

DRAFT CONDITION NUMBER/QUESTION	CONSULTATION RESPONSE NUMBER COMMENT RECEIVED (TOTAL RESPONSES)	COMMENTS	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
3. CONSTRUCTION	258(HB)	258(HB) – An external run within the property may allow an elderly dog to lie out in the sun and watch as everyone goes about their business, likewise a puppy could play freely in the open air and learn by watching proceedings. Daytime only, when weather permits and not necessarily every day.			
Q3.1 Do you agree that if there is external construction then the premises is not home boarding but rather a kennel?	1,3,4,9,35,40,43,45,50,57/63 58,70,89, 106, 114, 124, 126, 146, 158, 164+165 170, 173, 185, 189, 199 201,202, 206, 225, 226(HB) 230, 235(HB), 245, 247, 253(HB), 258(HB), 255,	1-only agree if dogs spent majority of time outside 3-probably yes 4-issue for owner and home boarder as some dogs prefer to be outside 9-agree 35-agree 40-agree 43-broadly agree 46-yes 50-agree 57/63-unreasonable-I expect the sitter to allow my dog in the garden to exercise and toilet, it is reasonable to fence off part of it for their use. Re an external kennel some dogs like to have a place they can retreat for solitude-having a separate run or kennel allows the sitter to isolate the dog if unwell or in season-maybe put a limit on the numbers of structures	33	2	2

		<p>58-do not see a problem if there is a dog run built but expect the dog to sleep and spend time in the home</p> <p>70-Agree</p> <p>89-agree</p> <p>106 – agree</p> <p>114 – yes, agree</p> <p>124 – wholeheartedly agree</p> <p>126 – agree</p> <p>146 – seems reasonable</p> <p>158 – agree</p> <p>164+165 – agree in principle but depends on construction of building</p> <p>164+165</p> <p>170 – agree</p> <p>173 – yes</p> <p>185 – agree</p> <p>189 – totally agree</p> <p>199 – reasonable but total exclusion of any external structure overbearing</p> <p>201- Don't see a problem if a dog run is built but would expect dog to sleep and spend time within the home.</p> <p>202-agree.</p> <p>206 – yes.</p> <p>225 – agree.</p> <p>226(HB) – Yes agree. Home boarding only applies to dogs kept within the main home structure.</p> <p>230- Agree</p> <p>235(HB) – Agree. People use me because dogs are in a home environment.</p> <p>245 – In Principle, when an animal is 'home boarded'</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>it is expected to be kept in the home environment as a family pet, rather than an outside kennel. Strict definitions can determine what is and isn't acceptable external construction.</p> <p>247 – Completely misses the point of HB which offers the ability for dogs to mix in a natural environment and enjoy home comforts. Sleeping arrangements should be agreed between owner & licensee.</p> <p>253(HB) – Agree. Boarding outside home is a kennel/cattery.</p> <p>258(HB) – Almost all dogs sleep happily in cages, it is not incarceration. Cages are good for dogs, not punishment!</p> <p>255 – Agree.</p>			
3.2	1,70,114,124,164+165, 189 233	<p>1-agree</p> <p>70-Agree</p> <p>114 – ok</p> <p>124 – agree</p> <p>164,165 - agreed 164,165 – agreed</p> <p>189 – no problem provided dog on lead when enter/exit property</p> <p>233 – How many HB's will have separate entrance just for animals?</p>			
3.3	1,70,114,124164+165	<p>1-agree</p> <p>70- Agree</p> <p>114 – ok</p> <p>124 – agree</p> <p>164+165 – agreed but natural hazards in every</p>			

		house so may be excessive			
Q3.4 Should separation be physical e.g cage	1,3,4,9,34,35,40,43,46,50 52,57/63,58,70,74,87,89, 106, 114, 115, 121, 124, 126, 146, 158, 164+165, 170, 173, 185, 189, 199 202, 206,225, 226(HB230, 231, 235(HB), 242, 245, 247, 250, 252(HB), 253(HB), 255,)	1-agree. Cages only acceptable if dogs not kept in for long periods 3-should be space to separate if needed 4-in unlikely event dogs need to be separated cage/room would work-no need to distinguish how it occurs 9-sufficient that are adequate facilities to separate 34-not necessary to regulate this-surely if needed house would have separate room 35-most homes could find a room to accommodate a sick/distressed animal 40-different room or tethered within same room or cage in extreme circumstances 43-broadly agree 46-prefer a different room-if no space for this would question whether the house is suitable for boarding 50-cage or crate suitable not necessary to have separate room 52-agreement between owner and sitter what they are happy with-should be facilities if required 57/63-unreasonable to insist on a separate room-is reasonable to expect a sitter to have a cage but if a dog needs to be kept separate I would prefer it in an outside kennel 58-agree 70-As long as enough space, a room or crate, which ever suits the situation best. 74-Depends on the animal and owners requirements and for how long required. If dogs is not caged at	33	6	7

