

<p>Q11.6 should we specify precautions to be taken?</p>	<p>1,4,34,35,37,43,50,58,70,74,89, 106, 114, 124, 126, 164+165, 173, 189, 199, 201,202, 206, 225, 226(HB), 230,235(HB), 245, 247, 253(HB), 255</p>	<p>1-agree-leave to licensee unless advised by vet 4-leave to discretion of licensee 34-offer guidance but leave to discretion of boarder 35-discretion of pet sitter 37-how could you validate proof provided by owner? 43-don't be ridiculous 50-discretion of boarder 58-leave to discretion of licensee 70-agree 74-leave it to boarder 89-pet sitters need to ensure all required vaccinations/treatments are up to date before being boarded, and owner to provide appropriate evidence 106 – At HB's discretion, difficult to police 114 – specify precautions 124 – agree 126 – at HB discretion, depends on environment 164+165 – agree but how to prove? Need to specify. 173 – no comment, cover in inspection regime 189 – agree but impractical to require proof of treatment 199 – who maintains proof – owner or sitter? What form? 201-leave it to the discretion of the licensee. 202 –licensee should request that animals are wormed and flead prior to boarding. 206 – leave to licensee. 225 – leave to discretion of licensee. 226(HB) – leave to discretion of licensee. 230 – Discretion of vet and licensee. 235(HB) - Leave this to the licensee.</p>	<p>18</p>	<p>19</p>	<p>3</p>
--	--	--	-----------	-----------	----------

		<p>245 – All dogs should have routine control of ecto- and endo -parasites as directed by a vet. Records must be kept for vet inspection.</p> <p>247 -Discretion of licensee.</p> <p>253(HB) – At discretion of licensee.</p> <p>255 – Linked to 11.2. The word of the owner should suffice</p>			
<p>Q11.7 should we specify period between treatments or leave to licensee</p>	<p>1,4,34,35,43,50,58,70,74 89, 106, 114, 124, 126, 146, 164+165, 173, 185, 189, 199, 201,202, 206, 225, 226 (HB), 230, 235(HB), 245, 247, 253(HB), 255</p>	<p>1-leave to licensee-some parasites build up resistance if over treat</p> <p>4- no need to specify</p> <p>34-offer guidance but leave to discretion of boarder</p> <p>35-discretion of pet sitter</p> <p>43-don't be ridiculous</p> <p>50-discretion of boarder</p> <p>58-leave to discretion of licensee</p> <p>70-agree</p> <p>74-specify period, with a certificate of proof of treatment</p> <p>89-leave to discretion of licensee</p> <p>106 – At HB's discretion, difficult to police</p> <p>114 – ok, list of approved treatments would be useful, specify period or define best practice</p> <p>124 – agree</p> <p>126 – at HB discretion, depends on environment</p> <p>146 – at licensee's discretion. Any reported issues can be dealt with accordingly.</p> <p>164+165 – agree but how to prove? Need to specify</p> <p>173 – no comment, cover in inspection regime</p> <p>185 – shouldn't be necessary if all dogs treated for fleas prior to being boarded</p> <p>189 – not required if 11.6 implemented</p>	6	23	3

		<p>199 – trust judgment of sitter 201-leave it up to the licensee. 202 - Hygiene at boarding site should be regularly maintained. 206 – Leave to licensee. 225 – Leave to discretion of licensee. 226(HB) – Leave to discretion of Licensee 230 – Discretion of vet and licensee. 235(HB) – Leave this to the licensee. 245 – Seek veterinary advice. 247 - Discretion of licensee. 253(HB) – Discretion of the licensee. 255 – Leave to discretion of licensee / vet.</p>			
11.8	1,70, 114, 124, 164+165 253(HB)	<p>1-agree, tri-gene or conficlean 2? 70-agree 114 – list of approved cleaning products would be useful 124 – agree 164+165 – if suitable for home environment then should not be an issue 253(HB) – Are you seriously suggesting we contact the vet for advice on each household cleaning substance we might use?</p>			

DRAFT CONDITION NUMBER/QUESTION	CONSULTATION RESPONSE NUMBER COMMENT RECEIVED (TOTAL RESPONSES)	COMMENTS	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
12. Isolation and Contagious Outbreak					
Q12.1 should effective separation be a separate room?	1,4,34,43,50,57/63,58,70 74,89, 106, 114, 121, 124, 126, 146, 164+165 170, 173, 189, 199, 201, 202, 206, 225, 226(HB) 230, 345(HB), 245, 253(HB), 255	1-agree, barrier nursing, hand cleansing etc 4-separate room should suffice 34-depends on illness and vet advice -offer guidance,deal with on case by case basis 43-broarly agree 50-yes separate room 57/63-if an ill animal is separate in the same house there is still a chance of the disease being transferred-if a dog needs to be quarantined it should prefably be outside in a heated kennel 58-unable to comment-should it be the animal is quarantined not the premises? 70-agree 74-Agree but back to 3.4 would you require separate rooms just in case animals were sick 89-agree and advice sought from vet asap 106 – agree separation 114 – ok, assume crate in separate room would meet requirement 121 – consulting vet to decide 124 – agree, would keep dog in separate room 126 – isolation should be crate other animals cannot	23	1	8

