

**THIS AFFECTS YOU!**



Community Standards Bylaw  
Public Consultation  
Specific to Regulation of Dogs  
November 25, 2019



WHAT WE HEARD:  
A REPORT TO THE  
COMMUNITY

## Contents

Introduction.....	2
Highlights .....	2
Advertising and Social Media Promotion Stats.....	3
Key learnings from the Engagement Progress.....	3
Thank You .....	4
Next Steps.....	4
Survey Results.....	5
Appendix 1: Public Comments: .....	8

## **THIS AFFECTS YOU: Community Standards Bylaw Consultation – Specific to Dogs**

### **Introduction**

The Town of Olds is committed to transparent and inclusive processes that are responsive and accountable while striving to engage residents when planning the future of our community. Understanding the views of our residents is a fundamental value for the Town of Olds. The Community Standards Bylaw 2015-08 is under review in 2019-2020. To effectively consult with residents and to address a pressing matter in our community, a public engagement specific to the regulation of dogs launched the Community Standards Bylaw review process.

- A survey was available online or in a printed version from November 1 to November 18, 2019.
- Evening public information sessions were hosted on November 7 and November 12, 2019.
- Feedback from the survey will be presented to Council at the November 25, 2019, Regular Council Meeting.

In total, 409 surveys were collected. 398 surveys were submitted on-line, and 11 paper copies were filled out. Approximately 20 people attended the public information sessions.

### **Highlights**

- The subject of dogs has a wide array of intense emotions ranging from “dogs are an extension of the family” to where respondents feel they are very negatively impacted by dogs.
- Respondents support licensing fees being less for dogs that have a microchip or tattoo registered with a licensed veterinarian.
- Indoor recreation facilities (Sportsplex, Aquatic Centre) should prohibit dogs (with the exception of service dogs).
- A majority of respondents feel that consequences/fines should increase depending on the severity of damage inflicted by the dog(s).
- 1/3 of respondents preferred that 3 licensed dogs be the maximum allowed per household.
- The majority of respondents do not support Dog Kennels or Commercial Dog Breeding operations in residential areas.
- Residents may not be clear on the municipal legislative responsibilities under provincial acts and statutes and that the Town has jurisdiction to pass and enforce bylaws to regulate people and property within its boundaries.

## Advertising and Social Media Promotion Stats

- Newspaper Ads (Olds Albertan) – October 29 and November 5, November 12
- Town of Olds Connector Newsletter – November addition
- 96.5 Radio Interview – October 31
- Posters at the Olds Off-Leash Dog Park
- Posters and paper copies of the surveys at the Olds Aquatic Centre and Administration Office
- Town of Olds Facebook page: 6 posts, total reach: 11,955, total shares: 57
- Olds Community Facebook page: 6 posts, total reach: 3,246, total shares: 26
- Town of Olds Twitter: 9 posts, total reach: 2,370, total retweets: 21
- Community of Olds Twitter: 7 posts, total reach: 1,438, total retweets: 11
- Town of Olds Instagram: 7 posts, total likes 67

## Key learnings from the Engagement Progress

In the past, software technology specially designed to conduct surveys has been used to support on-line surveys for the Town of Olds. With the launch of the new Town of Olds website earlier this year, and as a cost saving measure, it was decided to conduct the survey through a tool that was included in the Town of Olds new website platform. The website survey tool had been used successfully to engage the public on Christmas Lighting in Centennial Park, as well as receiving feedback regarding the new Website. Using the internal website module would help meet tight timelines set out by Council specific to this engagement process, and eliminate the need to work with a third party.

We learned this platform is not the best tool for a larger, more complex survey. A number of technical errors frustrated staff and some individuals taking the survey. The analytic tools needed to quickly and efficiently evaluate data are not part of the website platform therefore the data collected required manual analysis. Other products used in past engagements are designed solely for the purposes of supporting surveys and provided live data analysis, user friendly downloads for data analysis, and automated visual infographics. Staff were able to work through most of the technical glitches that emerged when the survey was live but going forward, for complex surveys, this tool will not be used again.

Most questions required an answer in order to submit the survey. Respondents indicated they did not like having to select an answer they did not agree with. Future surveys need to consider this, and provide context to a question in a concise manner.

A malfunction in the software caused some of the submissions to be corrupted capturing only empty answer columns. The submitted data was unrecoverable by the IT provider. Although we received a substantial response to the survey, losing any of the public feedback is not desirable. We estimate the loss in data to be approximately 10%. A survey is one tool used to gather input to understand the perspectives, concerns and values. Ample responses were collected to gauge the values and opinions of the community.

The Town of Olds apologizes to those who experienced difficulty with the survey and extend appreciation to those who contacted us to help identify and work through these issues.

## Thank You

Town of Olds would like to thank those who participated in the consultation process. Attached in the report is what we heard from you. Feedback received from the public will be taken into consideration by Council and incorporated into amendments to the Community Standards Bylaw, Land Use Bylaw, or other existing or new bylaws that may be required.

## Next Steps

This was the first stage of the Community Standards Bylaw review. The engagement data in this report, combined with legal advice and research, will be the basis to developing Bylaw recommendations for Council's consideration.



**2020**

Consultation on non-dog related CSB topics.  
Details to be confirmed.



**TOPICS**

Other animals, smoking, vaping, boulevard care,  
alcohol consumption in public parks.



