

<p>Q4.3 If 4.2 is unchanged – should familiarisation be with all animals at premises and how could this be achieved?</p>	<p>1,3,4,9,21,34,35,40,41,52, 57/63,58,68,70,74,89, 106, 114, 121, 124, 126, 138, 146, 164+165,166 170, 185, 189, 199 201, 202, 206,225, 226 (HB), 230, 231, 235(HB), 241, 242, 245, 247, 253(HB)</p>	<p>1-concerned about cats and young children. Advisable with other dogs, familiarisation undertaken before accept dog 3-seems to work as minder only has local dogs that they meet daily anyway 4-part of initial agreement between home boarder and pet owner 9-owner walks dog on neutral territory and sitter introduces other dogs 21-initial familiarisation visit. Leave decision on which and how many dogs to boarder 30-test walks with a new dog 34-decision made by dog owner not imposed by council-owner should decide for themselves what suits their dog 35-pet sitter meets animals before accepting them so aware of how behave 40-familiarisation not required unless dog sitters require it 41-not sure can have rules for this-rely on experience of home boarder 52-pet sitter met dog on neutral territory to walk with other dogs and assess behaviour before agreeing to have them 57/63-first day dog goes obviously doesn't know other dogs-however I haven't heard of any problems in the 3 years I have been using my sitter 58-i do not see it as a requirement some people may prefer a period of familiarisation before leaving their</p>	<p>28</p>	<p>12</p>	<p>5</p>
---	---	--	-----------	-----------	----------

		<p>dog, not sure how this can be done apart from with dogs that usually reside at premises</p> <p>68-yes all of the dogs should be familiarised before boarding together</p> <p>70-A responsible pet sitter would want to meet new dog and to introduce it to their own pets prior to stay and also see how prospective new boarders inter acts with other boarding dogs.. I cannot see getting written consent would pose a problem.</p> <p>74-Unless animal requires it, it's very hard to implement, familiarisation with different start/end days and times. What if a few dog starting on the same day?</p> <p>89-familiarisation with other dogs we have had in past is a 3 or 4 hour visit to the premises prior to a longer stay-only required for the first time so dog and pet sitter can get to know each other</p> <p>106 – difficult as transient, trial ok</p> <p>114 – no, cover this with home visit. Separate dogs if they do not get on but actively seek only to board sociable dogs</p> <p>121 – sensible owners would trial first</p> <p>124 – yes, already do this</p> <p>125 – absolutely no need to insist only animals from one household at any one time, nor dogs & cats, HB can assess whether animals go well together. Owners also decide if their animals are happy. Ludicrous to penalise caring & reputable HB</p> <p>126 – ridiculous requirement for all –use common sense whether trial period required</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>138 – written consent way over top</p> <p>146 – unreasonable. Dogs familiarised by HB away from house before entering house together, does not require set of regulations</p> <p>164+165 – how long for trial familiarisation? Should include all animals to be boarded, not just resident dogs. Irrelevant if 4.2 unchanged</p> <p>166 – do not agree “only dogs from same household may be boarded at any one time”, dogs benefit from pack situation provided controlled by someone who loves animals & understands canine psychology. Do agree “dogs must not be boarded with any cat unless normally live together in same household”, dogs & cats do not mix naturally together. Consider revision of 4.2</p> <p>170 – most already trial this – do we need to add paperwork to formalise?</p> <p>185 – disagree to written consent</p> <p>187 – positive for dogs to socialise, will reduce availability of service especially short & last minute bookings, increase prices</p> <p>189 – would always get consent, do trial stays</p> <p>199 – owner & sitter to agree any familiarisation</p> <p>201-Don't see it as a requirement, although some people may prefer it. Could only work with residing dogs.</p> <p>202-should be encouraged prior to boarding, in a neutral environment.</p> <p>206 – Yes.</p> <p>225 – Yes. Possibly initial assessment by licensees?</p> <p>226(HB) – Familiarisation should take place prior to</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>the boarding event.</p> <p>230 – HB's usually take new dogs on a trial basis following a thorough interview.</p> <p>231 – My dog went for a trial to assess her suitability; I know this is standard practise.</p> <p>235(HB) – Always have intro meetings with new boarders. Animal & owner come to meet my dogs. If I feel a dog from another household may be difficult I arrange for them to meet and play on a neutral site.</p> <p>241 – Responsible dog owners visit well in advance and ask many questions about how the dog will be looked after. This is our responsibility. All HB's I've used have the dog on trial to see how it interacts / behaves.</p> <p>242 – By all means introduce client dog to HB in advance but I don't see how you can get all the dogs together in advance. The dogs really aren't going to care!</p> <p>245 – Agree. Boarding and resident dogs should have the chance to meet and familiarise prior to boarding.</p> <p>247 – Put in some broad rules but leave to discretion of licensee.</p> <p>253(HB) – Clients are well aware we have resident dogs & cats. Clients visit us with their dog to meet, familiarise with residents and go through my comprehensive questionnaire.</p> <p>255 – Familiarisation is sensible.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

