Animals Bylaw review



Purpose of this briefing

 Complete statutory determinations for bylaw review under section 155 LGA

Direction on the preferred option for the Statement of Proposal



Review timeline

| Apr-2021 | scoping + research on Animals Bylaws |
|----------|--|
| Jul-2021 | Council briefing – Key Bylaw issues and process |
| Jul-2021 | analysis/legal advice |
| Today | Council briefing - options and direction for SOP |
| Sep-2021 | SOP development |
| Oct-2021 | Council briefing - draft SOP |
| Now-2021 | Council Meeting - adopt SOP |
| Dec-2021 | formal consultation |
| Jan-2022 | analysis/legal advice |
| Feb-2022 | Hearing/ deliberations |
| Mar-2022 | final drafting/ legal advice |
| Apr-2022 | Adoption |

Formal process can take 12 -18 months





Overview of the Animals Bylaw 2017

Council's Animals Bylaw is designed to supplement, rather than duplicate provisions under the following:

- Animal Welfare Act 1999 and related codes of welfare
- Health Act 1956
- Biosecurity Act 1993
- Land Transport Act 1998
- RMA 1991

Dog management is out of scope → Dog Bylaw Animal welfare out of scope → SPCA

High level of community interest in relation to the keeping of cats

1,019 submissions on the LTP



s.155 LGA - Council must determine

- Attachment 1 provides detailed analysis
- The perceived problem:
 - keeping of domestic animals in urban areas, and potential nuisance and health concerns it may create
- Is a bylaw the most appropriate way of addressing the perceived problem?
 - A bylaw is still appropriate
 - non-regulatory measures would be insufficient to address the problem
- Is the bylaw in the most appropriate form?
 - No needs to be amended
 - Update the definition of urban area
 - Consideration wither additional controls are needed for cats?
- Any implications under the NZ Bill of Rights Act?
 - No implications



Perceived problems

- Nuisance under s.145 LGA
 - the relevant behaviour is something for which a person is responsible
 - the nuisance is to the public (as distinct from, say, nuisance to other cats)
- Public health and safety under s.145 LGA
- The keeping of animals under s.146 LGA
 - the power is to regulate the keeping of cats, and not to regulate cats per se
 - NOT wildlife protection → RMA 1991, Biosecurity Act 1993
 - NOT pest control → NRC Pest Management Plan
 - NOT animal welfare

 SPCA under the Animal Welfare Act 1999



Bylaw validity

Lawful

- An unlawful bylaw is ultra-vires
- Legislation must explicitly give Council power to make the bylaw

Appropriate

- within Council's bylaw-making purposes
- relates to matters in respect of which the Council has a statutory role or function

Reasonable and proportionate

- remedies the actual problem
- proportionate to the extend of the experienced problem



Appropriateness

Relationship between sections 145 and 146 LGA

- s.145 nuisance, health; s.146(a)(v) "keeping of animals"
 - s.145 is general, and s.146 is specific
 - s.145 provides context to determine reasonableness of a bylaw made under s.146
 - s.146 restricted to the "keeping" of the animals (e.g. cats), and not the mere existence or presence of cats in the district
 - Stray cats or predation of wildlife are not lawful purposes of bylaw-making power under s.146
 - S.145 is broader than section 146(a)(v) because behaviour which causes a nuisance need not be limited to the "keeping" of cats e.g. the encouragement and feeding of stray cats.

 Whangarei

District Council

Reasonable and proportionate

- Is there a real problem in enforcing the current bylaw which microchipping would remedy?
 - In principle microchipping could be implemented to assist in enforcing limits on cat numbers
 - Other benefits of microchipping are related to matters outside the Council's bylaw-making purpose (finding lost cats, assisting in pest control)
- Depends on evidence of enforcement difficulties with the current bylaw – no difficulty since 2017 when bylaw was made.
- Mandatory desexing is likely to be too onerous and not in proportion to the extent of experienced problems.



Microchipping

Is microchipping within the Council's bylaw-making power to regulate "the keeping of animals" (excluding dogs)

Problem: wildlife protection, stray cats, pest control

Tests:

- ✓ not ultra vires s.146 allows to regulate the keeping of animals.
- X appropriateness does not relate to matters in respect of which the Council has a statutory role or function.
- X reasonableness cannot demonstrate that there has been difficultly in enforcing the current bylaw which microchipping would remedy.

Problem: assist in enforcing limits on numbers of cats kept per property

Tests:

- ✓ not ultra vires s.146 allows to regulate the keeping of animals.
- ✓ appropriateness Council may regulate how many cats are kept subject to conditions.
- X reasonableness cannot demonstrate that there has been difficultly in enforcing the current bylaw in relation to nuisance from numbers of pet cats

Whangarei

District Council

Options for cat management

- Option 1: No specific cat clauses in the bylaw. Regulation under the general rule (clause 6)
- Option 2: Limit the number of cats allowed per property
- Option 3: Mandatory microchipping and registration
- Option 4: Mandatory desexing of cats.
- Option 5 (Recommended): Non-regulatory measures in addition to retaining clause 6

Reasonably practicable options following review

 Option A – Retain the bylaw in its current form and continue without amendment

Option B – Consultation on the full bylaw

Option C – Allow the bylaw to expire



Feedback needed today:

- Complete statutory determinations for bylaw review under section 155 LGA
 - Options for cat management
- Direction on the preferred option for the Statement of Proposal
 - Reasonably practicable options following bylaw review
 - Recommended Option B consultation on the full bylaw. Develop a draft Statement of Proposal.