**INCORPORATE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Present new or amended bylaw(s) to Council.

## Survey Results

### Question #1

**After reading the above descriptions, do you feel the bylaw should treat aggressive dogs the same as vicious dogs?**

Yes - 42%  
No - 52%  
Unsure 7%

### Question #2

**Do you feel consequences/fines should increase depending on the severity of damage inflicted by an animal?**

Yes - 79%  
No - 16%  
Unsure - 5%

### Question #3

**Are there adjustments would you recommend to the current penalties/fines schedule?**

Increase - 31%  
Decease - 8%  
Keep the same - 40%  
Unsure - 21%

### Question #4

**Should licensing fees be adjusted for unaltered dogs (dog not neuter/spade)?**

Increase – 39%  
Decease – 13 %  
Keep the same – 45%  
Unsure – 3%

### Question #5

**Microchips or tattoos make it easier to identify animals. Should licensing fees be less for dogs that have a microchip or tattoo registered with a licensed veterinarian?**

Yes – 68%  
No – 26%  
Unsure – 7%

**Question #6**

**What should be the max number of dogs allowed per household (excluding puppies under the age of 3 months)?**

- 1 – 0%
- 2 – 24%
- 3 – 38%
- 4 – 22 %
- 5 – 2%
- 6 – 14%
- No Limit – 0%

**Question #7**

**Should Commercial Dog Breeding operations be allowed in residential areas?**

- Yes – 29%
- No – 60%
- Unsure – 11%

**Question #8**

**If Commercial Dog Breeding is allowable in residential areas, how many litters per year should be allowed per household?**

- 1-2 litters per year per household – 74%
- 3 litters or more per year per household – 19%
- 4 litters per year per household 1%
- Unlimited – 6%

**Question #9**

**Should Dog Kennel operations be allowed in residential areas?**

- Yes – 22%
- No – 73%
- Unsure – 5%

**Question #10**

**In what circumstances should the Town of Olds enforce that a Dog be euthanized:**  
(check all that apply)

- Bites at least 1 person, causing minor injury – 9%
- Bites at least 1 person, causing severe injury – 36%
- Bites at least 2 people in separate incidents – 32%
- Is continuing as an active and imminent danger to persons or other animals – 50%
- Is deemed by a licensed veterinarian unfit for adoption or public safety due to observed behaviors - 66%
- Never, the Town of Olds should not enforce euthanasia – 17%

**Question #11**

**Do you feel there is enough public awareness regarding the Town's current requirements of dog ownership?**

Yes – 23%  
No – 61%  
Unsure – 16%

**Question #12**

**Where would you expect to find dog ownership information? (check all that apply)**

At the time of licensing/renewal	79%
Annual information about animal ownership in Town newsletter	55%
Website	81%
Other (Specify)	7%

**Other:** veterinary clinics; breeders; pet shops; any form of media; welcome wagon; new utility hookup; new home permit; whenever someone move to or within the town; yearly notice in the newsletter.

**Question #13**

**Please indicate whether you support having dogs on a leash and under control being allowed in sitting/spectator areas in proximity to:** (check all that apply)

Playground – 87%  
Ball Diamond – 89%  
Soccer field – 89%  
Skate Park – 81%  
Splash Park – 69%  
Indoor recreation facility (Sportsplex, Aquatic Centre) – 38%



## Appendix 1: Public Comments

Transparency is a guiding principle of an engagement process. Please note comments are presented as submitted by respondents. NOTE: submissions where details identify a specific individual(s) and/or where inappropriate as per Town of Olds Social Media Policy 111C were edited for presentation in this Report. All redacted comments are denoted with an asterisk (\*).

### 1. After reading the above descriptions, do you feel the bylaw should treat aggressive dogs the same as vicious dogs?

A dog can be aggressive (protection/guard dog) without being vicious. Likewise people can be aggressive in their demeanor without being vicious.
a young dog is not a vicious dog although it may be aggressive ( curious and spontaneous )
After three aggressive tickets the animals should then be considered vicious.
Aggressive behavior and vicious behavior are 1 different things and should be treated differently. Until a dog acts vicious there should be no action.
Aggression & viciousness typically do not have the same impact or consequences.
Aggressive by name does not mean vicious. If properly trained and in control, an aggressive breed may never show its aggression or become vicious.
Aggressive is different than vicious, apply being aggressive with less serenity.
Aggression is in the moment most dogs do this in play or with other dogs. Sometimes one gets rough and as a dog is alpha one may get aggressive for brief moment, vicious is just a mean dog
All dog behaviors are what they are thought, so really don't believe in banning any dogs
All dogs can be aggressive when hurt or scared. Not all aggressive dogs are vicious.
An aggressive animal can turn vicious in less than 2 seconds. There should be no difference.
An aggressive animal has the potential to become a vicious animal.
An aggressive dog can become a vicious dog.
An aggressive dog could be hurt, protect its person or litter or mate, defending its territory. An affective dog will warn numerous times before it will think of biting. A vicious dog normally will not
I do not think they should be treated the same as they are not the same
An aggressive dog in a moment, there could be a reason for it- maybe its owner was threatened or something. Should be on a case by case basis for an "aggressive" dog
Both have no place in a community setting. These dogs should live in the country.
Dogs bark you can't pen up every dog that barks at people they are a deterrent for degenerates.
Dogs do not have the mental capacity to be intentionally cruel, the behaviour is a result of environment and temperament

