentation and may request production of licenses, records, and identification.

d. A person shall not obstruct, hinder, or interfere with a Bylaw Officer acting under this bylaw.

18. Entry to Dwelling
    a. A Bylaw Officer shall not enter a Dwelling without consent of the occupant unless the Officer has lawful authority as provided by a valid warrant.
    b. Nothing in this bylaw limits the authority of police or other emergency responders under applicable law.

19. Public Reporting of Incidents
    a. Any person who witnesses a suspected contravention of this Bylaw is encouraged to report the incident to the Municipality as soon as reasonably practicable.
    b. A report may be made in writing, electronically, or in such other manner as the Municipality may establish.
    c. The Municipality may establish administrative procedures for receiving, recording, and investigating complaints.

20. Witness Evidence
    a. A person reporting a suspected contravention may provide photographs, video recordings, written statements, or other relevant evidence.
    b. A Bylaw Officer may consider such evidence in determining whether a contravention has occurred or whether further investigation is warranted.
    c. Nothing in this section requires the Municipality to disclose personal identifying information of a complainant except as required by law.
    d. In order to proceed with charges under this Bylaw, a complainant/witness or victim must be willing to testify in court should the matter proceed to trial. Such willingness to testify does not obligate the Municipality or Bylaw Officer to lay charges.

21. Evidentiary Assessment
    a. In determining whether a contravention has occurred, the Municipality may rely on:
        i. direct observation of a Bylaw Officer.
        ii. witness statements.
        iii. photographic or video evidence.
        iv. physical evidence.

DRAFT

v. admissions by a party; and
vi. any other evidence the Municipality considers reliable and/or relevant.

b. The Municipality is not required to establish a contravention beyond a reasonable doubt for the purpose of laying charges or issuing an Order or designation under this Bylaw.
c. No person shall knowingly provide false or misleading information in a complaint under this Bylaw.
d. Providing false or misleading information constitutes an offence.

22. Investigation
    a. A Bylaw Officer may investigate complaints, Bite Incidents, and suspected contraventions, including interviewing witnesses and collecting evidence.
    b. An Owner or Guardian shall provide reasonable assistance to a Bylaw Officer investigating a Bite Incident, including identifying the Dog and providing vaccination information;
        i. Failure to do so may result in a fine for obstruction.

Part VIII- Orders to Comply and Service

23. Orders to Comply
    a. Where a Bylaw Officer has reasonable grounds to believe that a person has contravened this Bylaw or that conditions are required to protect public safety, the Bylaw Officer may issue an Order requiring corrective action.
    b. An Order shall be in writing and shall state: (a) the contravention or safety concern; (b) required actions; (c) the deadline for compliance; (d) the consequences of non-compliance; and (e) appeal rights and timelines.
    c. An Order may include conditions such as leashing, muzzle use, Secure Containment upgrades, signage, confinement during deliveries, training, behavioral assessment, microchipping, sterilization, and prohibition from attending specified areas.
    d. A Bylaw Officer may issue an Order containing any conditions that the Bylaw Officer deems necessary.
    e. Failure to comply with an Order is an offence and may result in seizure of the Dog(s) under ***Part XI-***

24. Emergency Interim Orders

DRAFT

a. Where immediate action is necessary to address a significant risk to public safety, a Bylaw Officer may issue an interim Order with immediate effect, including temporary confinement, muzzle, or leash requirements.

b. An interim Order shall be subject to review by the Appeal Committee upon application; filing an appeal does not stay an interim Order.

25. Service of Documents

a. An Order or other document may be served by: (a) personal service; (b) registered mail to the last known address; (c) posting in a visible place on the owner's property where other service is not practicable.

b. Service by registered mail is deemed effective five (5) business days after mailing. Service by posting is deemed effective the next day after posting.

c. A Bylaw Officer may serve an Order on an Owner or Guardian found in control of the Dog at the time of the incident.

d. Advising an Owner or Guardian that an Order is going to be immediately issued constitutes service, should the Owner or Guardian leave or be unavailable.