		<p>approach, not separate room</p> <p>146 - yes</p> <p>164+165 – agreed</p> <p>170 – have owners' signed permission to take dog to vet, boarders would normally comply with vet instructions</p> <p>173 – best answered by vet</p> <p>189 – sensible if could be contagious</p> <p>199 – separate room most appropriate form of isolation</p> <p>201-should be the animal is quarantined not the premises.</p> <p>202 – Separate room, no contact with other boarders.</p> <p>206 – Yes.</p> <p>225 –Yes</p> <p>226 (HB) Yes, effective separation should be separate room.</p> <p>230 – Yes but owner must be informed ASAP and dog removed to care of own vet.</p> <p>235(HB) – Yes</p> <p>245 – Isolation Facilities must be physically isolated from all other dog housing and vet advice should be documented and followed immediately.</p> <p>253(HB) – Yes.</p> <p>255 - Would hope vet would have been involved and advise taken as to appropriate isolation (room or crate) even if just until owners can return and take animal back into their care,</p>			
12.2	1,70, 114, 124, 164+165	<p>1-agree</p> <p>70-agree</p> <p>114 – ok</p> <p>124 – do not understand reason, more important to</p>			

		consult vet 164+165 – which diseases? Upset stomach? Kennel cough?			
Q12.3 should any quarantine period apply to animals normally residing at premises?	1,34,35,43,50,58,70,74, 89, 106, 114, 115, 121, 124, 126, 146, 164+165 189, 199, 201,202, 206, 225, 226(HB), 230, 235(HB), 252(HB), 253(HB), 255	1-agree, yes 34-depends on illness and vet advice -offer guidance,deal with on case by case basis 35-unnecessary 43-broadly agree 50-no should not be necessary 58-assume only if infected 70-agree 74-depends on disease, should be as per vet guidance 89-advice sought from vet and appropriate decision made 106 – HB should consult vet 114 – vet to answer 115 – vet to determine when boarding can restart 121 – consulting vet to decide 124 – consult vet, no need to involve LA 126 – should not be quarantine period. Do not close vet surgery when contagious dog in residence, same for hospitals. Overkill and difficult to enforce. 146 – leave to licensee 164+165 – agreed for serious infections such as parovirus but what about minor infections such as kennel cough? By time infection evident all other dogs will be infected or be carriers & gone home, especially in daycare environment Some infections such as giardia not identified until many weeks after initial infection. What would policy be on these?	4	5	21

		<p>189 – dependent on vet advice 199 – depends on nature of disease 201-only if infected. 202 – difficult to specify without vet diagnosis. Unsure why Licensing Authority would make specifications as a vet would be more informed and able to advise. 206 – No. 225 – Vets in conjunction with licensee should make this decision. 226(HB) I should take advice on this from a vet. 230- Advice should be taken from a vet. 235(HB) – Depends on the disease and whether animal is vaccinated. 252(HB) – Depends on the disease. Kennel cough should not be included. 253(HB) – Slightly ambiguous. If you mean our resident dogs being kept away from boarders until the ID has passed, then yes. 255 – Advice from vet.</p>			
12.4	1,70,74, 114, 124, 164+165	<p>1-agree 70-Agree. 74-Not in the event of an emergency, it should be safe for the animals primarily 114 – ok 124 – in accordance with owner's wishes, would take body to vet or organisation such as Dignity. No reason for LA to be involved 164+165 - agreed</p>			

DRAFT CONDITION NUMBER/QUESTION	CONSULTATION RESPONSE NUMBER COMMENT RECEIVED (TOTAL RESPONSES)	COMMENTS	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
13. FIRE/EMERGENCY PRECAUTIONS					
13.1	1,70, 114, 124, 253(HB)	1-agree 70-agree 114 – needs to be defined more clearly 124 – agree 253(HB) – What would these be? Fire Extinguishers/blankets and how many?			
13.2	1,70, 114, 124	1-agree 70-agree 114 – ok 124 - agree			
13.3	1,70,114,124	1-agree 70-agree 114 – ok 124 - agree			
Q13.4 should temp facility be another licensed establishment?	1,4,3,4,35,43,50,58,70 89, 106, 114, 119, 121, 124, 146, 170, 173, 189, 199, 201, 206, 225, 226(HB), 230, 235(HB), 245, 247, 253(HB), 255	1-agree-ideally another licensed premises but may not be possible in emergency 4-should not just be the permitted option 34-unreasonable as likely one off occurrence 35-anywhere suitable in short term 43-no 50-no as only temporary 58-immediate/short term maybe but not long term maybe	12	10	6