		<p>home not wanting this with boarder. 87-this para should be made clearer-have no problem if an owner may only insist on their own dog being kept separately from any other dogs 89-agree 106 – agree sometimes needs to be separation. Up to owner if they want their dog caged. 114 – yes, separation should be physical, they use crates and/or separate rooms 115 – agree animals should not be caged unless also caged in own home 121 – separate room or cage 124 – believe separation rarely required. Use cage if owner requests. 126 – separation should be by crate. Stacking of crates should not be permitted. 146 – should be available & either would achieve 158 – separation by room preferable 164+165 – too vague – what is sufficient space? Crate or room? Every dog different. 170 – should be allowed to control/separate with crate or separate room 173 – intent needs to be clearer – yes if separating sick or injured animal 185 – prefer different room to cage/crate 189 – baby gate should be sufficient 199 – cage/crate adequate 202-important for dogs to have access to areas that can be considered 'away' from the rest, for their own personal comfort.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>206 – Some dogs like their own space & will go to another room, others prefer company.</p> <p>225 – Should only be required in extreme cases.</p> <p>226 – Separation should be physical and should be by room. Crate should only be used for short periods.</p> <p>230- Strongly disagree with use of cages to separate. Should be separate room if at all.</p> <p>231 - Disagree. They should not be separated.</p> <p>235(HB) – Agree. Maybe not different rooms but ensure space to cage some dogs if needed.</p> <p>242 – Would suggest NO – depends on the dog and should be left to HB’s discretion.</p> <p>245 – Agree – must be sufficient space available to keep dogs separately if required. If using a crate it is essential that the dog has been positively trained to accept the crate.</p> <p>247 – Licensee to determine.</p> <p>250 – Dogs should mix to socialise and should be left to the discretion of the licensee.</p> <p>252(HB) – Crating acceptable to keep dogs apart. ONLY reason I separate dogs is to prevent play on the odd occasion they are left. Any dog with a suspect nature does not stay.</p> <p>253(HB) – Yes, separate room or crate depending on reason.</p> <p>255 – Crates are suitable with a single separate room if required.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

<p>3.5</p>	<p>1,70, 114, 124, 164+165, 199, 253(BH)</p>	<p>1-dogs should be caged separately whilst travelling 70-agree 114 – ok 124 – essential 164+165 – agreed 199 – method of restraint during transport up to owner & sitter 253(HB) – Any transportation should require the dog to be restrained.</p>			
-------------------	--	---	--	--	--

DRAFT CONDITION NUMBER/QUESTION	CONSULTATION RESPONSE NUMBER COMMENT RECEIVED (TOTAL RESPONSES)	COMMENTS	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
4. NUMBERS OF ANIMALS					
4.1	1,21,70,74, 114, 119, 124, 126, 138, 164+165, 182, 185, 188, 252(HB), 253(HB), 258(HB)	<p>1-agree. Need to take various factors into account including number of dogs walked at one time. recommend no more than 4</p> <p>21-max no should reflect the boarders situation i.e more than one carer, could have more dogs</p> <p>70-Number of dogs determined by facilities</p> <p>74-Will this be based on floor space or adult ratio?</p> <p>114 – ok, they current accept max 4</p> <p>119 – needs clarification. HB to decide appropriate number.</p> <p>124 – decision should be sole responsibility of HB, take flexible approach on numbers. HB can make decision better than licensing authority</p> <p>126 – unreasonable & subjective – replace with obligation on HB to state its max capacity to council & clients. Should have signed contract between owner & HB.</p> <p>138 – how will max number be decided? Need guidelines now so no surprises later.</p> <p>164+165 – need to specify how will be determined</p> <p>182 – not sure how relevant, boarder should be the</p>			

		<p>one to decide numbers. Irrelevant so long as dogs happy, safe, secure</p> <p>185 – number should be determined by host</p> <p>188 – will put boarders out of business</p> <p>252(HB) – Number of dogs should be at discretion of licensee. Some will be able to cope with more than others due to environment or experience.</p> <p>253(HB) – I have my own criteria in place taking in to account the size of my house and my 2 resident dogs.</p> <p>258(HB) – Numbers of dogs -Unforeseen circumstances (snow, Ice, volcanic ash, airline strikes, and bereavements) may on occasion cause an increase /overlap. Please remember this is a customer driven service – which is why you have had a large angry response from HB customers. Be realistic.</p>			