How does this apply to “smaller” dogs .. dogs whom bite but don’t have the same force? Who does the town employ with the education to know and understand the similarities between aggressive small dogs and large ones?
I believe in the one bite policy. After that the dog needs to be removed from owner, assessed by an educated dog handler then decision made as to whether the dog should be adopted or destroyed humanely.
I certainly think vicious dogs should be treated heavily. However I don’t feel that aggressive dogs, intentional or not, should be putting me, my kids Or my dog at risk either.
I don’t think they are the same is the animal aggressive or is it aggressive because it’s scared? Did humans push its boundaries and not listen to the animal’s body language?
I feel that an animal behaving in a way described by either of the above needs serious control.
I think that vicious dogs should be more of a concern than aggressive dogs. Aggressive dogs are still a concern and should be helped, but they don’t seem to be as big of a threat.
If a dog including Chihuahuas bites any human it should be treated like it is vicious
If a dog is vicious it should be put down. Perhaps mandatory dog training should be part of the penalty for have an aggressive dog. I am often told by dog owners that it is not the dog but the owner. The owner benefits from the training.
In the definition of aggressive is the word intentional. Aggression can be intentional asking with violent.
Innisfail Dog Bylaw -- Vicious Dog means any dog that has chased, injured or bitten a person or animal, damaged or destroyed property, Threatened or created the reasonable apprehension of a threat to a person
Intentional or not could be in both wordings as being vicious can happen unintentionally.
It is concerning that the bylaw states that only a peace officer may declare a dog as "vicious". There needs to be some kind of approval process and accountability here because leaving it up to the personal discretion of a peace officer is unsettling.
It is very hard to draw the line as to what an aggressive dogs behaviour looks like. To one person a dogs rough playing may be described as aggressive while others may think that dog is just a more “intense” player in a way. Just for an example.
I've owned dogs for 20 years and I don't feel qualified to determine the difference between aggressive and vicious.
My concern is that the proof is in the pudding, small dogs are more likely to bite and be “aggressive” yet the wording strong impact doesn’t necessarily apply ... sad
Not the same thing. Especially depending on circumstances. A aggressive dog could be protecting a property doing what they were taught previously OR a rescue dog on leash learning how to properly behave that is barking and lunging at another dog but is still under control. A vicious animal is one with no boundaries or person teaching proper behavior that is uncontrollable and harming people or animals
* If you can't support and enforce basic bylaws, how can you enforce this?

<p>Our lab puppy might fit the second definition she gets so excited sometimes, and although most would not consider it threatening someone fearful of dogs in general might, vicious however is entirely different, the wording of this survey feels like a door is being opened to potentially put dogs at risk to the reactions of people, some who may be innocently fearful of dogs, others who may hold a grudge against say a neighbour's loud new pup</p>
<p>Owners should have the opportunity to address the aggression</p>
<p>Regardless of the wording an animal should be under a responsible owners control at ALL TIMES. There is no difference between intentional or not intentional this should be treated the same way, large dog or small Chihuahua dogs (there are a few of these in town) if a dog is aggressive it will lead to vicious and if vicious it is already aggressive, so no there is no difference.</p>
<p>Some breeds are more aggressive by nature and may appear threatening when no malice or ill intent is intended, especially to those not used to their demeanor or to those used to milder breeds.</p>
<p>Some dogs have triggers that can set them in fear/aggression.</p> <p>If a dog is unpredictable and can not be controlled is a different situation.</p>
<p>Some dogs may seem aggressive but are not. It's hard to tell if someone doesn't know a dog.</p>
<p>That is a tough one, but Aggressive dogs usually have some reasoning behind it. My small dog was attacked by 2 big dogs when she was a puppy, she has had aggressive tendencies towards big dogs in the past. We got her proper training and corrected her behavior. A vicious dog is a whole other issue, attacking with intent to harm anyone. My dog would growl or bark at big dogs but never attack. Cannot say the same as a vicious dog.</p>
<p>The owner should be better disciplining their dog though.</p>
<p>The problem is who defines threatening. My dog may approach someone very quickly and because he's a big dog they may consider it threatening. My dog has never bitten anyone (person or another dog) but is very friendly and loves people.</p>
<p>The unpredictability of any animal requires the bylaw to be consistently applied to both aggressive and vicious dog classifications</p>
<p>These seem to be quite different as far as a dog is concerned. Vicious behaviour is bred into a dog whereas aggressive behaviour can be the result of many things in an animal including disease, treatment by humans or other animals and/or other environmental conditions.</p>
<p>Tough question...</p>
<p>Two different situations. Depends on how the breeder has raised the dog.</p>
<p>Two very different things occurring. I think more leeway should be given if it's not a vicious attack</p>
<p>Vicious dogs could hurt a child Aggressive are small annoying dogs but not dangerous</p>

<p>Vicious: either typically bred or trained to be vicious. Vicious dogs have no place in a residential community or town.</p> <p>Aggressive: any size of dog can be aggressive if feeling threatened. I've seen little dogs be very aggressive towards bigger dogs. It is a handlers responsibility to recognize signs that the dog may be uncomfortable and may act out aggressively and to remove from these situations , place on leash, etc.</p>
<p>We feel pit bulls should be banned from out town as they are in Toronto Ontario. If a large city can ban, why not a small town?</p>
<p>When a dog is showing aggressive signs most likely it would be vicious in nature if given the opportunity. For example some people I know have new neighbors how have dogs, these people have no Fence and keep the dogs tethered in the yard. They live on a corner lot and the dogs charge at anyone passing by at full throttle until the tether snaps them back. Pretty sure if the tether breaks they go from being aggressive to vicious.</p>
<p>You cannot treat an animal the same as a human in regards to intentions. Humans should express empathy for their actions. Dogs only know right vs. wrong. The owners should be treated the same, not the animal</p>
<p>You need to understand the motivation for behaviour. There are truly aggressive dogs that I suppose would be considered vicious, but there are also aggressive dogs that are so because they are fear reactive and those are two different behaviors.</p>