		<p>70-agree 89-yes 106 – if for no more than few days, don't require licence, owners/family should be informed & where possible collect their dog 114 – difficult to define rules. Would relocate, contact owner or emergency contact & agree best solution. Local kennel as last resort. 119 – unnecessary 121 – agree 124 – agree. No employees so nothing to gain from plan on display. Contingency arrangements in place to board elsewhere in emergency. 146 – not necessary, short term emergency arrangement 170 – boarders to advise their arrangements on annual basis. Display of certificates over the top 173 – ideally yes, but how practical? 189 – yes where possible but discretion 199 – extreme situation, allow pet sitter to decide 201-immediate/short term maybe not but long term possibly. 206 – Yes. 225 – No, although licensee should be satisfied with alternative emergency arrangements. 226(HB) – Yes I suppose it should but this may prove difficult in an emergency, what happens if there are no vacancies at the time? 230 - Might not be possible, another HB might be fully booked or too distant for transfer.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>235(HB) – If possible, yes. If not should be left up to the licensee.</p> <p>245 – The temporary boarding facility should be a licensed establishment.</p> <p>247 – Whole clause OTT. Where is an HB with a number of dogs going to find another HB at the height of summer with the availability to board 10 dogs? Non practical clause to such a low risk.</p> <p>253(HB) – Taking things a bit far? Best to agree with owner in advance to provide contact details for friend or relative who could temporarily house the dog.</p>			
13.5	1,70, 114, 124	<p>1-agree</p> <p>70-agree</p> <p>114 – ok</p> <p>124 - agree</p>			
13.6	1,70, 114, 115, 124, 164+165, 242, 251(HB), 252(HB)	<p>1-where possible</p> <p>70-agree</p> <p>114 – ok</p> <p>115 – disagree</p> <p>124- disagree, makes dogs feel excluded</p> <p>164+165 – for 13.6 to 13.9 all these points too stringent for HB environment, fire evacuation plans step too far for a house.</p> <p>Can't say doors must be kept shut at night as may not be appropriate for individual dogs staying</p> <p>242 – Really important to keep doors open at night so that HB can listen out that all is well.</p> <p>251(HB) – Once again you have failed to justify the reason behind a point. Would have a negative effect on</p>			

		socialisation and integration. 252(HB) – Up to the HB. 255 – Yes.			
13.7	1,70, 114, 124, 164+165	1-agree 70-agree 114 – ok 124 – agree 164+165 – unrealistic in home environment. Most homes have cables, including owners'. Dogs likely to chew them would be crated.			
13.8	1,70, 114, 124, 164+165	1-agree 70-agree 114 – ok 124 – agree 164+165 – as home environment goes without saying. Why no freestanding gas or oil heaters? PAT testing required?			
Q13.9 Should emergency contact details be posted outside the premises?	1,4,35,43,50,70,74,89 106, 114, 121, 124, 146, 164+165, 189, 199, 201,206, 225, 226(HB230, 235(HB), 245, 252(HB), 253(HB), 255),	1-agree principle but is 5mins reasonable? Need postcode and emergency telephone number 4,not realistic in security terms for the boarder 35-approve 43-no 50-no 58-not sure 70-agree 74-Do not agree for security reasons the boarder and their emergency contact, there should be emergency contact details/on call details for accessing the licensing staff	9	14	5

		<p>89-yes 106 – agree neighbour should have key & other neighbours should know who keeps spare key. No to display of phone number on premises 114 – no to emergency number outside as potential for security breach 121 – notification by email negates need for out of hours contacts 124 – agree although no benefit to LA holding details 146 – no 164+165 – completely unrealistic & unnecessary. Ridiculous to have details posted outside the premises. Would these people have to be available 24 hours a day? Need to have list of people in case one out? 189 – make details available to boarders 199 – see logic but would insurers have a view? 201-not sure 206 – No 225- Not sure. 226(HB) Not necessary as no dog is left on its own at night. 230 – 5 mins away may not be achievable. Yes, someone else should have keys in case of emergency. 235(HB) – Different for boarding Kennels but not for HB. 245 – Unsure what this question means. Would expect licensed premises to have contingency plans in place for the safe removal of dogs in an emergency. Sensible to have emergency no. posted outside. 252(HB) -Nice in principle. Already have people in place for emergencies and spare keys in key safes on site.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		253(HB) – Don't think any such personal details should be left outside for anyone to access. 255 – Yes			
--	--	---	--	--	--

DRAFT CONDITION NUMBER/QUESTION	CONSULTATION RESPONSE NUMBER COMMENT RECEIVED (TOTAL RESPONSES)	COMMENTS	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
14. REGISTER					
Q14.1 anything else to include in register?	1,50,74,89, 114, 115, 121, 124, 146, 164+165 173, 189, 199, 201, 206, 225, 226(HB), 230,235(HB), 245	<p>1-on acceptance/registration form-permission for dog to be with other peoples dogs, let off lead, taken to vet if needed. Waiver if dog dies in licensees care</p> <p>50-cannot think of any</p> <p>74-allergies</p> <p>89-sufficient</p> <p>114 – don't require actual microchip number, list seems comprehensive</p> <p>115 – acceptable</p> <p>121 – owners to decide</p> <p>124 – agree</p> <p>146 – no, list already too long & introduces unnecessary & disproportionate bureaucracy</p> <p>164+165 – agreed, also need written agreement for veterinary treatment & off lead walking</p> <p>173 – requirements sensible & what most owners expect</p> <p>189 – in accordance with their existing procedures</p> <p>199 – reasonable but time consuming to implement & maintain, especially if large no dogs & short stays. Why 2 years? 12 months sufficient? Could council provide secure server space for a common database for sitters & council staff to access?</p> <p>201-I think it covers the main points.</p>	6	11	3

		<p>206 – No. 225 – No. 226(HB) – No, cannot think of anything. 230 – The owners return date. 235(HB) – Looks well covered. 245 – Info about a dogs behaviour should be recorded, proof of current vaccinations / parasite treatments and medical history to include current conditions which may need observation / medication during stay.</p>			
14.2	1, 57/63,70, 124, 164+165, 233	<p>1-reasonable times? 57/63-not happy that any vet can see my details, breach of my right to privacy-only should see if in connection with outbreak of disease 70-agree 124 – yes to vet but no benefit to LA 164+165 – agreed 233 – How many staff are the Council going to employ to go checking registers, for what purpose and what petrol cost to tax payers? Is the cost of the licence just to pay the staff who have decided a licence scheme is needed?</p>			
14.3	1,70, 114, 119, 124, 164+165	<p>1-agree 70-agree 114 – ok 119 – unnecessary 124 – agree 164+165 – why?</p>			
14.4	1,70, 114,124, 164+165	<p>1-agree-but unlikely to be staff 70-agree</p>			