Q4.2 Is this reasonable?	<p>1,3,4,5,7,8,9,10,12,13,14,15,16,17,19,20,21,23,24,25,26,27,29,30,32,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,43,44,45,46,47,48,50,51,52,54,55,56,57/63,58,59,60,62,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,72,73,74,75,76,78,81,82,83,84,87,89,90,92,93,94,95,96,97,100,101,103,105,106,113,114,115,116,119,121,122,123,124,125,126,127,128,129,130,131,132,133,134,135,136,137,138,</p>	<p>1-no – some owners like dogs to mix. Not financially viable for sitter. Suggest have written permission from owners</p> <p>3-Quite mad, dogs love company</p> <p>4-not reasonable-totally disagree</p> <p>5-don't understand why would want this</p> <p>7-no one could earn a living just boarding one households pets-great asset to many pet owners who prefer a 'home-from-home environment</p> <p>8-home boarders are like our pets having a 'second' home well looked after with walks, well cared for –owner has no worries for their pets welfare and happiness – trust common sense will prevail-treat each establishment individually</p> <p>9-outrageous- not reasonable, ridiculous and</p>	1	185	1

	<p>139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 164+165, 168, 169 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 181, 182, 183, 185, 186, 187, 189, 191, 193, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199, 201, 202, 203, 206, 207, 212, 210, 213, 216, 218, 222, 223, 224(P/T HB), 225, 226(HB), 228, 229, 230, 231, 233, 234, 235(HB), 237, 239(HB), 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 248, 247, 249, 250, 251(HB), 252(HB), 260, 254, 253(HB), 258(HB), 255</p>	<p>unrealistic 10-no, unviable, inconsistent locally- no appeal process? 12-business would become unviable, impacts on owners who depend on these boarders- have restriction of number of dogs kept at any one time 13-not reasonable 14-against this as would destroy current excellent levels of service animals currently receive 15-unnecessary-dogs love company, able to provide care at short notice-unviable for boarders 16-disagree 17-ludicrous-will lead to decrease in standards and correct controls being in place 19-ludicrous, unviable for boarder, do not want to lose this service-good idea to licence but not to restrict the numbers 20-unreasonable- needs to be removed but licensing is a good idea 21-unreasonable- dogs enjoy socialising 23-no, not viable for boarder, owners would not wish to use kennels for their dogs 24-object, put petsitter out of business as one dog not viable-cannot see problem with other dogs staying at house-is feasible to put limit on number of dogs 25-dogs are pack animals, limiting numbers is not relevant – the more the merrier 26-not practical or necessary-will seriously reduce this valued service-boarders will be forced to close down through economics</p>			
--	---	---	--	--	--

		<p>27-too restrictive – unviable-owner responsibility- dogs benefit from social interaction-would be more expensive</p> <p>29-impractical, too severe-a good assessment of facilities and care is enough to maintain standards-a limit on numbers should be done in consultation with the boarder</p> <p>30-detrimental to wellbeing of animals, unreasonable-pack animals enjoy company of other dogs-unviable to a business-removing owners choice of how to board animals</p> <p>32-over complicated, irrelevant, would put many pet sitters out of business</p> <p>34-unreasonable, business no longer able to be viable-decision on numbers should be based on facilities, size of house and boarders own preference,</p> <p>35-unnecessary-a good pet sitter will have control over animals boarded</p> <p>36-would make business unviable</p> <p>37-no, ludicrous, not be financially viable, happy for boarder to have other dogs for company-decision for owner not 'nanny state'</p> <p>38-unreasonable-suggest owner should be able to give written permission happy to board with other dogs</p> <p>39-this currently takes place with the agreement and to the benefit of dogs and owners-why change this and prevent dogs suitable care when they need it</p> <p>40-totally unreasonable-sisagree completely-destroy businesses, render inaccessible a valuable service</p> <p>41-not reasonable-business unviable, provide valuable</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>service would not wish taken away, dogs enjoy socialising</p> <p>43-no not reasonable, would close businesses, owners with one dog would be discriminated against, up to owners to decide if happy for pet to stay in household with other pets</p> <p>44-do