4.4	1,70, 114, 119, 164+165, 185	<p>1-children kept away from dogs, especially if dog not used to them. Suggest minimum age of child?</p> <p>70-agree</p> <p>114 – don't understand</p> <p>119 – unnecessary</p> <p>164+165 – agreed but far too vague</p> <p>185 - overcomplicating</p>			
-----	------------------------------	---	--	--	--

DRAFT CONDITION NUMBER/QUESTION	CONSULTATION RESPONSE NUMBER COMMENT RECEIVED (TOTAL RESPONSES)	COMMENTS	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
5. EXERCISE FACILITIES					
5.1	1,70, 114, 124, 164+165 185	1-agree 70-agree 114 – ok 124 – agree 164+165 - agreed but “area must be kept clean” too vague 185-agree			
5.2	1,70, 114, 124, 164+165 185	1-agree 70-agree 114 – ok 124 – agree 164+165 – how to assess “totally secure & safe”? “All areas to which boarded dogs have access” too wide, perhaps should just apply to areas where dogs kept unsupervised 185-agree			
5.3	1,70, 114, 124,138164+165, 183, 185, 189, 196, 210	1-or swimming pool (fenced off?) 70-agree 114 – ok 124 – agree 138 – depends on the pond, already covered by 5.2 164+165 – disagree, unnecessary, up to householder 183 – disagree – if owners happy that should be ok			

		<p>185 – agree 189 – ensure only dogs who can swim or have no interest in water at residences with ponds 196 – if owners happy that's ok 210-covering ponds is suggested by someone unaware of the dogs' nature. They will choose to enter water and a small pond is likely to be ignored and offer no danger to a dog.</p>			
<p>Q5.4 Is wearing a collar at all times reasonable?</p>	<p>1,3,4,34,35,40,43,46,50,57/63,58,70,74,89, 106, 114, 115, 121, 124, 126, 146, 164+165, 170, 173, 183, 185, 189, 196, 197, 199, 201, 202, 206,225, 226(HB), 230, 235(HB), 245, 247, 252(HB), 253(HB), 255</p>	<p>1-yes – legal requirement- only exception vet advice 3-yes, essential 4-no-some dogs are used to having collars removed at times i.e at night – perhaps they should all be microchipped? 34-choice of owner and boarder 35-not necessary as most dogs microchipped 40-reasonable 43-broadly agree 46-legal obligation to tag a dog in public 50-reasonable 57/63-allow the sitter to create a run-can also be designed to avoid hazards such as ponds 58-ok, unless for health reasons and in agreement with owner 70-Agree but there may be circumstances where it's not possible and allowances should be made. 74-Some dogs only wear a collar for walks, it might bother them to have it on 24/7 89-agree 106 – essential 114 – yes, all their dogs wear collar & tag</p>	34	6	4

