

### Animal Bylaw Amendment Recommendations

The following is a summary of Administration’s Bylaw amendment recommendations. These have been developed based on the first 24 months of the new Animal Bylaw being put into practice as well as the resident feedback received.

Topic	Description	Challenge identified as of November 2, 2015	New Information from survey (Leger 2016)	Recommendation	Impacts and Rationale
Trails, playgrounds, tot lots, sports fields/courts within off-leash areas,	Under section 27 of the Animal Bylaw it is allowable for pedestrian trails, tot lots and sports fields/courts to be within an off-leash area. Dogs are however prohibited from entering a playground area and must be on-leash when on a trail	40% of the comments received in the resident survey expressed safety concerns about dogs not being in complete control. Out of control dogs can include dogs that are barking excessively, not listening to their owners, running into other dogs, chasing dogs, showing aggressive behaviour, dogs that are in or on playgrounds and dogs that are unleashed on the walking trails. This matter is compounded when we also take into consideration that	61% of respondents were concerned with the location of off leash sites, adjacent to a playground. 60% were concerned with the location of off leash sites adjacent to a school. 51% were concerned with the location of off leash sites, to a sport field and 41% were concerned with the location of off leash sites to a trail.	That the criteria in the Animal Bylaw for off-leash dog designations be amended so that it prohibits off-leash areas from having trails, playgrounds, tot lots, sports fields/courts within them (other than enclosed outdoor rinks, or trails that remain solely within the off-leash park boundaries).	This will encourage a safer park environment for users. It responds to and acknowledges mixed feedback from residents. Ultimately it will reduce conflicts with mixed use in park areas. Research has indicated that this approach is a more commonly accepted practice in municipalities. This approval will result in the removal 15 off leash sites.

		20.9% of the comments received suggest that additional fencing and barriers be incorporated in order to separate off-leash and on-leash areas.			
Off-leash areas in every Neighbourhood	Section 27 of the Animal Bylaw requires the City Manager to “endeavour” to establish an off-leash area in every neighbourhood.	In order to meet this provision, Administration is required to designate off-leash areas in parks that are not necessarily designed to accommodate a large number of off-leash dogs. These parks often will often have multi-use trails, playgrounds and sports play areas within them therefore increasing the likelihood for a negative off-leash dog interaction.	77% of respondents don’t think that any off leash sites should be removed. 41% of respondents expressed various concerns with the location of the leash sites.	If Council supports the first recommendation then administration recommends that section of the bylaw that requires the City Manager to “endeavour” to establish an off-leash area in every neighbourhood be removed, as every neighbourhood does not have a green space that meets the site requirement.	Not all residents will have access to an off leash site in their neighbourhood.
Public applications for off-leash designation changes	Section 27 of the Animal Bylaw requires that the City Manager establishes a process and	Administration has realized that there are strong divisive opinions on off-leash site designations. By accepting	The survey has reaffirmed that the community is divided on the topic of dog off leash areas.	That the provisions that require the City Manager to establish a policy in order to accept applications for off-	Because this issue is divisive, Administration feels that this process will create a further divide in

	<p>policy for accepting applications from residents, groups or organizations for adding, removing or altering an off-leash area.</p>	<p>applications on changing designations, Administration believes that this will result in further community frustration and it will require additional resources by Administration to manage.</p>		<p>leash designations changes be removed.</p>	<p>the community. It is the responsibility of administration through the bylaw, city manager directives and public feedback to ensure off leash areas meet the needs of the community at large.</p>
<p>Outdoor Boarded Rinks – Off-leash times</p>	<p>Section 27 designates that all “outdoor rinks” shall be designated as off-leash areas.</p>	<p>Although it has not happened or been a challenge yet and risk is very low, there is a chance that dog owners can have their dogs off-leash during winter or when rinks are being formed.</p>	<p>Anecdotally we have had positive response from the public on the use of outdoor rinks during the months that ice is not in use. Administration is not currently booking outdoor boarded rinks in the summer months. Seeing that only 47% of survey respondents use dog parks in the winter during</p>	<p>The recommendation is that Administration add the appropriate wording to only permit off-leash activity during the months that ice is not in use on the outdoor boarded rinks.</p>	<p>Allowing outdoors boarded rinks to be used as off leash sites through a portion of the year, will allow more residents to have access within some neighbourhoods. This will ensure that there isn’t opportunity for conflict of use of the space in the winter.</p>

			which time the outdoor rinks are programmable areas. For these reasons, it is agreeable to set seasonal designations on outdoor boarded rinks.		
Dangerous Dog Determination	Section 17 prescribes the how a dog may be deemed "dangerous" as well as the process for a dog owner to appeal this declaration.	If a dog owner appeals a declaration, under section 17(8) the General Manager of Community and Protective Services has the responsibility to make a decision after hearing the evidence, however there is no time limit placed on the General Manager to make this decision.	N/a	The recommendation is that Administration added to the provision an appropriate time limit to decide. Such as "within 20 calendar days".	This will ensure that the process is not unreasonably delayed and both the victims and appellant understand the time lines around decisions.