Part IX- Dangerous and Fierce Dogs

26. Dangerous Dog – Designation Criteria

a. A Dog may be designated as a Dangerous Dog where, on a balance of probabilities, the Municipality determines that the Dog:

i. has committed an Attack causing injury that is not Serious Injury.
ii. has engaged in a Bite Incident or attempted bite.
iii. has aggressively pursued, threatened, or menaced a person or domestic animal.
iv. has, in the opinion of the Municipality based on credible evidence, displayed behavior indicating a heightened risk of Attack.
v. has been found At Large in circumstances creating a risk to public safety, including repeated escapes coupled with aggressive behavior.

b. A designation decision shall be made by written Notice of Designation stating reasons, evidence relied upon, and appeal rights.

27. Fierce Dog- Designation Criteria

a. A Dog may be designated as a Fierce Dog where, on a balance of probabilities, the Municipality determines that the Dog:

i. has committed an Attack causing Serious Injury to a person.

ii. has committed an Attack resulting in death of a person.
iii. has committed repeated Attacks or repeated Bite Incidents demonstrating a pattern of dangerous behavior.
iv. has committed an unprovoked Attack in a Public Place.
v. has failed to comply with conditions imposed for a Dangerous Dog and, as a result, presents an ongoing significant risk.
vi. has attacked a domestic animal causing Serious Injury or death.

b. A Fierce Dog designation shall be accompanied by immediate conditions appropriate to the risk and may include seizure if necessary.

28. Notice, Evidence and Procedural Fairness

a. Before designating a Dog as Dangerous or Fierce the Municipality shall provide written notice to the Owner or Guardian, except where immediate conditions are required for public safety.

b. The notice shall summarize evidence relied upon. The Municipality may withhold personal information of witnesses where required by privacy law, provided the Owner or Guardian is given sufficient information to know the case to meet.

c. The Owner or Guardian may provide written submissions to the Municipality within the time specified in the notice.

d. For the purposes of designation under this Part, the Municipality shall apply the civil standard of proof on a balance of probabilities.

e. The Municipality is not required to prove negligence, intent, or fault on the part of the Owner or Guardian in order to designate a Dog as Dangerous or Fierce.

29. Aggravating or Mitigating Factors

a. In determining whether to designate a Dog as Dangerous or Fierce, or in determining the conditions to impose, the Municipality may consider all relevant circumstances, including but not limited to:
i. the severity of injury caused, whether direct or indirect.
ii. whether the incident was provoked.
iii. if the victim was trespassing or in contravention of a law during the incident
iv. the vulnerability of the victim, including whether the victim was a child, elderly person, or person with a disability.
v. the prior history of aggressive behavior or complaints, stemming from any jurisdiction.

vi. whether the Dog was At Large.
vii. whether the Owner had previously been warned or subject to conditions.
viii. the degree of cooperation by the Owner.
ix. whether Secure Containment was in place.
x. steps taken by the Owner to mitigate risk prior to and following the incident; and
xi. any other factor relevant to public safety and proportionality.

30. Conditions for Dangerous Dogs
    a. Upon designation as Dangerous, the Owner or Guardian shall comply with all conditions imposed, which may include any of the following (the "Dangerous Dog Conditions"):
        i. Secure leash control by a Competent Person when off the Owner's property.
        ii. muzzle in Public Places except as specifically exempted by Order.
        iii. Secure Containment standards (fence height, locking gates, enclosed run, or indoor confinement when unsupervised).
        iv. warning signage at property entrances.
        v. Microchipping at the Owner or Guardian's expense.
        vi. approved training course completion within a stated period, at the Owner or Guardian's expense.
        vii. prohibition on being in specified Public Places or events.
        viii. notification to the Municipality if the Dog is moved, transferred, or lost.
        ix. prohibition on the Dog being under control of a minor.
    b. The Municipality shall tailor conditions to risk, proportionality, and practicality, and shall consider less intrusive measures where they can reasonably protect public safety.