		114 – ok 124 – agree but not where no additional staff employed 164+165 – data protection issues here			
--	--	---	--	--	--

DRAFT CONDITION NUMBER/QUESTION	CONSULTATION RESPONSE NUMBER COMMENT RECEIVED (TOTAL RESPONSES)	COMMENTS
15. OTHER ISSUES		
LEGISLATION	1,70, 114, 173, 245	<p>1-Animal Welfare Act 2005, Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996, Control of Dogs Order 1992, Dogs Act 1871, Dangerous Dogs Act 1991</p> <p>70-agree</p> <p>114 – requirement to comply with other legislation</p> <p>173 – inspection regime should be specified in the regulations</p> <p>245 – The document does not contain all of the information expected in order to meet the 5 welfare needs of dogs. Would be appropriate to outline how HB's can provide for each of the 5 needs (similar to the DEFRA Code of Practice for the Welfare of Dogs).</p>
OTHER	1,3,9,52,70, 124	<p>1-fit and proper person always present, no premises with children under 10 be licensed?, only allow persons over 16 to walk dogs?, max time dogs can be left stipulated?-if at all?</p> <p>3-dogs need at least 2 walks a day, premises to be inspected annually by local authority, agreed daily rates for boarding agreed, owner to supply boarder with animal records, dietary needs-excellent idea to licence home boarders, need to take responses into account</p> <p>9-asking for references would help judge businesses, owners should have freedom of choice as to where to send their animals, welcome a licence to support welfare of animals but give comments considerable thought</p> <p>52-references written by people who give honest feedback re their pet sitter</p> <p>70-agree</p> <p>124 – all points raised are of concern</p>

GENERAL COMMENTS ON DRAFT CONDITIONS

CONSULTATION RESPONSE NUMBER COMMENT RECEIVED	COMMENTS	TOTAL RESPONSES
2	Cat sitter at peoples own homes – no views on this consultation	
6	such bureaucratic restrictions will put many home boarders out of business. Draconian restrictions at odds with the service that is provided. Seems this will only add to the numbers of locally unemployed.	
7	Most points valid only issue with 4.2	
11	Agree some standards are needed but these are over strict and will result in businesses being forced to close and more animals being abandoned	
15	Agree with most points and principle of licensing is sound but should not place onerous restrictions that limit the availability of this service``	
18	Can not justify this consultation in the current climate of staff and service cutbacks	
21	Conditions 5-15 all criteria met by boarder- same comforts as in own home with bonus of socialising with other dogs	
22	Have regularly used a dog sitter as know dogs come back happy and relaxed unlike a kennel environment where had a bad experience. Regulation could be helpful but not at complete cost of unviable business and depriving owners of feeling their animals are happy and well cared for	
24	If the sitter is properly licensed then the Council can ensure they have taken the proper steps to ensure the dogs will be comfortable and happy with each other	
25	Home boarding is less stressful compared to kennelling for dogs, the dogs have freedom as they do at home and have company both human and other dogs. People who use home boarders are fussy owners – who are very concerned with the welfare of their dog and would not leave their pet in unsuitable surroundings.	
26	Pleased Council is looking at pet sitters – most proposals appear reasonable	

31	Use dog sitter-home from home environment-benefit allows dog to socialise-down to owner to choose what environment they wish their dog to be left in.	
35	Applaud desire to regulate business of home boarding it has been working well in Wokingham for many years. Great shame for this valuable resource to be restricted and take away pet owners discretion.	
36	Agree that animal boarding be regulated to prevent unscrupulous operators, surely government should be supporting small businesses rather than imposing outdated and ill thought out legislation. Home boarders/pet sitters offer valued and much needed service to the community	
37	Not appropriate use of time and resource-adverse impact on peoples livelihood leading to closing of businesses and increased reliance on the state for financial support.	
43	Avid supporter of pet welfare but find the majority of these points unnecessary. Is this a good use of Council Tax payers climate especially in view of the current economic climate.	
45	Much of the conditions are common sense and responsible pet owners would not leave their pets anywhere they weren't safe or looked after-I think the conditions are better than some pets homes and think it should be left to the responsible owner and boarder to make common sense decisions themselves	
46	Only commented on areas I have an opinion	
47	Generally agree with proposals as may wipe out people/premises not suitable-gives owners ability to leave dogs in a home environment with plenty of exercise-would never consider kennels when boarded in cages and few opportunities for interaction with people or animals. Home boarders would be unlikely to stay in business and owners would have to rely on friends/family who have may have little or no knowledge of caring for dogs	
48	It is important that animals being kept in the boarding business should abide by rules to ensure animals are treated well and kept in good conditions	
49	I am fully in favour of keeping animal boarding in domestic environments-does not need to change-owners would face difficulties- possibly leaving dogs for long periods	