**2. Do you feel consequences/fines should increase depending on the severity of damage inflicted by an animal?**

<p>A fine is for an offence , not severity of the offence</p>
<p>A problem is a problem. Severity does not matter as it can lead to something down the road.</p>
<p>Again depends on the owner of the dog</p>
<p>An attack is an attack</p>
<p>And should go to vet bills</p>
<p>Animal owners need to be responsible for the actions of said animal.</p>
<p>Any vicious or aggressive attack should result in the dog being put down. I love dogs, but humans, especially the young and vulnerable are INFINITELY more important.</p>
<p>As well as increase with subsequent offenses as outlined in the By-Law, and size doesn't matter. Small dogs are notorious for not being trained the same as a large dog, I've had my ankles chewed by more small dogs than bitten by large breeds of any kind.</p>
<p>But animals should not have to be put down because their human is not a responsible pet owner</p>
<p>Damage is damage</p>
<p>Dependant on the circumstances that caused the animal to inflict damage. If the animal has randomly attacked then it should be increased, if the animal was protecting an owner, or was being harmed then no.</p>
<p>Depends on situation, and the owners</p>

Depends on what it was and the severity!!! Also how many times it has happened. Every situation is different as is every dog. So how can standards be in place were every situation is different
dog on dog scrap/disagreement dog on human/child
I feel breed does play a role in some situations, If a Sporting breed for birds or small game attacks a cat or bunny, that's is what they are bred for, that Instinct will always be there.
Same for a Border Collie or Australian Cattle Dog, They are programmed to herd cattle, and that includes nipping at heels.
Double existing second offence and triple existing third offence fines.
Especially not on a first offense, and consequences should include mandatory behaviour assessment and training by an accredited professional dog trainer that can determine if the behaviour was a result of the animal being mishandled, and if there are preventative measures that could prevent the issue from reoccurring - ideally including training that works with the dog to teach them to handle stress and anxiety (and modifying any environmental factors that contributed to the behaviour) and does not just suppress them
Evaluated by a trained medical professional, ie, veterinarian and medical doctor
Even though we can make a huge effort to train our dogs, they are animals and sometimes they can be uncontrolled. I think the fines are fair the way they are. We all have to live in a health community, respecting each other. If someone can't deal with dogs or other animals in any way, than this person should find a town where they're prohibited.
Fines are adequate
Fines for any attack should be high.
Fines need to be doubled and consequences severe. There should be zero tolerance.
fines no but additional consequences should include the owner of the dog paying for any damaged caused
However this is offence remediation, I don't see your office capable of any method of deterrent as most people aren't even aware we have bylaws and believe even a parking issue is for the RCMP.
I believe if a dog attacks anyone or any other animal and causes damage, there needs to be a hefty fine as well as mandatory behavior rehabilitation. Just as a human would be sent to anger management, a dog would go to classes with the owner and not be allowed near anyone in public until proven Graduation of the class.
I believe penalties should be well defined and severe in all cases and situations.
I don't think they should have that many chances to be fined if the dog is vicious. What if the attack escalated each time! Death of a child or small person is worth more than the fines
I think that fines should reflect severity of damage. Severe injury to people, children, other pets, or property is not acceptable ever. Should vicious dogs be given the opportunity to offend up to 3 times? (as per

6.11b, 6.11c,6.11d). This is impacting the safety of our communities. First offense by a vicious dog needs to be taken very seriously and owners need to ensure all bylaws are adhered to, to ensure the safety of our community.
If a dog attacks a human to the point of hospitalization I think the fine should be increased. But, research needs to be done into the case. Was a human hitting the animal or teasing it? Dogs have animal instincts and most will retaliate if they feel endangered or bothered (no matter dogs previous behaviour)
If there is an animal attack where another animal loses a life or a person is extremely injured I feel the owner of the dog involved should lose all rights to own another animal within town limits for life.
In every other area (eg, road fines), fines increase depending on the severity of the offence.
It depends on the situation. If my leashed dog bites an unleashed dog. It is not my fault and I should NOT be fined or responsible for any Bill's.
It is fair to have consequences that increase with severity. It becomes a motivation for people to properly train and control their pets.
It should depend on the circumstances and the dog.
It truly depend on whether the animal was provoked or whether someone approached uninvited, as well as dogs give warning signs and if they don't like it they will tell but they are often ignored.
No! But I do believe if the dog is needed vet attention the dog's owner should be responsible for that bill..
No because who makes that determination? That would be up to the police
Once again if a dog attacks unprovoked it should be put down.
Owners must be held accountable.
Owners should be liable for damage or injury caused by their dog.
Owning dogs is not a right. It's a privilege. Same as holding a drivers licence. More severe crimes get more severe punishments.
Paying a fine isn't going to stop certain people from getting the Bully breeds, they should just be banned. Let them live their lives out but no more breeding them. The only people upset with a ban are the ones profiting off breeding them.
The consequences of an injury due to a dog should not be increased, as the person is not 100% accountable for what the dog has done. The owner cannot control the strength or weakness of the dog. It is still their responsibility if someone is injured due to their dog, but I do not think fines should be increased depending on the severity.
The fine of having to euthanize an apparent vicious dog is enough of a fine.
The more damage/injury sustained the more a penalty should be.
To a degree I guess
Very much so. I think consequences should happen far sooner than they currently do, even ahead of fines, since plenty of folks will put all the money they have into keeping their animal, regardless of behaviour or threat to others.
Who decides what is conceded more severe in the past? Olds is known for more severe if the victim is an influential person in the community and that is not fair.
Who determines/defines a vicious dog vs any other dog? Is it the breed? The complainant? The officer?