not agree</p> <p>45-need to revise thinking- leave to home boarder to decide-great advantages for socialising and distracted when owner away</p> <p>46-no,totally disagree, no basis-well socialised dogs should be able to live together comfortably-as long as introductions made in effective manner no need for this, good for dogs to socialise, up to owner to assess if their dog will be happy in this situation- if this were to happen less places available to board pets, not enhance welfare of dog as need to be put into kennels or left with less willing family/friends</p> <p>47-unacceptable-dogs need socialisation-when at home boarders get this for several hours/days which not opportunity for at own home</p> <p>48-not flexible enough-common sense approach to dogs from different households could be adopted- or will not be viable business-kennels do not offer same level of individual care</p> <p>50-no, unviable, resulting in no or few pet sitters</p> <p>51-would seriously affect my pet sitters business as she has dogs from different households. Important to socialise dogs one reason I send my dog to her</p> <p>52-unreasonable and unrealistic numbers should be</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>sensible and comfortable for pet sitter, dogs enjoy company of others</p> <p>54-unacceptable-our dog sitter gives us peace of mind whilst away and would not cope with kennels, dogs prefer other dogs for company</p> <p>55-do not add this condition – pet sitter will go out of business, I rely on her as one less thing to worry about as know dog happy when there</p> <p>56-do not include-business unviable – dogs well looked after and contented, boarding dogs in home rather than kennels far less stressful</p> <p>57/63-will be more expensive to board my dog if have to pay exclusive use of sitter-dogs also benefit from socialisation with others</p> <p>58-no, great cause for concern- business would be financially unviable increase unemployment, valuable service provided, cause increase in cruelty as people forced to leave dogs for long periods of time unattended, dogs enjoy socialising</p> <p>59-unnecessary, valuable service would become unviable</p> <p>60-ridiculous, can not run a business with just one dog</p> <p>61-have concerns about this –current sitter provides home environment, dog well looked after, trust her to treat dogs medical conditions, socialising- rely on service as would not wish to put dog in kennels- happy to mix dog with others- need to reconsider this proposal</p> <p>62-concerns-if sitter unable to have my dog if already</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>looking after another</p> <p>64-no-boarder only takes well trained and agreeable natured dogs- would be detrimental to dorder and dog owners</p> <p>65-not a problem to have dogs from different households as long as the right facilities and procedures are in place-also boarders would probably go out of business if this were to be imposed</p> <p>66-this would effectively remove pet sitters from the economy as would not be a viable business, good for dogs to socialise</p> <p>67-no, we are very happy for our dog to be with other dogs as enjoys socialising and home from home environment and the option of using kennels would be dreadful</p> <p>68-it should be possible for dogs from 4 or 5 homes to board together so long as they get on</p> <p>69-no, maybe state a maximum for each pet sitter according to their facilities and experience</p> <p>70-People who use pet sitters want their dog treated as with personal approach and part of the family. If they want dog kept separately they would use kennel. Time spent with sitter and boarders should be fun filled. If owner is happy with sitter offering this service to more than one dog there is no reason to change. business's might have to close if we implement these changes.</p> <p>72-it restrictive, people who board animals are capable to making sensible judgements about which dogs can be board together and they are not necessarily from a</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>single household.</p> <p>73-Some dogs love mixing with other dogs, it make them well socialised.</p> <p>74-Boarders discretion</p> <p>75-Please delete</p> <p>76-Completely unworkable. Dogs need to meet other dogs socialising is important even through adulthood.</p> <p>78-the majority of people only have 1 dog, which suggests that having only 1 dog at any one time will potentially put some home boarders out of business.