	of time resulting in behavioural problems and unsatisfactory care- dogs need to be sociable and cared for like our children-if owners feel cannot cope may result into animals being taken to rescue centres	
52	Support some form of licence to protect welfare of animal but make it workable for our pet sitters	
53	Rely on such a service to enjoy the company of a dog and health benefits of exercising them without the expense, impersonality of kennels. Is this consultation a result of any problems that have occurred-I have never heard of any. I take the view that if it ain't broke don't fix it.	
59	On the whole agree with draft proposal and support its introduction- apart from 4.2 – as long as other conditions complied with an agreed number of dogs can be identified as part of each licence and consent of owner can be obtained in advance	
62	I choose to use a sitter so my dog is looked after in a caring, loving environment, my dog enjoys socialising with other dogs, is comfortable and secure during my absence, all the dogs under the sitters care are well behaved – it would be disasterous if I could no longer use the sitter	
66	Our pet sitter already applies many of the proposals, including dogs vetted before boarding, no puppies taken, dogs not neutered are not allowed to board-part of our decision to have a dog was based on that we would wish to use a pet sitter rather than kennels	
70	I welcome the introduction of licence but believe may result in closure of some establishments. Took long time to find someone I could trust with the care of my pets.	
71	Is there anyone on the panel who owns a dog and regularly leaves it at a good quality home boarding accommodation? It important for all types of dogs to interact with each other. A family pet is thought of as a family member and therefore great consideration is made when leaving them. Should it be in kennels with cages where they are locked up for most of the day and night hearing other animals in distress or aloud the freedom to move freely and interact with other animals. The number of pets a home boarder can look after a one time needs to be revised.	

75	Prefers dog to go to home boarder than kennels where dog is left alone in cage for many hour a day. My dog is very socialable with other dogs and thoroughly enjoys her time away. She well looked after in a clean household where three walks a day are undertaken.	
76	I believe the sooner a puppy can spend time with a boarder the sooner she can get use to mixing with other dogs. Limiting boards to have one dog at a time is ridiculous. Surely the licence should be based on the size of the accommodation, facilities etc. The majority of dog boarders have set their home up accordingly to house dogs and make sure that the dogs have plenty of exercise, are safe and loved.	
78	My dog spends up to 4 weeks a year at the home boarders and I have no concerns or issues. The welfare my dog and the others dogs are top priority to the boarder. I also like to fact my dog is interacting with other dogs. I also like it the fact she is in a home from home environment and is kept in the same daily routine as she id with us. My dog is on a special diet which is not an issue, I give the home boarder food and medication and in the case of any emergency (never needed) she always has the ability to contact us day or night.	
80	I am extremely satisfied with the service I receive from home boarding and my dog always comes home fitter and happier for having socialised with a few other dogs from other households.	
81	Entirely agree with the need to licence home boarders but have issue with para 4.2	
82	I board my dogs with a responsible sitter for the ease of boarding with someone I trust with my pets and of their welfare and safety-please bear comments in mind before making hard and fast rules as it would make life more difficult for the animals and people who rely on these borders to look after their pets	
83	Licensing dog sitters is a very good idea as there are lots of walkers with many dogs causing problems as they do not know what to do. We only have issue with para 4.2. Congratulations to the Council for this idea and allowing residents to comment 84 I wish to voice my objection to the proposed changes to animal boarding at	

	domestic premises. I depend heavily on my dog sitter who is trustworthy and reliable something I have never felt when using kennels	
84	I wish to voice my objection to the proposed changes to animal boarding at domestic premises. I depend heavily on my dog sitter who is trustworthy and reliable something I have never felt when using kennels	
86	I am a local dog trainer and find the services that boarders provide invaluable and often recommend them to new dog owners. I am constantly in the company of other dog owners and would say around 90% of them favour the services of a dog sitter rather than using kennels. I understand need to regulate boarding services but it would be a disaster for the pet owner to loose this valuable service.	
88	I sincerely hope this consultation is not passed. We have a much loved dog who we would not consider sending to kennels due to the distress it would cause him. I appreciate the need for a certain element of policing to make this business illegal without a licence and only allow one extra dog is complete madness. Also for many animal boarders this is their livelihood.	
89	I think the idea of licensing individuals who offer this service is sensible and welcomed	
91	Why at this stage do you have to make changes to the current system, I would object to any changes unless you fully clarify the benefits to both the animals and public.	
94	On the whole I agree completely with, so as to protect animals and their owners.	
95	Overall the proposal I believe is good, practical and would offer protection to both dog owner and service provider.	
97	Home Boarder Facilities do need appropriate standards.	
98	Disappointed to limit of boarded animals & animal carers in the current climate. Inspection of premises to make sure that they are fit for purpose is the right way forward. But some of your proposals if adopted, we will see many animals abandoned at holiday times.	
99	Home Boarding is a much better solution than sending your dogs to the kennels and we must encourage people to provide these services.	