Who would set the boundaries and how would guidelines work , who decides severity
Yes but it should be well defined and not arbitrary. Emotions should not define punishments.
Yes I do think fines should go up on dogs that cause harm but shouldn't be put down cause of their actions that's like killing a human if they cause bodily harm to someone it's not right by all means dogs are just like people they have a mind set and have hearts there's no reason to put them down over something that could be fix by training.
Yes to increased consequences, no to increased fines. What does the spca do? Dogs confiscated and license revoked. *No future ownership allowed

### **3. Are there adjustments you would recommend to the current penalties/fines schedule?**

1. Increase fine for leaving dog unattended in a motor vehicle without required restraints (3rd & subsequent offences should be 1000) 2. Vicious dog bites or attacks a person. There should not be fines for a third offence. The dog should be euthanized. It's already established it's vicious. 3. Vicious dog causes injury to a person or animal. There should not be a fine for a third offence. It again should be euthanized because it has already been established it is a vicious dog.
6 dogs is simply too many for an urban-based homeowner
A bite from a dog/vicious dog is very lenient. It should be a fine, medical bills and dog training as compulsory. Interfering with a dog? I'm guessing that's sexually motivated...that needs prison time.
A severe penalty would hopefully encourage dog owners to take extra caution owning dogs.
Add training for animal owners so both animal and owner learn something.
Again the defining and determining of what constitutes as a vicious dog is my concern.
I had no idea 6 dogs were allowed in one house hold. That seems high unless you are a breeder.
Again, your intentions are moot if you do not actually follow through.
All fines should be increased and enforced
But fines have to actually be given. I've never seen a by-law officer even checking for licenses in my 3 years of being a dog owner.
Combine wording of "decrease or eliminate a fine relating to the restriction of a dog from defecating on any property, other than the property of the dog owner" and the fine for FAILURE to pick up feces should be increased. How does one stop a dog from a bowel movement when out for a walk. The important thing is that it is picked up.
Decrease fines for entering a park or flower area.
Decrease the Unlicensed dog fine
doubled and zero tolerance

far too lenient - laws not enforced
Fines for multiple dogs involved in one incident is a bit much .... over fining someone in to an absurd financial hardship to prove a point is ridiculous
Fines should not be compounded. Fine should just be the highest one that applies.
Higher fines run the risk of fewer pet registrations. What purpose would an increase serve?
How do you determine a "vicious" dog from a non-vicious dog? That seems rather subjective.
How do you keep a dog in heat out of trouble? Is it ok in your own back yard. And dogs chasing bikes or people. What if it's your own people or friends? Why can dogs not use playgrounds and go on equipment. If no other person is there besides your own family and playground does not say no animals allowed and you clean up after your animal. Why can't it use the playground????
I am not an expert. I feel that there might be precedence to pull from.
I believe that when a dog threatens a person, there should be severe fines levied in that case. Only fines that are truly severe are a sufficient deterrent to ensuring that people will be truly discouraged from owning dogs that have exhibited risky behaviours. HOWEVER, fines are only as good as they are applied.
I believe the fees for leaving an animal in a car without proper ventilation should be increased. Other than that, the fees seem reasonable.
I believe the fine for leaving an animal unattended in a vehicle is out of bounds. Our well behaved pup loves the car and to have to tether or otherwise restrain him and risk him hanging himself is far more cruel than having him lie on the floor. Agree with the comment on ventilation.
I really have no idea as to how to enforce so many of the listed offenses. For example, just last week, my 5-yr old son and I were chased back into our front door by an aggressive dog that came running from the home across the road. It was a full-size brindle boxer-type dog, barking wildly and running full speed. We had never seen the dog before. Thankfully my son and I were able to scoot back into our house and watch this thing continue to bark at us from the safety of our home... but what if we were 10 seconds further along, and well into our front yard? Where would we go then? My son asked what we would've done, and I said that I would've protected him and kicked that dog really hard with my boot. It's our home. It's our front yard. That's my little boy. I shouldn't have to plan what I'd do when an aggressive dog comes tearing out of a vehicle parked at a home in our neighbourhood. The dog wasn't heeding the owner's shouts at all. Should I have called the Town? I'm not sure. Should I have grabbed the show-brush on our porch and whacked the dog? I'm not sure. What I do know is that most dog-owners think this is just normal natural dog-behaviour, and that's what angers me.
I would add one amendment to Schedule A. That a dog owner should be granted a ONE time accidental incident of a lost/found non-aggressive/non-violent dog as accidents do happen. Sometimes the dog will run out the door or yard if a gate or door is accidentally left open (this DOES happen if you also have children).
If the bylaws already in place were enforced like they should be there would be no reason to increase. But bylaws are not enforced around here at all



Increase for defecation on another's property or in playground/public areas and for failing to pickup said defecation.
Not so many chances!
Not sure
Not sure that fines solve the problem. Some people should not have pets
Other than - 6.8 e - Fail to ensure that a dog doesn't defecate on any property other than that of the land owner? When you're walking your dog how do you ensure it doesn't defecate? This seems unreasonable.
Our pup loves being in the car, we keep him safe and wouldn't leave him in a hot car. So I disagree with this penalty
Owners of vicious dogs should have to pay for any medical bills in the case of injury of other pets, property damage etc.
People don't fear fines until the make a significant impact on their pocketbook, which affects their livelihood. Hence the increase in traffic fines continuously.
People may find it easier to just put the dog down than pay a pricey fine, but with this being said, the fines should not be significantly lowered as then people may shrug it off and not find it as big of a deal.
Should also take into effect, the situation the dog was placed in to bite or attack someone. If a dog feels threatened and is just defending itself or being pestered by kids that thing dogs are jungle gyms, then in my opinion it's justified.
Sometimes, dogs can escape a fenced yard if a human error occurs, a friend enters property not knowing to close a gate or something along those lines. I do agree with most of the fees. I do believe on the other hand, there needs to be some kind of understanding and empathy from by law officers if loose dog is found before just slapping a ticket for a "loose dog".
The fine amount seems to be fine but we need to make sure the owner is fined when an infraction occurs, ie: animal off leash, no collar or tags running at large
The fines and penalties certainly seem harsh enough.
The money collected for the fines that are due to injury or property damage should go to the victim.
There is a difference between a dog that bites someone *without provocation* and one who is in a defensive situation, protecting either itself, its family or its property. A dog who attacks without provocation is a danger, but if a criminal breaks into someone's home he deserves to have a chunk of flesh torn off his sorry self.
Until the town enforces all the penalties no changes should be made. There are people constantly using Ralph Maybank park as a dog park and never do I see anyone get fined. You can't cherry pick what you will enforce and charge more.
What happens after the 3rd offence? Do people just keep paying that fine? When a dog attacks another dog does the Town keep those funds? Or do they forward them to the family who now has to pay for a high vet bill to heal their pet?