		<p>115 – all points in 5 acceptable, her HB uses tag with her contact details while animal staying there</p> <p>121 – agreed</p> <p>124 – agree, tag should show HB's details. Ok to remove collar for medical reasons inside home if owner specifies.</p> <p>126 – agree</p> <p>146 - yes</p> <p>164+165 – agreed unless medical reason for not having collar, harness may be appropriate</p> <p>170 – ok</p> <p>173 – yes</p> <p>183 – isn't this a legal requirement? Why specify?</p> <p>185 – agree, tag should have boarder's contact number</p> <p>189 – yes reasonable, use own emergency contact no.</p> <p>Fitting address on tag impracticable</p> <p>196 – isn't this a legal requirement? Why specify?</p> <p>197 – reasonable</p> <p>199 – collar & ID tag ok. Agree between owner & sitter, don't prescribe</p> <p>201-seems ok unless there is a health reason, then there should be an agreement with the owner.</p> <p>202 –should be compulsory. Microchipping should be a recommendation of the licensee.</p> <p>206 – Yes.</p> <p>225 – Yes</p> <p>226(HB)- Yes</p> <p>230- Very reasonable condition, HB should also know if the dog is chipped.</p> <p>235(HB) – Yes</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>245 – Agree. Tag must display name, address and tel. no. of the boarding premises. Exceptional circumstances i.e. skin conditions, might allow for not wearing one. Vet to confirm before boarding.</p> <p>247 – Leave to licensee dependent on their premises.</p> <p>252(HB) – Yes at all times including nights.</p> <p>253(HB) – Outside obviously, inside at owners/licensee's discretion.</p> <p>255 – Agree.</p>			
5.5	1, 114, 119, 124, 164+165, 233	<p>1-reported straight away</p> <p>114 – ok</p> <p>119 – not relevant. HB should focus on finding the lost animal</p> <p>124 – agree</p> <p>164+165 – agreed although prefer shorter period so repeat offender HB can be identified & situation rectified</p> <p>233 – If dog is lost, what with Authority do other than tick a box?</p>			

DRAFT CONDITION NUMBER/QUESTION	CONSULTATION RESPONSE NUMBER COMMENT RECEIVED (TOTAL RESPONSES)	COMMENTS	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
6. TEMPERATURE, LIGHTING & VENTILATION					
Q6.1 Should this be more specific?	1,3,4,9,34,35,40,50, 57/63,58,70,74,89, 106, 114, 115, 121, 124. 126, 146, 164+165, 170, 173, 185, 189, 199, 201, 202, 206, 225, 226(HB) 230, 235(HB), 245, 247, 253(HB), 255,	1-if possible, specify how keep dogs cool 3-difficult to be more specific 4-difficult to be more specific –owners would assess this for themselves 9-no 34-assessed using common sense and a factor in deciding max number of animals a boarder is allowed 35-leave to owners discretion 40-no 50-specific enough 57/63-licence should be based on outdoor space available 58-no comment-should be in line with good welfare and practice 70-Agree 74-What defines “adequate”, size/weight? 890i think this depends on types of dogs to be housed- small dogs would need less room than large ones 106 – fine 114 – assume at discretion of local authority but their house is adequately heated etc for them	8	20	9

		<p>115 – acceptable 121 – in home so heat/light should be adequate 124 – agree 126 – agree clause, homes ok for humans & therefore dogs. Animal welfare groups can address any cruelty. 146 – no, this is adequate 164+165 – too vague – home environment for human habitation, depends on 4.1/4.2 decision 170 – not necessary 173 – LA specifying numbers should cover this 185 – specific enough 189 – include “comfort”? 199 – wording satisfactory. “Adequate” open to interpretation, common sense & negotiation better than legislation 201-should be in line with good welfare and practice. 202 – difficult to be more specific unless tailored to the specific breed of a boarded animal. 206 – no. 225 - adequate enough. 226 (HB)– Can’t be more specific, every home will have a different build and layout. As long as it is heated, well lit and ventilated, that is good enough. 230 – Not possible, potential client must decide for themselves whether the environment is suitable or not. 235(HB) – People will use their common sense. 245 – Should be sufficient info within the licence conditions to ensure the standards within the HB establishments meet the welfare needs of the animals. 247 – No.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		253(HB) –This is HB, I expect these would be a given. How could it be more specific? 255 - Depends on sizes / types of dogs to be housed.			
--	--	---	--	--	--