</p> <p>79-Ridiculous, it would completely stop any home boarder from being able to carry on their business. Our dog loves meeting other dogs over a slightly longer period. What harm is there in dogs from different homes sharing some space together. Dogs are pack animals who enjoy being in a group. They are very skilled at sorting out the "pecking order" for themselves so fights are unlikely, especially if you exclude the dangerous dogs. As long as their injection are up to date, there is not much likelihood of transmission of anything worse than fleas.</p> <p>80. It would place undue and unnecessary restrictions on home boarding and will consequently render such business unviable. Also it allows dogs to be in a home based environment, allowing the dog to socialise, essential for a contented, well natured dog. Kennels are not an option for my dog. I strongly urge that this clause in its present form be deleted.</p> <p>81-completely unrealistic to restrict the numbers to dogs from the same household at any one time-no one</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>could successfully run a business on those lines</p> <p>82-I board my dogs with a sitter partly so they can socialise with other dogs-should mark each premises on its merits and feed back from people who use the facility</p> <p>83-our dog is able to socialise at a dog sitters-it is imperative that dog sitters should be licensed and able to take in 5 dogs otherwise it would not be viable, they would be out of a job or pass the hefty charge onto us</p> <p>84-dog sitters welfare would be at risk if numbers were to be limited</p> <p>85-I understand very well that dogs thrive on the company of other dogs and socialising is beneficial to their happiness and behaviour, therefore I object to this restriction-perhaps the clause could be phrased along the lines to say that dogs of different households can be boarded together provided the dog owners are in agreement. Dog introductions should be performed prior to boarding/socialising the dogs with dogs displaying negative reaction to others not permitted.</p> <p>86-concern with this clause-will force many dog boarders out of business, unrealistic and unnecessary</p> <p>87-strongly object- boarding is an important opportunity for my dog to socialise with others, would mean I would have more difficulty obtaining my dog sitters services when I need them, may also mean I would have to use someone I did not trust as much or had no experience of at all</p> <p>89-not reasonable-better to put a limit of total number of dogs that can be looked after on the premises-</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>suggest a maximum of 8 dogs at one time, agree familiarisation with other dogs is a sensible idea</p> <p>90-No, No one would be able to run a business if it was limited to dogs from the same household.</p> <p>92-No, Totally impractical and unnecessary.</p> <p>93-No-Totally unnecessary, unreasonable and unwelcome in what otherwise appears to be perfectly laudable paper need to reconsider this totally unnecessary clause.</p> <p>94-Will put many out of business.</p> <p>95- If implemented would severely curtail the availability of this service.</p> <p>96-No- If enforced is highly likely that the service I use would no longer be viable and with no reasonable alternative.</p> <p>97-No-Simply Ludicrous</p> <p>100-Need to be able to accept more than one dog.</p> <p>101-Disagree</p> <p>103-Object – Business is dependent on accepting more than one dog.</p> <p>105-Ludicrous</p> <p>106-very unreasonable, would put lot people out of business. Agree no cats with dogs</p> <p>113-would make business impracticable & expensive, reduce number of places available. Overlapping issue. Suggest ok with owner's consent</p> <p>114 – may be relevant to franchising boarding companies that process bookings & farm out boarding to host families. They only board dogs in their own home. Insist on home visit prior to accepting guest for</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>boarding. Do not board cats or own any.</p> <p>115 – strongest objection, absolute nonsense. Would put HB out of business. Ok to restrict numbers of new HB until proved competent but not established ones. Omit this clause from final conditions</p> <p>116 – socialising with other dogs important for dogs & puppies</p> <p>119 – impractical. Overlap between clients.</p> <p>121 – not hard/fast requirement, depends how well dogs socialise together</p> <p>122 – absolutely wrong</p> <p>123 – totally unnecessary & unreasonable</p> <p>124 - illogical & unreasonable. Why? Assess whether dogs will get on together. Dogs thrive in pack environment. Not financially viable to restrict to one household's dogs, would put out of business. This clause should not be implemented.</p> <p>126 – very contentious, would have dramatic impact on business. Would mean no overlap between bookings. Not in animal or client interest. Impact on their costs – salary, sale, recruitment, licence.