Zero vicious dogs allow in town limits.  
 No defecating or urinating on private property not owned or expressly permitted to, regardless if feces is picked up immediately.  
 No "aggressive" dogs permitted to be off leash unless secured indoors or a pen; \$5000 fine and/6 months in jail for any infraction, intentional or not.

**4. Should licensing fees be adjusted for unaltered dogs (not neutered or spayed)?**

Owners that choose to keep their pets intact may choose to do so for a variety of reasons, including medical benefit. They should not be charged additional fees, especially if they are not allowing their dogs to run at large, or cause any harm to the community. There should be no noticeable difference of an intact dog v fixed dog.
Fees should be the same all around. But cheaper.
Should be the same cost for either dog, what actual difference does that really have on a dog. A well trained dog intact or not will behave the same
License cost should be the same for both categories
Why raise the price at all. Carstairs is free for a whole month. And what about a different fee after July as half the year is gone. The license fees are a damn money grab
Make it low so you get full compliance then make them read the full bylaw!
I would think the community would want to encourage dogs and cats to be neutered and spayed. In the interest of this, I would think that decreasing the fees for such animals and possibly increasing fees for intact animals might be considered.
Taken from town of Carstairs: Pet Licences Licenses for dogs and cats are available at the Town Office. Fees for dogs and cats are as follows: January: Free February to December: \$20 per dog or cat (spayed) or \$30 per dog or cat (not spayed). Unless Town of Olds is in it strictly for monetary gain.
Increasing costs will not make more people license their dogs. The above listed fees are average for most small centers/towns.
I believe the fees should be the same for altered or unaltered. There are many reasons to alter or to choose not to alter your dog. Many of which do not include breeding the dog. Show dogs cannot be altered in order to show for instance, many medical reasons make it so that you cannot alter your pet either. My opinion would be the fee should be the same for either altered or unaltered, but the fine for dog at large should be greater for either an altered or unaltered dog.
As a responsible pet owner, why would you penalize based on whether the animal has been fixed. If it is because of risk of accidentally having puppies, that is addressed under the "at large" fines.
We are responsible pet owners, so I'd rather pay less as it's already an added expense
and why is the price different if neutered / spayed - if you want to give people incentive to neuter/spay work with the vet clinics in town to have clinics several times a year for just that at a DISCOUNTED rate... people don't spay or neuter simply due to the ridiculous price of it.
Their fees should be increased to incentivize responsible pet ownership.
If it's more expensive for un neutered/spayed animals it would be good incentive to get it done

There should be an incentive for spaying and neutering your pet. Working in the industry, we see a lot of health issues directly related to intact pets.
Owning pets is a privilege. Not a right.
Absolutely, especially if they plan to breed them.
Especially unaltered males ....can be more aggressive
for intact animals to \$100 encourage altering (keep altered at 25\$). Responsible breeders (ie not backyard) will have no problem paying this fee.
Absolutely
We should discourage dog breeders operating in town.
Free for fixed dogs
Unaltered dogs --Annual fee should be \$250/year This would encourage residents to spay or neuter their pets.
I feel that if the dog is a puppy when you get it you have a yr to neuter or spay as large dogs have been proven that they need that year to grow so they have less chances for the incidence of cranial cruciate rupture,2-4 hip dysplasia and patellar luxation I ... problems
"Unaltered/open" males or female dogs tend to bark more and are more territorial. There is a legitimate reason for the term "bitch". Open females are hormonal, protective, and barky. The males are looking to mate. We live next to a breeder, who has 3 open females and another neighbor breeds their female as well. These are the dogs who are always barking, whether in heat, pregnant or immediately post birth. \$45 annual fee for open dogs is a joke.
There should be a built in deterrent to not altering a dog that lives in town. I think that the license fee for an unaltered animal should be the same or similar to the cost of fixing it (spaying or neutering) after its first 2 years of life. There is no reason the not fix an animal in town after about 2 years old.
Not neutered or spayed fines should triple. Then there is a big enough spread in few cost
Unaltered dogs should be charged a business license fee and reduced to regular fees at next renewal, when presented with vet confirmation of being neutered.
All the same
Unneutered males and unspayed females should not be allowed within the town. There is no logical reason to allow random females to become pregnant as these pups create over population and subsequently are dumped or destroyed by the owners.
It is the owner's responsibility to decide whether they want to spay/neuter their dog or not. Dogs tend to be more aggressive when they are not fixed. in addition, if there is an "oops" litter of puppies, it can be hard to find a good home for the puppies. People may also not know how to care for puppies properly, and many of them may end up in a shelter.
Why should they be treated any differently? What would the reasoning be for difference in fees? Reproductive status does not always play a role in an animal's behavior.
But there should not be a change in cost depending on the time of year. Only if a person goes over their year as per licensing date
These fees are strictly a money grab for the town , I would like to see a list of fines actually given out and when
A discount or free licence for altered dogs would be more beneficial.
Why are the fees going up? This seems ridiculous to raise the fees by 40% for a neutered dog and 29% for in neutered dogs.
People should have to spay and neuter their dogs, as this not being done can cause aggression. And if you can't fix your pet for financial reasons, you shouldn't have one.