100	Need to licensed. The current law needs to be updated otherwise it might lead to animals being left with unsuitable carers	
102	Strongly disagree with the proposal waste of tax payers money and such antiquated legislation. Elected members should be spending more time on pressing issues.	
103	Providing a vital service to the local community.	
104	Invaluable service not sure how we would manage without it.	
105	Why are you wasting tax payer's money on such antiquated legislation? Surely there are far more pressing issues for elected councillors to spend time on.	
106	Some form of licensing good idea. Uses HB.	
107	Uses HB. Don't do anything to make it harder for them to provide valuable service	
108	Strongly object to proposals. Home boarding better than cage/kennels	
109	Restrictions unacceptable, strongly object. Why introducing now? Valuable service, could put HB out of business. Uses HB.	
110	Uses HB, prefer to kennels. No reason to alter current situation.	
112	Would put HB out of business. Reconsider proposals.	
113	Dog sitter. Key points are licensing, insurance, comfortable living conditions & occasional inspections by dog warden or equivalent	
114	Home boarder.	
115	Uses HB. Not against licensing but why now? HB to determine number of animals boarded, not council.	
116	Dog owner, uses HB. Concerned about restrictions, much needed service. Owners vet HB themselves. RSPCA could do inspections if necessary.	
117	Opposed. Prefers HB to kennels.	
118	Uses HB. Proposals would put HB out of business. Reconsider distress they would cause.	
119	Dog owner, use HB in preference to kennels. Believe licensing would be detrimental & put HB out of business. Cost & administrative burden on HB, how will conditions be enforced?	
120	Dog owner, use HB. Prefer to kennels.	

121	Sees benefit of proposals, has used HB & kennels. Agree licensing HB would assist owners in making their choice.	
122	Uses HB. High standard of care important.	
123	Laudable except 4.2. Uses HB. 4.2 would put HB out of business.	
124	Experienced HB. Agree to licensing subject to comments above. Home assessment required, also consider length of experience & references.	
125	Agree licence HB but not 4.2. Not disturbed by neighbour's HB business	
126	Letter of support from John Redwood MP, who believes no need for LA to set up a new licensing regime. HB & dog walking business. Not opposed to concept of licensing but strongly object to 4.1 & 4.2 which would put HB out of business. Propose business licence covering up to x boarders. HB licensing has not worked in Bracknell. Will put people out of work or business, reduce boarding capacity, increase prices & increase pressure on remaining businesses. Believe whole industry would be pushed underground, as has in Bracknell, open to rogue traders & poor standards. Owners would take their animals to other unlicensed areas. Both Wokingham and Bracknell have confirmed they have not received complaints about HB establishments.	
128	Dog owner, uses HB. Conditions appear out of touch with majority of local responsible pet owners. Did experienced HB assist with proposals? Should retract and rewrite draft.	
130	Dog owner, use boarder. Invaluable service, high standard care. Doesn't see how licensing would benefit, not worked in Bracknell. Opposes in strongest possible terms	
131	Poorly thought through. Dog would have to be rehomed or put down. Dog owner, use boarder. Invaluable service, high standard care. Doesn't see how licensing would benefit, not worked in Bracknell. Opposes in strongest possible terms	
132	Complete dismay at proposal. Dog owner, use boarder. Invaluable service, high standard care. Doesn't see how licensing would benefit, not worked in Bracknell. Opposes in strongest possible terms	
133	Dog owner, use boarder. Invaluable service, high standard care. Doesn't see how licensing would benefit, not worked in Bracknell, opposed in strongest terms	

134	Pet owner, uses HB.	
135	Run pet care service, although doesn't include HB. 4.2 poorly thought out. Think most HB carry out most of points raised, albeit in more relaxed fashion. This is why people use HB rather than kennels.	
136	Dog owner, use boarder. Invaluable service, high standard care. Doesn't see how licensing would benefit, not worked in Bracknell, opposed in strongest terms	
137	Dog owner, use boarder. Invaluable service, high standard care. Doesn't see how licensing would benefit, not worked in Bracknell, opposed in strongest terms	
138	Dog owner, use HB occasionally. Regulation for sake of it, other legislation covers. Cost of administering scheme. Should reduce licensing obligations to minimum so as not to damage "cottage industry" providing useful service	
139	Dog owner, use boarder. Invaluable service, high standard care. Doesn't see how licensing would benefit, not worked in Bracknell, opposed in strongest terms	
140	Dog owner, use boarder. Invaluable service, high standard care. Doesn't see how licensing would benefit, not worked in Bracknell, opposed in strongest terms	
141	Dog owner, use boarder. Invaluable service, high standard care. Doesn't see how licensing would benefit, not worked in Bracknell, opposed in strongest terms	
142	Dog owner, use boarder. Invaluable service, high standard care. Doesn't see how licensing would benefit, not worked in Bracknell, opposed in strongest terms	
143	Dog owner, use boarder. Invaluable service, high standard care. Doesn't see how licensing would benefit, not worked in Bracknell, opposed in strongest terms	
144	Dog owner, used local pet sitter last 2 years who is fully insured & responsible. Prefer HB service to kennels. Proposals would put their sitter out of business. Particularly opposed to 4.2. Why interfere when service runs successfully?	
145	Dog owner, use boarder. Invaluable service, high standard care. Doesn't see how licensing would benefit, not worked in Bracknell, opposed in strongest terms	
146	Who funds inspections? Prefer LA to provide minimal level of interference. Proposals could drive HB out of business & force owners to use kennels. Resent expense which would be incurred.	