</p> <p>127 – object – what is the reason? Socialising good for dogs. Update clause to read dogs of different households can be boarded together at same time provided dog owners are in agreement</p> <p>128 – makes no sense whatsoever. Dogs social animals, enjoy each others' company. HB can assess if dogs will get on. Method statement for assessing & introducing dogs better. Would be detrimental to HB business.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>129 – introduction would be great loss for existing HB</p> <p>130 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>131 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>132 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>133 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>134 – totally unnecessary. Good for dogs to interact with others. Would curtail HB's business</p> <p>135 – poorly thought out, not necessary to restrict. Dogs social creatures & generally mix well with others. Introduction good & owners should be aware they will be with others. Many view this as positive.</p> <p>136 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>137 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>prices</p> <p>138 – unnecessary & unreasonable. Dogs need to be compatible, HB can assess before accepting new dog</p> <p>139 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>140 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>141 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>142 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>143 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>144 – strongly opposed to 4.2 in particular</p> <p>145 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>146 – unreasonable. Dogs from different homes does not pose any problem & increases sociability of dog</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>147 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>148 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>148 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>150 – unworkable, views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Reduction in numbers would restrict availability of service especially at short notice or short booking, increase prices.</p> <p>151 – Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>152 – excessive. Good for dogs to socialise</p> <p>154 – individual should decide if dog boarded along or with others, prefer own dogs to be with other families' dogs. Recommend signed disclaimer stating preference. Completely unwarranted restriction. Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>155 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places,</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>156 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>157 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>158 – very unfair & totally unnecessary</p> <p>159 – disagree</p> <p>160 – completely unreasonable, will put boarders out of business</p> <p>164+165 – disagree, will put many HB out of business. Good for dogs to socialise</p> <p>168 - Views mixing as positive, good for dogs to socialise. Restriction will reduce availability of places, especially for short or last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>169 – wholly wrong, not viable, cannot see reason, why limit to dogs from one household. Will put HB out of business & remove vital service. Dogs will have to be left home alone.</p> <p>170 – this restriction would put professional boarders out of business – dedicated people not claiming benefits & providing much needed service. Reconsider & have sensible max number of dogs from different households that can be boarded in any 24 hour period. Where would dogs be kept otherwise – limited kennels</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>171 – object – negative impact on boarders’ business, may be difficult for people with 1 dog to find boarder</p> <p>172 – restriction could put boarders out of business, especially where sole source of income</p> <p>173 – totally unreasonable & unacceptable, would drive boarders out of business & restrict choice and number of places available. Owners choose boarders for type of care, including boarding with other dogs.</p> <p>174 – strongly object</p> <p>175 – far too prescriptive, makes business unsustainable</p> <p>176 – no, views this as positive, dog gets to socialise, would restrict service available especially short & last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>178 – disagree</p> <p>179 – seems rash, should rethink clause, would put boarders out of business & reduce accommodation available, people only use if environment right</p> <p>181 – why this restriction?