31. Mandatory Conditions- Fierce Dog
    a. Upon designation as Fierce, the Owner or Guardian shall comply with all conditions imposed, which may include any of the following (the "Fierce Dog Conditions"):
        i. permanent muzzling in any Public Place (subject to veterinary exception and municipal approval).
        ii. leash control by a Competent Person at all times off property, with leash length not exceeding 1.5 metres.
        iii. enhanced Secure Containment, including locked gates, enclosed kennel run, and escape-proof barrier standards.

iv. warning signage on property and at entrances.
v. microchipping (mandatory).
vi. proof of training/behavioral management plan completed within the time specified.
vii. restriction or prohibition from designated Public Places.
viii. prohibition on transfer/sale without Municipal approval.
ix. requirement that the Dog not be left outdoors unsupervised.
x. requirement for the Owner to maintain a plan for safe interaction with Lawful Entrants, including notifying all entrants that the Fierce or Dangerous Dog is present.
xi. proof of liability insurance in an amount not less than $1,000,000, covering bodily injury and property damage arising from ownership of the Dog, and proof of such insurance shall be provided annually to the Municipality, and the policy must name the Municipality as an additionally insured.
xii. The Owner shall notify the Municipality immediately if such insurance is cancelled, expires, or is materially altered.
xiii. The Owner or Guardian shall notify the Bylaw Officer and the Municipality immediately, if the Dog runs At Large, bites another person or dog, or if the dog dies.

b. The Municipality may require additional measures necessary to protect public safety.

32. Non-Compliance and Escalation

a. Failure to comply with Dangerous Dog Conditions or Fierce Dog Conditions is an offence and may result in seizure, impoundment and euthanization.

b. Repeated or serious breaches may support re-designation from Dangerous to Fierce or may support court proceedings where warranted.

c. Nothing in this Part limits the Municipality's ability to seek relief in court as permitted by law.

33. Review and Variation

a. An Owner or Guardian may apply for review of conditions after at least twelve (12) months of demonstrated compliance unless the Municipality permits an earlier review.

b. The Municipality may vary conditions based on evidence of compliance, behavioral improvement, or changed circumstances.

c. A Fierce Dog designation may be reviewed only in exceptional circumstances and only where the Municipality is satisfied that public safety can be protected by conditions less restrictive than those imposed.

34. No Automatic Destruction
    a. No Dog shall be destroyed solely because it is designated Dangerous or Fierce, unless such destruction is necessary, by police, for public safety.
    b. Destruction may also occur under ***Part X-*** or by court order after due process.

Part X- X Emergency Powers

35. Dangerous Dog at Large
    a. Where a complaint involves a Dog believed to be Dangerous or Fierce or is designated as such, and reported At Large, or to have breached the conditions imposed, the Municipality may request RCMP accompaniment where bylaw Officer safety requires or may require.
    b. RCMP accompaniment does not limit municipal authority under this Bylaw and does not replace police authority under applicable law.
36. Immediate Threat Response
    a. Where a Dog is At Large and represents a Clear and Present Danger, and where no reasonable alternative exists, a Bylaw Officer or police officer may take immediate action necessary to prevent serious injury or death, including authorizing the Dog to be destroyed.
    b. Emergency destruction under this Part is a measure of last resort in the moment and does not replace the graduated process for non-emergency cases.
    c. Where feasible and safe, a Bylaw Officer should consider reasonable alternatives such as containment, capture, or with other means available where available; however, no Bylaw Officer is required to take actions that would reasonably place the Bylaw Officer or the public at greater risk.
37. Documentation and Internal Review
    a. Where emergency destruction occurs, the Bylaw Officer shall, as soon as practicable:
    b. prepare a written incident report including a narrative, date, time, location(s), witnesses, conduct observed, and alternatives considered and any other

DRAFT

pertinent details relating to the incident, including any history learned from others or from municipal or police records.

c. gather witness statements, medical reports, where necessary or appropriate, document injuries and property damage where applicable.
d. retain photographs, videos, or other evidence.
e. notify the CAO or designate.
f. ensure remains are handled in a dignified and sanitary manner.
g. The Municipality shall conduct an internal administrative review of the incident and retain records in accordance with municipal retention policies.
h. Nothing in this Part limits any reporting obligations to provincial authorities where required by law.