147	Dog owner, uses HB. Without HB service dog would have to be put into care or rehomed. Doesn't see how licensing would benefit, not worked in Bracknell, opposed in strongest terms	
148	Dog owner, use boarder. Invaluable service, high standard care. Doesn't see how licensing would benefit, not worked in Bracknell, opposed in strongest terms	
149	Dog owner, use boarder. Invaluable service, high standard care. Doesn't see how licensing would benefit, not worked in Bracknell, opposed in strongest terms	
170	How will we find out who is/is not boarding dogs?	
170	Users of local pet sitting service, broadly support proposal but object to 4.2, if pet owners willing to leave dogs with boarder knowing they're with other dogs, they should be allowed to do so	
172	Agree with need to licence. Regularly board dog, choose boarder over kennel where dog was distressed & in poor condition, boarder gives more attention & exercise than kennel	
173	List of consultees would have been helpful, should publicise more, lack of explanation why now – revenue, problems? Owners choose boarders over kennels, preference.	
174	Could cause problems with barking dogs	
175	Strongly object to proposal, ridiculous red tape	
176	Animal welfare paramount, degree sensible regulation important but proposals too prescriptive, would result in loss of choice of care. Uses pet sitter in own home.	
177	Uses home boarder. Believes introduction in Bracknell has been failure. Strongly opposed to proposal.	
178	Dog owner. Would cause boarders to go out of business or work unlicensed. Waste of money.	
180	Do not believe council should consider home boarding licensing, not relevant under Animal Boarding Establishments Act, why specifically dogs. Unnecessary bureaucracy & waste of taxpayers money.	
181	Have taken time to choose right place for dogs to stay, happy with arrangements. What are reasons for change? Dogs return in better health & condition than when left	

183	Proposals too prescriptive & not fully thought through, owner should be able to choose	
184	Consider social welfare of animals, agree home boarding should be licensed	
185	Responding as dog owner. Would make business unviable. Should consider amount of time host should be away from home while boarding dogs – max 3 hours a day. Why does council feel need to regulate & how will owner & host benefit	
186	Appears over regulated & lack of understanding of dogs, applaud consultation. Dog owner who uses boarding services.	
187	Dog owner, uses boarding services. Fail to see how this would benefit. Introduction in Bracknell has been a failure. Opposed in strongest possible terms.	
188	Concerned at conditions.	
189	National franchise – support proposals. Suggest licence fee £50-75 pa per f/t host but that licence should be granted to franchise to cover all host families they use. Spot check one host home per year.	
190	Regular user of home boarding. Do not support changes, request withdraw them. Elaborate & cumbersome, restrictive, would force boarders out of business.	
191	Has used pet sitter for nearly 8 years. She has majority of conditions in place already. Should grant licence based on experience & working practices. Some will comply, others will avoid licensing regime. Assess each sitter on own merits.	
192	Supports home boarders. Could affect livelihood.	
193	Welcome proposals exc 4.2	
194	Scheme absurd. What is public support for it? Let people make their own decisions	
195	Unnecessary, unwanted & ill thought out. Cost of consultation. Can make own judgment. Rogue element. Should be reducing red tape.	
196	Not averse but has concerns. Uses home boarder. Proposals too prescriptive, not fully thought through. Owner should make own decisions.	
197	Former user of home boarding.	
198	Should allow flexibility, do not restrict boarder unnecessarily.	
199	Word of mouth will regulate. Proposals overly bureaucratic. Don't understand purpose of 4.2. Set of standards could be of benefit to dog owners.	

200	..by all means introduce a licence but make sure it's one that will work and not put people out of jobs.	
201	I do hope this is given serious consideration. Home boarding is a great service and there are a great many owners who are not happy to kennel their dogs, regardless of how well respected the establishment is.....please do not implement requirements that will have a detrimental effect on those who are totally committed to animals and their welfare.	
203	Given the negative effect that this proposal will have on our ability to obtain professional care for our dog, we would like to understand the Council's rationale for introducing this. We would like to voice our opposition to it in the strongest possible terms.	
204	We would appreciate an explanation of the ultimate objective of your proposals and how you feel these rules will achieve it. We are confident you have best interests at heart and with consultation of all concerned parties; a better approach could achieve the desired outcome.	
206	Homeboarding is a caring environment. Dog recognises 'holiday friends' afterwards. My family enjoy their holiday, why shouldn't the dog? Please consider animals as you would consider your own family care and give people the choice as to how they cater for their holiday care	
207	Used home boarding 7 years, dog has thrived. Set up is entirely safe & dogs can be separated if needed. I know I can always find safe & happy boarding alongside other dogs.	
208	Exactly the same comments as 203	
209	Exactly the same comments as 203 and 208	
211	Do not assume all dog boarders are the same. Our dog has spent many happy, wonderful safe holidays with a home boarder where he has the freedom to exercise alongside other dogs. This arrangement gives us flexibility when booking holidays etc.	
212	Whilst I understand that care cannot be guaranteed and that certain individuals would abuse the lack of legislation to profit therein, in essence I object to the proposed	