DRAFT CONDITION NUMBER/QUESTION	CONSULTATION RESPONSE NUMBER COMMENT RECEIVED (TOTAL RESPONSES)	COMMENTS	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
7. CLEANLINESS					
7.1	1,70, 114, 124, 164+165	1-disinfection should take place between boarders 70-agree 114 – ok 124 – agree 164+165 – agreed. Disinfect between different animals leaving & arriving?			
7.2	1,70,114,124, 164+165 170, 252(HB), 253(HB)	1-depends on percentage of waste to household 70-agree 114 – ok 124 - helpful if specify what facilities required 164+165 – agreed but irrelevant if limited to animals from one house as no different to at home, unfair to insist on alternative arrangements 170 – hypocritical to impose when dog waste bins removed & ok to put with ordinary waste 252(HB) – My dogs produce very little waste at home, they eliminate on walks. 253(HB) – Why should anything else be agreed with LA? Dog owners already bag waste and dispose of in public bins or home dustbins.			
7.3	1,70,114,124, 164+165	1-agree 70-agree 114 – ok			

		124 – agree 164+165 - agreed			
7.4	1,70,114,124, 164+165 253(HB)	1-10% dog waste/90% human? 70-agree 114 – would not accept any dog with infectious disease 124 – should be same as for human residents, in strong polythene bags along with household waste ok 164+165 – agreed 253(HB) – Waste from an infected dog could be different but what are the current regs?			
7.5	1,70,114,124, 164+165	1-agree 70-agree 114 – what measures would these be? Suggestions for best practice would be useful 124 – more applicable to kennels 164+165 - too vague			
Q7.6 Should we include anything else?	1,50,74,115, 173, 185, 199, 206, 230, 245,	1-animals adequately supplied with suitable food, drink, bedding materials, adequately exercised & visited at suitable intervals 50-cannot think of anything 74-no 115 – para 7 acceptable 173 – no comments 185 – expect good standard of cleanliness 199 – common sense & good judgment better than rules 206 – no. 230 – No 245 – Should be expanded to include: Dogs should always have access to a dry, clean area	4	5	1

		and be able to avoid wet floors. Husbandry procedures should have a consistent daily pattern similar to that in the dog's own home. Should be given the opportunity to toilet outside the space in which they are kept, at least 3x/day.			
--	--	--	--	--	--

DRAFT CONDITION NUMBER/QUESTION	CONSULTATION RESPONSE NUMBER COMMENT RECEIVED (TOTAL RESPONSES)	COMMENTS	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
8. FOOD AND WATER SUPPLIES					
8.1	1,70, 114, 124, 164+165	1-agree 70-agree 114 – providing client leaves adequate supply of food, otherwise fed by HB (high quality complete dog food) 124 – agree 164+165 - agreed			
8.2	1,70, 114, 124, 164+165	1-agree 70-agree 114 – ok 124 - agree 164+165 – agreed but how to check being changed twice a day? Once a day in domestic environment should be ok			
8.3	1,70, 114, 124, 164+165 247, 253(HB)	1-agree bedding but not bowls unless disposable 70-agree 114 – ok 124 - agree 164+165 – no cross contamination if client brings own kit, they prefer clients don't bring own bowls 247 – Restrictive. Leave it to licensee and owners to decide. 253(HB) – Most owners bring their own but most HBs			

		will have spares. Cost could be an issue.			
Q8.4 should we ask for separate drinking bowls?	1,4,25,35,37,43,50,57/63 58,70,74,76,89, 106, 113, 114, 115, 121, 124, 126, 128, 135, 138, 146 164+165, 170, 172, 173, 185, 189, 199, 201, 202, 206, 218, 225, 226(HB) 230, 235(HB), 242, 245, 247, 250, 251(HB), 252(HB), 255	1-agree-feeding may need to be carried out separately. Have separate washing up bowl for dog's equipment. No need for separate water bowls –water must be clean and fresh 4-unreasonable- dogs will drink from anywhere 25-unnecessary-dogs often drink from puddles! 35-difficult if not impossible to segregate water bowls unless dog was itself separated from others 37-no-adequate fresh drinking water provided 43-no 50-no 57/63-you can put them down but they will share 58-not necessary, unless for health reasons 70-Agree but not workable dogs generally use the bowl they want. If separate bowls required for medical grounds this should be implemented. 74-How can this be enforced unless dog is caged but I don't consider home boarding to involve a cage. 76-Disagree completely unworkable and unnecessary 89-not necessary to have individual water bowls but agree with food bowls-dogs will drink from nearest water bowl-all bowls should be cleaned regularly 106 – can't stop dogs drinking from other bowls. Bowls should be clean & water changed throughout day. 113 – no to separate drinking bowls – separation would make home environment into a kennel 114 – dogs need access to fresh water at all times. Ensure water bowl available in every room but not individual water bowls	3	43	2