Some vet's recommendation for large breeds dogs is 18 months of age for the health of the dogs could there be a rebate with paperwork?
Town should encourage vets clinics to alternate in town to run a "at cost" neuter/spay service once a year to encourage this being done to eliminate unwanted breeding.
Animals should be mature prior to altering the bone growth is affected by premature altering the veterinary industry is now admitting too many joint issues can be avoided by having the animal fully developed before altering takes place.
Why the increase suggested? Additional services, advocate for dogs in trouble would be an occasional position only, but would prevent the present punitive action taken.
The fees should be relevant to the previous year's enforcements costs plus 10%. This will bring both fair and cause inter-enforcement by all dog owners.
Some choose not to alter their pet for a certain amount of time to decrease chances of disease in adulthood...seems unfair to penalize them but measures also need to be taken to encourage responsible ownership...
I do believe a \$10 difference would not encourage neutering or spaying.

**5. Microchips or tattoos make it easier to identify animals. Should licensing fees be less for dogs that have a microchip or tattoo registered with a licensed veterinarian?**

Again another incentive. Tattoos are typically included in your spay or neuter so there is no reason why you couldn't get this done.
Again, make them read the bylaw or sign off that they have done so.
Anyone that fixes their dog and microchips it should get a free lifetime licence for that dog
as long as a dog is licensed in any way, i think that fees should stay the same.
Have pricing similar to that of spayed or neutered but with only one price. If they are both microchipped and spayed it's still \$25/\$35
You want to encourage safe pet handling but it shouldn't be unaffordable to own a pet. Looking for responsibility but shouldn't be a money grab.
I found a dog on the weekend when there was no vet or knowledgeable person available to read the tattoo/chip.
I have 2 dogs that are micro chipped but due to a house fire no longer have the paper work and 2. When scanned they can not find the chip on one dog in particular because it has traveled so far. There is many extenuating circumstances in different situations.
I think some people are reluctant to register their pets as it is. I wonder if by registering your dog you get a 10% discount at your local vet to microchip. Just trying to think out of the box.
I think yes if dogs are easier to identify then the owner should be given a break
I would have to ask for the spirit behind the license. If this bylaw update is about behaviour, a chip doesn't change behaviour. If it is about loss of animal, then a chip should reduce the cost of license

If people are being smart about where they are acquiring their pets from, all registered ethical breeders will already have the puppy chipped, same with acquiring one from a shelter 9 times out of 10 that animal already have some type of identification tracking either tattoo or chip done. This in my opinion is simply a backyard breeding issue of people having litters and not taking responsibility.
If that directly reduces cost of enforcement, then yes; otherwise no.
If the owner has taken responsibility and can prove microchipping has been done, yes.
If you pay to have your dog micro chipped or tattooed than it shows you are responsible in following protocol and therefore should be less for licensing.
Is being able to identify the dog for lost animals or to identify those that are aggressive or vicious? Not sure what value to the town this action has.
it needs to be consistent for everyone and the bylaw should be changed to read... "all dogs and cats have to be microchipped or tattooed..."
It would be a good incentive, but I'm not sure if it's fair. Maybe the town could arrange an event explaining how the tattoos or microchips are important, and make a partnership with a licensed veterinarian for getting the microchip or tattoo with a discount.
Less time and resources will be used to identify and return dog if microchipped or tattooed.
Less time finding owners means less time spent on that issue
microchip - expensive, invasive procedure, not always productive. identification - so is a dog tag. if done, no fee necessary. Be proactive with pet owners. Many can't afford procedures - nor are they necessary except for dog return. 3 days before a dog goes ___? from chinook is not enough to find an owner.
microchip gets the animal home sooner, it's responsible ownership
no everyone can afford those kinds of extras
No real benefit to this as far as the control of animals in town.
Our dog is chipped and tattooed
Owner information is not always kept current for either microchips, tattoos or town licenses.
Penalizes persons who cannot afford microchip or tattoos.
That's up to the owners discretion to chip or tattoo their animal. Licence costs should be the same for either
The same as the rest
The town has no right to enforce either procedure but if an owner does it in their own they should be rewarded
We pay for these services at the vet. To have a dog licensed with all of the above should be next to nothing
When they have a town of olds tag, paid for by a responsible owner, they should have been already categorized as a hobby dog or business breed.

Why does it matter if the vet is licensed or not. What if a shelter dog got done in the shelter. Or prior to being owned. How are you going to keep track of all this if records can't be found. I know my dogs are all chipped but I have no idea where my original paperwork is. And what about people that chip their dogs and then move and loose the paper when to. How then do they prove their dog is chipped. Making more work and headache for yourselves you are. The town will have to have a chip reader at the front doors to scan dogs to probe they are chipped if you bring this in. Just lower fees period and people will be able to afford to license their dogs
Yes and current address and # proof of updated information, so many get microchip and not update information = pointless microchip
Yes because owners pay to have them microchipped and tattooed
Yes because the animal will already have a permanent method of being able to locate the owner. Collars with licenses are capable of being broken off or lost. I've had a dog that was notorious for losing the license tag off of her collar while playing.
You can't penalize the public for what they can't afford, i.e. tattoo. I'm forces to smell post and compost. You have bigger issues.

**6. What should be the max number of dogs allowed per household (excluding puppies under the age of 3 months)?**

2 per adult willing and able to see to each dogs health, welfare, energy, emotional and financial requirements.
2 per adult thus 4 / household that takes into account a senior dog being replaced by another upcoming dog ( mentoring )
2 unaltered dogs or 3 altered dogs
3 if small breed 2 if large breed
6 dogs per household in an average sized yard in town? Noise issues, feces etc. If someone has 6 dogs, they are most likely a breeder...out of town, no problem, but not in residential communities. 3 adult dogs at the very most.
6 small breeds is fine but I think it should decrease as the size of dog gets larger. Having six 70lb or greater dogs is uncalled for in town. I think there should be a weight category to go with the maximums. 6 small or toy then 4 for medium breeds then 2 for large or extra large breeds.
8 Pomeranians is not the same as 8 Malamutes.
Any more results in pack behaviour.
Any more than 3 creates a pack mentality and no matter the personality of the dog, Peer pressure takes over.
Anything more than this should require a business license.