</p> <p>182 – wholeheartedly object. Dogs enjoy each others’ company. See no benefit or relevance.</p> <p>183 – should be revised, restricting max number would be disaster & cut livelihood, good for dogs to socialise</p> <p>185 – dogs are pack animals & thrive on being together. Disagree only dogs of one household should be boarded together. Agree no cats. Not cost effective.</p> <p>186 – formally object, dogs pack animals & enjoy other dogs’ company. Consequences on boarders would be devastating.</p> <p>189 – should allow individual judgment – cats</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>191 – cannot see how would work effectively, overlap of care, delays in owners returning, sitter can assess suitability of dogs together. When will this be enforced?</p> <p>193 – should withdraw, not in best interests of dogs</p> <p>194 – unnecessary, impossible to enforce</p> <p>196 – object, socialising important</p> <p>197 – totally unreasonable – delete</p> <p>198 – disagree, propose instead max no to be increased above 2 dogs if establishment facilities support greater number, dogs from more than one owner if owners given written consent</p> <p>199 – bizarre suggestion, difficult to understand intent. Dogs social animals, enjoy mixing with other dogs. Up to owner whether dog houses individually.</p> <p>201-Absolutely not - Dogs are sociable animals that enjoy being together.....it is an important part of the home boarding service to the animals’.</p> <p>202-The number of boarders should be evaluated with regard to the animals’ requirements, the premises and its facilities; this can only sensibly be evaluated by the licensee...by restricting boarding to ‘same household’ animals, a significant part of these businesses will be lost.</p> <p>203 – The imposition of the ‘one family’ restriction will: Reduce availability of boarding places by huge margin. Reduce the chances of getting a place. Mean getting a short notice booking will be virtually impossible. Put up prices.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Result in my dog having to stay with a different boarder for each booking.</p> <p>206 – no.</p> <p>207 – Disagree. Will put my sitter out of business & cause me a huge problem.</p> <p>212- Restricting the premises to animals from one external family totally ignores the 'pack' nature of dogs.</p> <p>210 – setting this limit is too simplistic and detrimental to the business aspect of the boarding house. Does not take into account each particular house. Some places are bigger than others, would be better if an application is made for a maximum number of boarders and the environment assessed accordingly.</p> <p>213 – Limiting the numbers would mean ours and many other dogs losing out hugely & being forced to find alternatives. Any licence should reflect the services, environment and facilities provided.</p> <p>216 – I would like to see this text removed from the proposal. The number of boarders licensed should be determined following a premises inspection by the LA.</p> <p>218 – I strongly urge you to reconsider this point. It will result in the majority of animal boarders going out of business.</p> <p>222- Unrealistic. As long as the overall conditions are met during a period of boarding it shouldn't matter that the animals are from different homes. It should be up to the owners to decide whether to let their pets come into contact with others at the sitter. It should not be imposed by the Council.</p> <p>223 – Seems to be an attempt to find a 'one size fits</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>all' solution to a perceived problem. The number of dogs should be judged on the type and location of the premises.</p> <p>224 (P/T HB) All potential boarders are screened beforehand to ensure they are well socialized and 'get on' with other dogs. If in doubt after a 2nd visit the boarding will not happen. It is in the nature of dogs to be in a pack and an 'only dog' will enjoy itself more than when alone.</p> <p>225 – Totally disagree. Dogs from more than one household encourage socialisation, companionship and obedience.</p> <p>226 (HB)– Not reasonable. Dogs are pack/social animals and have a better experience when allowed to socialise.</p> <p>228 – Limiting to 2 dogs is too overly simplified. Does not allow consideration of each particular residence in either a practical sense or as a viable business.</p> <p>229 – So long as an individual is happy for their dog to be cared for with others this would cause no problem. Should amend to, 'with each owners consent more than one dog can be kept at a pet sitter's'. How can looking after only one dog at a time make a livelihood?