		<p>115 – para 8 acceptable, several drinking bowls in every room of her HB</p> <p>121 – see no problem provided bowls regularly refreshed</p> <p>124 – not necessary. Cleanliness & levels of water overriding.</p> <p>126 – agree in principle but difficult in practice. Clean water changed regularly.</p> <p>128 – doesn't matter so long as clean drinking water available at all times</p> <p>135 – little extreme, how to implement? If dog possessive or aggressive around items, probably its not ideally suited to HB.</p> <p>138 – dogs do not need separate water bowls provided main bowl regularly topped up & cleaned</p> <p>146 – these are dogs not babies. Reasonable hygiene but no need to overdo</p> <p>164+165 – conflicts with above – owner or HB provides? Agree each dog has own food bowl but separate drinking bowls ridiculous. Better to insist on water bowls in each separate area so dogs have constant access to water. Dogs should be able to feed separately to avoid food competition / aggression</p> <p>170 – adequate bowls enough, can't stop dogs using others' bowls</p> <p>172 – not feasible, dogs drink from any bowl available</p> <p>173 – dogs would not observe separate drinking bowls</p> <p>185 – dogs all drink out of shared bowls</p> <p>189 – advisable to have separate drinking bowls, some dogs grazers with food, all need constant access to</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>water</p> <p>199 – shared drinking bowls perfectly satisfactory</p> <p>201-not necessary, dogs are willing to share. Only exception should be for health reasons.</p> <p>202-no need providing bowls are clean, water is plentiful and not shared with known infectious individuals.</p> <p>206 – No. Dogs often drink out of puddles.</p> <p>218 – You can ask but it's completely unrealistic to ensure dogs drink only from their own bowls.</p> <p>225 – Absolutely not!"</p> <p>226(HB) - Separate bowls should be supplied although dogs will drink out of each others.</p> <p>230 – No. Shared bowls with water changed 2x/day is adequate.</p> <p>235(HB) – Impossible to police, especially in summer with so many water bowls dotted around the garden. Each dog has its own feeding bowl which is washed after every meal.</p> <p>242 – How do you propose telling a dog it has its own water bowl? They're not fussed...</p> <p>245 – Yes, separate feeding and water bowls.</p> <p>247 – No. Not practical, dogs drink from the nearest available bowl, they don't care whose it is!</p> <p>250 – Should be provided but not mandatory – dogs drink from any bowl or puddles given the chance.</p> <p>251(HB) – Demonstrates the utter lack of aptitude with which this proposal has been constructed.</p> <p>252(HB) – Ridiculous. Dogs constantly exchange saliva therefore acceptable for them to share drinking facilities.</p> <p>255 - Not necessary to have individual water bowls but</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		should have separate food bowls that are cleaned between meals.			
--	--	---	--	--	--

DRAFT CONDITION NUMBER/QUESTION	CONSULTATION RESPONSE NUMBER COMMENT RECEIVED (TOTAL RESPONSES)	COMMENTS	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
9. KITCHEN FACILITIES					
9.1	1,4,70, 114, 115, 124, 164+165, 173, 185	1-have separate fridge? 4-implies vermin proof containers?-combine with 9.2 70-agree 114 – ok 115 – para 9 acceptable 124 – agree 164+165 – not clear who should provide the airtight containers – owner or HB? More realistic to insist food kept out of reach of dogs & vermin regardless of container 173 – no comments 185 – no comments			
9.2	1,4,70, 114,124, 164+165,	1-agree 70-agree 114 – ok 124 – agree 164+165 – as above			