Part XI- XI Seizure, Impoundment Redemption and Disposition

38. Seizure
    a. A Bylaw Officer may seize and impound a Dog that is At Large.
    b. A Bylaw Officer may seize and impound a Dog where the Officer has reasonable grounds to believe the Dog is being kept in contravention of this Bylaw, an Order, or designation conditions.
    c. A Bylaw Officer may request RCMP assistance where seizure presents a safety risk or possible safety risk.
    d. A Bylaw Officer may seize a Dog where necessary to prevent imminent risk pending a designation hearing.
    e. Where practicable, the Owner or Guardian shall be informed of the seizure.
    f. Where a Dog is kept in a Dwelling, the Bylaw Officer shall apply for a warrant to enter and search the property.
39. Impoundment Care
    a. Impounded Dogs shall be kept at the Pound or other facility approved by the Municipality.
    b. The Municipality shall provide care to impounded Dogs consistent with animal welfare standards.
    c. The Owner is responsible for all reasonable costs of seizure, transport, impoundment, boarding, veterinary care, and administration, prior to release of the Dog.
    d. The Municipality may refuse redemption until applicable fees and costs are paid, subject to appeal rights under ***Part XII-***where applicable.
40. Notice and Redemption

a. Where practicable, the Municipality shall take reasonable steps to notify the Owner or Guardian of the impoundment and the steps required to redeem the Dog.
b. A Dog may be redeemed upon proof of ownership, payment of applicable fees and costs, and compliance with licensing and any conditions imposed.
c. Where a Dog is subject to Dangerous Dog or Fierce Dog conditions, redemption may be conditional on proof of compliance, including Secure Containment upgrades or training enrolment.
d. An Owner or Guardian may be subject to fines or penalties under this Bylaw, in addition to and exclusive of any other fees.

41. Holding Periods & Transfer of Ownership

a. Identified Dog (tag/microchip): minimum holding period of seven (7) business days.
b. Unidentified Dog: minimum holding period of seven (7) business days.
c. Investigation Hold: where a Bite Incident or Dangerous/Fierce investigation is underway, the holding period may be extended until the investigation or appeal is concluded, subject to humane care requirements and the Municipality is under no obligation to release the Dog.
d. Upon expiry of the applicable holding period and where a Dog has not been redeemed, all ownership rights to the Dog are deemed to be transferred to the Municipality, and the Municipality may determine disposition in accordance with this Part.

42. Disposition of Unredeemed Dogs

a. If a Dog is not redeemed within the holding period, the Municipality may, having regard to public safety and the Dog's welfare:
    i. place the Dog for adoption where appropriate.
    ii. transfer the Dog to an animal welfare organization or rescue.
    iii. return the Dog to the Owner, which may include being subject to conditions.
    iv. decline to place a Dog for adoption where public or other animal safety concerns exist.
    v. in exceptional circumstances and only where no humane alternative exists, the municipality shall recommend to the Dog Bylaw Committee that the Dog be Euthanized.
b. The Municipality shall not euthanize a Dog solely for administrative convenience.

c. Where euthanasia is considered, the Municipality shall document the reasons alternatives were not viable.
d. Any Dog euthanized shall have the procedure performed humanely, by a veterinarian licenced in the Province of Nova Scotia.
e. Regardless of the dog being unclaimed, the known Owner or Guardian is responsible for all fees relating to the transportation, impoundment, boarding, care, veterinary care and costs, euthanization and administration.

