

DOG CONTROL BYLAW COMMITTEE  
MINUTES      AUGUST 17, 2011

PUBLIC HEARING FOR PROPOSED BYLAW REVISIONS

- Meeting started at 7:05PM.
- All Committee Members present:
  - Michael Bouchard
  - Lt. James Cullen
  - Tom Delaney
  - Susan Hogan
  - George Moore
- Meeting started with brief presentation of activities to date
- Comments from the Public
  - Can consideration be given to other “remedies”, other than fines? Examples to be dog training, owner certification, etc.
    - Other remedies often included in a order from the dog officer.
  - Are changes to the bylaw necessary?
    - Committee was asked to review bylaw in light of recent serious dog incident. Our focus was to review the current bylaw and recommend appropriate changes that would enhance the ability for the dog officer to address incidents.
  - Member of the public stated that his land is posted for “no dogs”. He informs realtors selling houses in the area of this. Member raises livestock.
  - Are Pit Bulls banned?
    - Bylaw intentionally does not address specific breeds.
  - General support of the provisions that the dog officer should have an ability to make incident related determinations.
  - Several discussions on the need for “physical control” contrasted to “control”.  
Summaries:
    - Responsible owners will exercise appropriate control
    - Irresponsible owners may not exercise proper control
    - Public safety must be given top priority
  - Does physical control mean a “leash law”? Why not call it a leash law?
    - Dogs on a leash under owner’s control meet the requirement of the law.
    - There are other methods of physical control (e.g. electric collars)
    - A dog on a leash with an owner of limited physical ability may not have the dog under physical control, yet still be on a leash.
  - Why is “written permission” required? Why not just require that the owner have “no objection”?
    - “No objection” is passive. If the owner isn’t asked, how would one know
    - Would “permission” be adequate? Committee to consider.
  - Clarify some inconsistent language in the bylaw.