DRAFT CONDITION NUMBER/QUESTION	CONSULTATION RESPONSE NUMBER COMMENT RECEIVED (TOTAL RESPONSES)	COMMENTS	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
10. EXERCISE					
Q10.1 Should dogs always be kept on a lead when taken off premises regardless of owners permission	1,4,9,15,24,30,34,35,37, 43,50,52,57/63,58,68,70, 74,76,87,89, 106, 114, 115, 119, 121, 124, 126, 138, 146, 164+165 170, 172, 173, 185, 189, 199, 201, 202, 206, 218, 225, 226(HB), 230, 235(HB), 242, 245, 247, 250, 251, 252(HB), 253(HB), 255	1-could be let off with owners permission but limit number walked at anyone time to 4? 4-disagree on leads at all times-permission to be included in initial contract 9-no reason to keep on lead unless danger to others 15-not necessary, unworkable-permission included in initial contract 24-dogs always kept on leads when away from the boarders house 30-do not agree dogs only walked on lead-left to owners discretion-detrimental to wellbeing if not allowed to run free 34-decision between boarder and owner 35-pet sitter should agree in writing with owner what permitted 37-no, want dog off lead so gets plenty of exercise 43- no, dogs need plenty of exercise-boarder should be asked to ensure dogs kept under control 50-pet sitter should be able to judge 52-agreement between pet sitter and owner 57/63-object strenuously, dogs need proper exercise preferably off the lead 58-no, only on lead if it is at owners request	3	46	5

		<p>68-no as they need exercise but must always be controllable</p> <p>70-If owner is happy for dog to be exercised off the lead. and pet sitting happy with this , then if owner has provided written consent why should this be opposed?</p> <p>74- Dogs cannot be exercised properly on a lead they should be able to run freely.</p> <p>76-Most dog walkers insurance companies require written permission by the owner to allow the dog off the lead.</p> <p>87-strongly object- my dog requires a lot of exercise and his health would suffer if he had to remain on a lead and his mental health would suffer if he could not stimulate his mind exploring and sniffing. I trust my dog sitter to know where and when it is appropriate to let dogs off the lead and to have control of them</p> <p>89-I wouldn't want this as a pre-requisite-our petsitter only lets a dog off the lead if the owner agrees</p> <p>106 – Fine so long as owner happy. Dogs cannot stretch legs when on lead.</p> <p>114 – with owners consent & depending on dog's behaviour, only remain off lead if have full control</p> <p>115 – ok if HB confident with dog off lead. But on lead if owner has specifically requested this.</p> <p>119 – HB to determine, only if well behaved</p> <p>121 – agree dogs on leads unless written permission of owner to allow the freedom</p> <p>124 – owner to decide but written permission not necessary. If owner specifies, HB to comply</p> <p>126 – strongly disagree. Not in best interest of dog to be</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>kept on lead. Owner to give written consent. 138 – up to client & at discretion of HB 146 – no. Owner & HB to agree risk. Do not want dog forced to stay on lead. 164+165 – as above 170 – agree if near road or children’s play area, but not for woodland or traffic free areas 172 – unfair to restrict dog to being on lead 173 – no, boarders’ experience should dictate 185 – happy for dogs to be exercised off lead, with owner’s consent 189 – allow dogs off lead where customer permits, host comfortable & safe/secure environment. Lead walking reduces exercise & socialisation 199 – leave decision with sitter, ok if they’re comfortable with dogs off lead & owners happy 201-No, should only be on a lead at owner’s request. Dogs are pack/sociable animals and need good exercise and freedom...some dogs need to be kept on a lead but this should not be the case for all. This should be an arrangement made between the owner and the dog walker. 202-no reason why dogs trained off the lead should be restricted. Ultimately should be the licensee’s decision. 206 – No. 218 – This should not be a condition, it should be left to discussion between owner and boarder. 225 – Depends on individual dogs. Owners should declare off-lead problems so licensee can assume responsibility. Also dependent on where exercised.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>226(HB) –If the dog is well behaved there is no reason to keep it on a lead. OK if the owners have signed to say it is safe to run free in a safe environment.</p> <p>230 – Difficult. Some LA's prohibit walking more than 4 dogs at a time – probably sensible as large groups of dogs can be intimidating, particularly to children. Handler may not be able to control them and clear up faeces at the same time.</p> <p>235(HB) –Up to the discretion of the owner and dog walker.</p> <p>242 – No, if an owner is happy and confident then it is acceptable. Dogs are generally happiest off lead.</p> <p>245 – The decision to let a dog off lead will depend on the individual dog although it is important that off lead exercise is provided. Free access to a secure, enclosed area may be suitable for dogs with recall problems. The amount and type of exercise must be appropriate to the individual dog.</p> <p>247 – No. Flexibility should be available for licensee and owner to decide what's best.</p> <p>250 – Should be in accordance with owners wishes.</p> <p>251 – I am highly offended that you are taking away a decision about MY pet.</p> <p>252(HB) – My dogs are exercised off lead on private farm land. Only on lead for medical reasons or if they will not recall.</p> <p>253(HB) –Common sense & HB's discretion should prevail.</p> <p>255 - Would not want this as a pre-requisite. Decision we entrust to the pet sitter.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