Part XII- XII Appeals (Dog Bylaw Appeal Committee)

43. Establishment and Composition

a. A Dog Bylaw Appeal Committee is hereby established.

b. The Appeal Committee shall consist of two CAO appointed staff members and one Council appointed Councillor where available.

c. To eliminate conflict of interest, the two staff members shall not be: The Chief Administrative Officer, the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Director of Land Use and Planning, or a staff member within the Land Use and planning department or any enforcement capacity.

d. Council may appoint alternate council members and may establish terms of appointment by resolution.

e. A member shall disclose any conflict of interest and shall recuse themselves where required.

f. Quorum of the Appeal Committee shall consist of three (3) members.

g. Decisions shall be made by majority vote of members present.

h. Where there is a tie vote, the decision under appeal is deemed confirmed.

i. Members shall conduct hearings in accordance with principles of procedural fairness.

44. Jurisdiction and Powers

a. The Appeal Committee may hear appeals of:
    i. Orders to Comply (including interim Orders).
    ii. Dangerous Dog and Fierce Dog designations and conditions.
    iii. license conditions, suspensions, revocations, or refusals.
    iv. decisions relating to redemption conditions where materially disputed.

DRAFT

b. The Appeal Committee may confirm, vary, or rescind the decision appealed and may impose reasonable conditions consistent with this Bylaw.
c. The Appeal Committee shall review and determine any recommendation by the Bylaw Officer for the euthanasia of a Dog, and may confirm, vary, or refuse such recommendation in accordance with this Bylaw. The Appeal Committee shall give written reasons of its decisions to the Chief Administrative Officer and the Appellant.

45. Appeal Procedure

a. An appeal must be filed in writing with the Municipality within fourteen (14) business days of the decision, unless the Appeal Committee grants an extension for good cause.
b. The Municipality shall schedule a hearing as soon as reasonably practicable and shall provide notice of date, time, and location to all parties involved.
c. Hearings shall be informal but shall comply with principles of procedural fairness, including the right to know the case to meet and to respond.
d. The Appeal Committee may receive evidence in any form it considers reliable and is not bound by strict rules of evidence.
e. The Appeal Committee may permit parties to be represented by counsel or an agent.
f. The Appeal Committee may make procedural directions respecting disclosure, time limits, and order of presentations.
g. The Appeal Committee may enter in camera as outlined in the Municipal government act for committees of council.
h. The committee may request the lawyer.

46. Euthanasia

a. Where the Bylaw Officer recommends euthanization of a Dog, the matter shall automatically be referred to the Appeal Committee for determination.
b. The Appeal Committee shall convene a hearing within 3 business days unless impracticable due to exceptional circumstances.
c. The Bylaw Officer shall attend the hearing to present evidence and respond to questions from the Appeal Committee.

DRAFT

d. The Owner or Guardian of the Dog shall be provided an opportunity to be heard, except where the Committee determines that urgent action is required to address an immediate risk to public safety.

e. In making its decision, the Appeal Committee shall consider:

   i. the severity and circumstances of the behaviour giving rise to the recommendation.

   ii. the likelihood of future risk to public safety.

   iii. whether reasonable and humane alternatives to euthanization have been attempted or are available; and

   iv. any other relevant factors consistent with this Bylaw and public safety.

f. Euthanization shall be considered a measure of last resort and shall only be ordered where the Appeal Committee is satisfied that no reasonable alternative exists to adequately protect public safety.

g. The Appeal Committee may conduct all or part of a hearing in camera to protect confidential information, including investigative methods and the identity of complainants or victims, provided that any such decision is made by resolution in a public session.

47. Stays

a. Filing an appeal does not stay the operation of an Order, Designation or Condition.

b. The Appeal Committee may grant a stay on terms it considers appropriate, except when deemed necessary to address an immediate risk to public safety remain in force unless expressly stayed.