</p> <p>230- Strongly disagree. Up to the owner and HB to decide.</p> <p>231 – Would put most HB's out of business and take away our right to choose a preferred home.</p> <p>233 – How many HB's can make a living from this?</p> <p>234 – Suggest you follow the lead of Middlesbrough Council ie. 'where the licensee has their own dog(s) or</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>others not being dogs subject to this licence on the premises, written agreement must be obtained from the client. This agreement will include confirmation that a trial period has taken place for any dogs not previously boarded on the premises'.</p> <p>235(HB) – Should be assessed individually. Years of experience should determine how many dogs are allowed to stay. With cats, should be up to individual household to manage appropriately.</p> <p>237 – Dogs are pack animals and welcome the opportunity to play, relax and walk with others. I hope you will propose an amendment allowing dogs from more than one family to be home boarded at one time, if this is deemed appropriate and acceptable by both owners and pet minder.</p> <p>239(HB) – Clients are beside themselves with your suggestion. Dogs come to me to enjoy socialisation, interaction and play with their own kind. The owners want this for their pets. None of us could survive on the income you will be forcing us to accept. Cats – should be discussed /decided by owner and HB together. Would have thought it more obvious to address the issue of young children in the home.</p> <p>241 – Nobody can possibly make a living out of having one dog to stay. We like the idea that our dog boards with others, its company and socialisation – just the same as with children.</p> <p>242 – What on earth for? This is utter nonsense...dogs love to be with other dogs and soon socialise with strange dogs. Occasionally dogs don't get on but they</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>can be happily kept in separate rooms within the 'home' environment.</p> <p>243 – Reducing the number of dogs allowed to board will have major implications for Pet Sitters And their incomes at a time when we all need our jobs – you included.</p> <p>244 – Support the need to control the number of dogs boarded at any one time – should be judged and approved on each premises accordingly. Limiting to 'same household' dogs may cause great harm to an established, thriving business.</p> <p>245 – Agree, reasonable. Dogs must not be boarded with cats unless they normally live together.</p> <p>248 – Not reasonable. Means HB will not make enough income to cover their costs. Set a limit dependent on space and ability to separate dogs if necessary.</p> <p>247 – Restrictive and ridiculous. Whole basis for HB is for dogs to mix and socialise. Owners accept /expect this. Please do not restrict choice for owners and put HB's out of business.</p> <p>249 – Concerned. Our previously ill treated dog would not have learned social skills without the opportunity of being with other dogs in a safe, secure and monitored environment.</p> <p>250 – Unreasonable. Most dog owners only have one dog, would lead to increased prices to compensate for loss if income.</p> <p>251(HB) – NO I trust you will withdraw this absurd condition from the proposal. Illogical, strict & needless</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>criteria see no legitimate reason for this. Socialising is recommended by vets, behaviourists, trainers and anyone else who has the slightest knowledge about dog development.</p> <p>Decision belongs 100% to owner.</p> <p>252(HB) – IF HB wants to board cats it's up to them to accommodate this.</p> <p>260 – Unworkable. HB's I know have been working with dogs for many years & would not put themselves, their families, their pets or charges in a situation which would compromise their safety. I object to the legislation.</p> <p>254 – Misconceived. The Bracknell experience has indicated it is likely to lead to fewer providers. HB with more than one other dog is clearly safer and healthier than a boarding kennel. Up to the customer. A restrictive licence would be positively unwelcome.</p> <p>253(HB) – No. Ambiguous and main issue for HBs, why only dogs from same household? May as well close my business now.</p> <p>258(HB) – Totally impractical, overnight would put serious HBs out of business! HBs should be allowed to have the number of dogs they realistically find manageable with LA approval. Throw out this rule and embrace the few dedicated HBs you have and build on their numbers.</p> <p>255 – Not reasonable and not necessary. Limits the ability of the HB to provide a service. Might be better to put a total limit per premises.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--