DRAFT CONDITION NUMBER/QUESTION	CONSULTATION RESPONSE NUMBER COMMENT RECEIVED (TOTAL RESPONSES)	COMMENTS	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
11. DISEASE CONTROL & VACCINATION					
11.1	1,70, 114, 124, 164+165 251(HB)	1-agree 70-agree 114 – define adequate precautions 124 – agree in principle but substitute “reasonable” for “adequate” 164+165 – vague 251(HB) – Agree that all dogs should be vaccinated but there is no mention of kennel cough, which is far more common than those mentioned.			
Q11.2 Is list of vaccinations correct?	1,4,9,30,34,35,43,50, 57/63,58,70,74,89, 106, 111, 114, 115, 119, 121, 124, 126, 146, 164+165 170, 173, 185, 189, 199 201,202, 206, 225, 226 (HB), 230, 235(HB), 245, 251(HB), 252(HB), 253(HB)	1-include canine influenza?, kennel cough?, proof of immunity within last 3mths 4-agree proof of vaccination but does not need to be kept on site 9-agree 34-only want routine vaccinations not non standard ones 35-correct, but possibly exclude kennel cough 50-include kennel cough 57/63- do not agree that vaccinations should be a requirement 58-? Refer to vet 70-agree 74-up to boarder to decide	23	17	11

		<p>89-I think a pet sitter should only house dogs whose vaccinations are up to date and evidenced by vaccination card</p> <p>106 – should be enough provided kennel cough vaccination shown & dog's annual booster</p> <p>111 – apply common sense</p> <p>114 – vet to answer, will follow their guidance, do not board any unvaccinated animal</p> <p>115 – acceptable, required by her HB</p> <p>119 – proof of current vaccinations for boarded & resident dogs</p> <p>121 – all should have proof of vaccination before board</p> <p>124 – total agreement, add kennel cough to list</p> <p>126 – believe correct but vet to answer. Ok to board if not vaccinated provided not with other dogs.</p> <p>146 – seems complete overkill – intended to drive HB out of business? What evidence of previous problems? Owners should bear risk if their animals not vaccinated</p> <p>164+165 – homeopathic vaccinations, titre testing, bordatella? Photocopy of certificate? Unnecessary admin – written record of dates should suffice. Some vets now don't vaccinate dogs over certain age. Go with vet's advice & ensure owner signs to say aware dog could be infected if not vaccinated</p> <p>170 – restrict to kennel cough & annual vaccinations</p> <p>173 – vet should answer, kennel cough missing? Define "current vaccinations".</p> <p>185 – no, believe we over vaccinate</p> <p>189 – list correct. If vet confirms vaccinations detrimental to dog's health, should be allowed to board</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>199 – is photocopy sufficient?</p> <p>201-need to refer to a vet</p> <p>202 – yes, absolutely all animals should be vaccinated prior to boarding. Advisable to include intranasal kennel cough vaccine as this disease is associated with mixed boarding.</p> <p>206 – suggest kennel cough, yes to reject.</p> <p>225 – As far as I'm aware. Responsible licensees should already be familiar with canine diseases.</p> <p>226(HB) – Yes correct. An unvaccinated dog should not be boarded.</p> <p>230 – Vet should confirm. Rejected vaccinations should be a matter for HB and owner to decide.</p> <p>235(HB) – Not sure. Initial thought is 'no' but it won't harm my dogs as they are vaccinated. If all other dogs are up to date what would be the harm? However if two were not vaccinated I would refuse one. A record of proof on site is a good idea.</p> <p>245 – By stating 'other relevant diseases' allows the list to be detailed but not exhaustive. Any dog not vaccinated should not be boarded.</p> <p>251 – Find it alarming that you are asking if this list is correct.</p> <p>2525(HB) – an owner who will not inoculate will be unable to board.</p> <p>253(HB) – If owner cannot provide vaccination evidence I doubt an HB would take them. Should be legislated.</p> <p>255 – Was a qualified vet consulted? HB should only house fully vaccinated animals evidenced by vaccination</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>If owner does not vaccinate can they board animal?</p>		<p>card from vet.</p> <p>1-no, unless immunity proven 4-need to check time lag of vaccinations 30-yes, up to owner if want dog vaccinated 34-if routine ones reasonable to refuse animal to be boarded for safety of others 35-no 43-no-provide boarder with list of vaccinations to be kept on file-and have brief history of pets medical history and veterinary practice 50-no 57/63-it is reasonable for the dog sitter to ask whether a dog is vaccinated but whether they decide to accept the dog is up to the boarder 173 – clearly yes 199 – up to sitter</p>			
<p>Q11.3 should licensee obtain owners permission to seek vet treatment before animal boarded?</p>	<p>1,4,34,43,50,58,68,70,74 89, 106, 114, 119, 121, 124, 126, 146, 164+165 173, 185, 189, 199 201,202, 206, 225, 226(HB), 230, 235(HB), 245, 253(HB), 255,</p>	<p>1-agree-be included in registration/acceptance details form 4-agree-be included in initial contract 34-yes but only in emergency and not possible to contact owner 43-every effort should be made to contact owner but in emergency welfare of pet paramount 50-yes 58-yes to protect the licensee 68-should be recommendation only 70-agree 74-probably best to get it in writing 89-owner should inform their vet that their animal is being</p>	31	2	1