	licence. Home boarders are often thoroughly vetted by pet owners...that is the beauty of the arrangement. To legislate & make it untenable for many home boarders is a 'Big Brother' style step too far.	
210	These places offer huge benefits over kennels. Their owners are animal lovers first and business men a distant second. We need to help preserve this valuable part of our pet owning community & support it with legislation, not stifle it. Certifying with sympathy and understanding of ongoing businesses and capabilities.	
214	I have been using home boarding for 7 years – it embraces the home from home ethos which has made dogs and their owners separate happily and without distress!	
215	Exactly the same as 203,208 and 209.	
217	Exactly the same as 203,208,209 and 215.	
218	'Home' conditions have ensured that those of us who use these services continue to do so for many years.	
219	Exactly the same as 203,208,209, 215 and 217.	
220	I am fully aware you have the best interest/welfare of my dog at heart but it would be a miscarriage of justice to hinder the work of a home boarding business which does such a wonderful job.	
221	There should be a rigorous and well thought out interview process between the boarder and the dog/dog's owner to ensure compatibility all round.	
223	We fully accept that the welfare of the dogs must be a priority, and that of neighbouring properties but your proposals seem overly restrictive and poorly thought through.	
224 (P/T HB)	I urge you to reconsider and leave the business of dog boarding in the very capable hands of those already entrusted by the dog owners.	
228	Regulation in this area would be a positive measure and in principle I would support it. However it is way too restrictive and may even result in the removal of home boarding, or putting home boarders out of business. Would be a terrible shame for a well intended idea to result in closures. My experience of HB has been hugely positive.	
227	Vastly overcomplicated and badly written – forgotten who your customer is – caused great consternation in dig owning community you don't seem to have any idea about	

	<p>the HB business you are trying to regulate. Our dog is our responsibility. Will result in: Licensing a handful of people, not necessarily the best ones. A large number of 'boarding' people in estate type properties will go 'underground'. Destroying a healthy HB business activity.</p> <p>Understand this regulation may be necessary but just how many dodgy boarders do you come across? Kennels will not be an option!</p>	
231	Agree with most of the proposals. I would hate to leave my dog in a standard kennel, she would be acutely distressed.	
232	More regulation where there is not a significant problem seems neither desirable nor economically sensible. Threaten the survival of highly caring and safe businesses where the customers and pets are happy. Please reconsider. I do not think more regulation will actually benefit the animals.	
233	I believe I have the intelligence to decide if an HB option is appropriate for my pet; an expensive licence will not be the deciding factor for me...an admin person isn't needed to make this decision, just a caring owner.	
235(HB)	Really good idea to have some procedures in place although some things should be left to licensee's discretion. A lot my boarders stay because their owners care about them and love the idea of a home environment. Each licensee should be assessed on their experience etc.	
236	236 – Could never use an ordinary kennel knowing that the only person my dog will see is when he is fed and all the exercise is in a run. We are animal lovers and want the best for our animals.	
238	Exactly the same as 208, 209 etc.	
239(HB)	The faults we are finding in the proposal are faults because they offer no gain to owner, dog or HB. I hope your licence does weed out the bad among us and not target the ones who love their job and dogs. We know there are people doing this without knowledge or care, for that reason I welcome some form of legalisation and control.	
240	Exactly the same as 208, 209, 238 etc.	
241	Some of your suggestions are sensible i.e. How the dogs are kept overnight. But there	

	wouldn't be anyone running a HB business if they could only board one at a time.	
242	None of this is in the best interest of the dogs. It's a set of measures used to 'tick your boxes', keep the fire-boys happy, to keep the kennels happy and show you are 'doing the right thing'. ...neither Bracknell nor W/ham has received complaints in relation to HB... in Bracknell this licensing has been a failure. I voice my opposition to this in the strongest possible terms.	
243	A licence is perhaps a fair and sensible consideration -- feel sure would be welcomed by professionals but why would anyone wish to enforce closure of a business by saying it can only take one/two dogs? - A most unprofessional consideration -- sincerely hope this case will be closed.	
246	My husband is badly disabled following a severe stroke & we rely on HB's on the occasions when we have medical emergencies resulting in his immediate admission to hospital. It is a great help when these people collect our dog & look after her in a safe, friendly environment for a few days so I don't have to worry about her. Please consider disabled people in your consultation / decision process.	
248	I use day boarding for my dog so that he receives a better quality of life (not home alone while I work). Already difficult to find this service because of demand. Broadly agree with the rest of the consultation document.	
256	Exactly the same as 208,209,238 etc	
257	Exactly the same as 208, 209, 238, 256 etc.	
247	This proposed piece of legislation fails to address the fundamental difference between kennels and that of home boarding. Aspects of this legislation will limit the choice of dog owners and put excellent long established businesses out of business. I have no issue with there being some good guidance rules.	
249	Whilst fully supporting the sentiment behind this type of legislation, I ask you to consider exceptions for places that provide a safe, dog-orientated environment with people who give invaluable advice.	
250	No mention has been made of a licence fee.	
251(HB)	The way this has been handled is little short of shambolic. You would have been better	

	off putting together a new proposal rather than cutting and pasting bits and pieces from an act that is almost half a century old. Seeking advice from dog boarders, behaviourists, trainers and vets you could have put together a credible, relevant and up to date set of conditions.	
252(HB)	Agree in principle with most points and have implemented many already. If we are to be licensed then it should also apply to franchises that should have each and every one on their books licensed too. The general consensus from my clients is that this proposal is a complete waste of money and totally unnecessary.....their words not mine!!	
254	We are strongly against the limitations of these proposals,...will reduce suppliers....increase costs...take business away from W/ham or force it underground.	
253(HB)	I have set my own criteria and standards to provide a home environment and to protect my home and family.....my clients are now my friends and their dogs are like out own pets.	
258(HB)	You should be looking for dedicated boarders that know & readily comply with licensing /regulations rather than those people with full time employment who trick owners into HB by actually locking their dogs away all day or those despicable bureau people who pass dogs to homes via a list and without the knowledge of the dog's owner.	
259(HB)	Is the same document as 258HB.	
255	Licensing this valuable service is sensible.	