Part XIII- XIII Offences, Penalties and Cost Recovery

48. Offences

a. Every person who contravenes this Bylaw, an Order, or a condition-imposed license conditions, suspensions, revocations, or refusals under this Bylaw commits an offence.

b. Each day a contravention continues constitutes a separate offence.

c. A person who obstructs a Bylaw Officer commits an offence.

DRAFT

d. In addition to any other remedy under this Bylaw, the Municipality may establish by policy or resolution an Administrative Monetary Penalty regime for specified contraventions were authorized by legislation.

e. An Administrative Monetary Penalty shall not preclude prosecution for serious or repeat offences.

f. The Municipality may establish review procedures for Administrative Monetary Penalties by policy.

49. Penalties and Tickets

a. Penalties, including fines and Summary Offence Ticket amounts, shall be as set by Council from time to time according to the Fees Policy, consistent with the MGA and applicable provincial ticketing regimes.

b. In addition to any fine, the court may order payment of costs, restitution, or other relief as permitted by law.

c. Nothing in this Bylaw prevents prosecution by summary conviction were permitted by law.

50. Cost Recovery

a. All reasonable costs incurred by the Municipality in enforcing this Bylaw, including seizure, impoundment, care, veterinary costs, and administrative costs, are recoverable from the Owner as a debt due to the Municipality, and may be collected in accordance with applicable law.

b. The Municipality may refuse licensing or redemption until costs are paid, subject to appeal rights where applicable.

51. Repeal

a. The existing Dog Bylaw #3 is repealed upon the coming into force of this Bylaw.

52. Effective Date

a. This Bylaw comes into force effective (insert date here).

DRAFT

Part XIV- Appendix A - Current fines *(to be removed)*

1	Owner of dog failing to provide statement within 10 days of receiving notice	9(b)	$237.50
2	Owning dog that runs at large	13(a)	$237.50
3	Owning dog for which registration fee is not paid	13(b)	$237.50
4	Owning fierce or dangerous dog	13(c)	$237.50
5	Owning dog that persistently disturbs neighbourhood quiet by barking or howling or otherwise	13(e)	$237.50
6	Owner of dog failing to remove dog feces from property not belonging to owner	13(f)	$237.50

Appendix B – Proposed updated fines *(pending approval)*

Level 1 Administrative/Minor offences

Offence	First	Second*	Third+
Failure to license dog	$100	$200	$300
Failure to display dog tag	$75	$150	$250
Failure to notify change of address	$75	$150	$250
Failure to remove feces	$150	$300	$500
Nuisance barking	$200	$400	$600
Dog in restricted area	$150	$300	$500

*First offences expire after 24 months in level one, a warning does not constitute first offence

DRAFT

Level 2 – Control/Public Safety Offences

Offence	First	Second*	Third+
Dog At Large	$250	$500	$750
Failure to leash a dog	$200	$400	$600
Use of Invisible Fence as sole containment	$300	$600	$1,000
Tethering creating public risk	$300	$600	$1,000
Failure to implement protective measures	$300	$600	$1,000

*First offences expire after 24 months in level one, a warning does not constitute first offence

Level 3 – Dangerous/Vicious Non-Compliance

Offence	First	Second	Third+
Breach of Dangerous Dog condition	$750	$1,500	$2,500
Breach of Fierce Dog condition	$1,500	$3,000	$5,000
Failure to report bite	$500	$1,000	$2,000
Obstruction of Bylaw Officer	$750	$1,500	$2,500
Providing false or misleading complaint	$500	$1,000	$2,000
Failure to maintain Fierce Dog Insurance	$1,000	$2,000	$3,500
Failure to Notify Municipality of cancellation or alteration of required insurance	$750	$1,500	$2,500

DRAFT

Offence	First	Second	Third+
Failure to comply with an Order or Interim Order	$750	$1,500	$2,500

Level 4 – Severe Public Safety Violations

Offence	Recommended Fine Range
Allowing Dangerous Dog to be At Large	up to $5,000
Allowing Fierce Dog to be At Large	up to $10,000
Repeat breach of Order resulting in injury	up to $10,000

DRAFT