		<p>looked after and permission given to seek veterinary treatment in the event this is required and to pay on behalf of dog owner</p> <p>106 – Agree HB should have owner's permission plus name/address/tel no of owner's vet</p> <p>114 – yes, cover this in their T&Cs</p> <p>119 – responsible HB would check if pet insured or get owner's permission to take to vet</p> <p>121 – owners to leave details of usual vet & prearrange payment of emergency treatment</p> <p>124 – agree, get dog's own vet details, vet to be notified dog with HB, owner's to give permission & agree to pay</p> <p>126 – agree HB full discretion to seek & follow vet advice</p> <p>146 - yes</p> <p>164+165 – agree, always get owner to sign form saying can take dog to vet if necessary & that they will pay for treatment. Also that they are able to authorise treatment if necessary.</p> <p>173 – yes, sensible business practice</p> <p>185 – host should decide what best for dog & take to vet regardless of whether permission has been given</p> <p>189 – yes, very important</p> <p>199 – good practice to obtain permission, unless extreme circumstances & dog's wellbeing could be jeopardised by any delay</p> <p>201- Yes, to protect the licensee.</p> <p>202- Yes. Might be worthwhile mentioning pet insurance in this section as a recommendation.</p> <p>206 – owners should authorise vet treatment with bills going direct to owners.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>225 – Yes, any responsible owner should agree to this anyway.</p> <p>226(HB)- Yes</p> <p>230 – Already normal practice.</p> <p>235(HB) – I always ask the owner what they want me to do in case of emergency.</p> <p>245 – Obtain owners written permission to seek vet treatment before animal is boarded.</p> <p>253(HB) – Yes.</p> <p>255 – Not necessary, does not need legislation. If there was an issue we would be contacted.</p>			
11.4	1,70, 114, 124, 164+165 253(HB)	<p>1-separate human first aid kit- animal prescription drugs kept in locked cabinet</p> <p>70-agree</p> <p>114-ok</p> <p>124-agree</p> <p>164+165 – agree – advice on recommended contents would be good. Recommend HB first aid trained.</p> <p>253(HB) – What would you suggest? I have never needed anything other than a bandage, salt water or antiseptic spray, which are ordinarily in the house.</p>			
11.5	1,70, 114, 124, 164+165 250	<p>1-agree</p> <p>70-agree</p> <p>114-ok</p> <p>124-agree</p> <p>164+165 – agree</p> <p>250 – Client's own vet should be used whenever possible.</p>			