<p>As a home owner that edges the municipal reserve I am surprised by the number of dogs walked in the area and especially the number of dogs per owner. These animals urinate and defecate daily in the area and some do not pick up the poop and none can take the urine with them. I am not sure the difference between animal waste and human waste but we would not let human's bathroom wherever they felt like it. The sanitation and bacterial issues of dog waste is not considered fully when we talk about picking up after your dog. I do not know why someone needs multiple dogs in a town household. The smell in spring is very offensive until nature tries to clean it up. I also find it frightening when walking the paths to meet dogs and especially multiple animals.</p>
<p>As long as the animals are well taken care of. Who cares.</p>
<p>Believe if the individual of the household is able to provide proper care and love to each animal and provide safe responsible care no limit should be reached. Some owners cant care properly for one dog while another can care and love an unlimited number. Why penalize the responsible dog owner for the neglect of a few.</p>
<p>Crazy to have more than 3 dogs in a small town lot, even the County has limits on quarter sections</p>
<p>Depending on size maybe. Six Chihuahuas compared to six St Bernard's would have to have different living arrangements</p>
<p>Depending on space available</p>
<p>Depending on the situation. A house with acreage and plenty of room can hold more dogs where as a smaller condo or apartment should be less as space is limited.</p>
<p>Depends on if they live in town or rural property. 6 dogs seems excessive for a typical sized property in Olds.</p>
<p>Depends on the care and facilities provided for the animals.</p>
<p>Even 3 is tough for a single person.</p>
<p>Four per household seems adequate. Any more could deem close to animal hoarding with the exception of puppies or a friend/family member visiting temporarily with a dog(s).</p>
<p>Having dozens of, well cared for, non-annoyance beautiful fur pals in a single household should not be impeded, and care and social health should be the means of measure. However, this is only if all other suggestions I've made, regarding vicious and aggressive dogs, are also ratified.</p>
<p>I believe 2 per person is fair but if there are multiple renter's in a house I believe it should be 2 per person up too a maximum of 6 in the house total after that they are too many too control safely</p>
<p>I have seen people walking 4 of their dogs at one time in the parks and wondered how in the world could one person with 4 dogs pick up the dogs feces (poop)!</p>
<p>I noted this above that I was surprised it's this high. Seems like an unhealthy environment. You may need to asterisk as a mama might have a litter and then after 8 weeks the household would have to be back down to the limited number.</p>
<p>I really don't care how many animals a person wants to share their home with... as long as there's not dog-poop stinking up the neighbourhood, or ending up on sidewalks, and the barking isn't heard, and overall, it's not any bit disruptive to neighbours. And of course, there's been zero incidences of bites and aggression. If it's in your home, do what you want, as long as it's compliant.</p>

I think for a rural home there should be a limit of 4 while a farm a limit of 6.
I think more dogs should be allowed, if a person can prove they are a good owner, spay and neuter, and identify their pets.
I think size of dog should be considered. Three pit bulls in 600 sq feet is a lot different than 3 Pomeranians.
If a resident wants to have more dogs, they should move to an acreage where there is room for them.
if people/a person have over six dogs in a household, I would consider it a hoard. It's near impossible to properly care for all of those dogs in town. Daily exercise and training would be exhausting.
If this changes to less, it cannot be retroactive to owners who previously have more than the changed amount. You cannot expect owners to suddenly give up their pets. This would be cruel.
I'm not from here and I never heard about having a limit of dogs allowed per household. It sounds strange, if the person wants to take care of dogs, why not? The town should interfere only if the animals are not well treated.
I'm not sure there is a right answer here. Some people can handle more animals and some can't. Maybe limit to 4 but with exceptions that don't require jumping through hoops to get.
It gets out of hand with more than 3 dogs under one roof.
Limit should depend on size of dogs. Total weight limit should be 200 lbs per 1000 square feet of residence. An example would be a 1000 ft2 mobile home could have up to 20 yorkshire terriers or two great Pyrenees dogs.
Living in town does not provide enough space for more than two dogs. No yard is big enough for exercise purposes. Dogs should be registered and licensed to their owner and the specific address they reside. The limit may be flexible if someone is caring for another individual's dog in their home but on a temporary basis. This is where bylaw officers should be used to observe and check.
*Many people in town have 3-4 dogs, why does this need to be changed..
Most yards and houses in town are not big enough to accommodate that many animals in a healthy and secure and controllable way. More than 3 dogs per house is asking for abuse and problems with control (ie. barking and aggressive behaviour).
Must have control of all dogs at all times
No limit most renters are not allowed pets in the town of olds. And that is why I'm relocating my family to Calgary. Along with many others..
Number of dogs should be by size of animal owned
Of course you limit 1 household business licence to a home, even if no customer activity.
One person cannot walk three dogs successfully.
Personally I think 4 is a comfortable number, I feel if someone wishes to have more than that they could pay an amount of money to have a kennel license.
Pets in need are turned away from shelters.



puppies exclusion in those numbers is great however it takes time to find good homes and 3 months just seems too little perhaps that should be changed to 6 months
Should be allowed to apply to own more dogs so responsible owners can own more. People who don't qualify should not be allowed to own more in order to prevent hoarding and pull mill situations
Should be based on the accommodations and number of people in the house to care for them - more than 6 dogs should require an inspection of the home arrangements though
Six dogs on one property sounds like a puppy mill.
Six is ridiculous. I lived next to a couple young girls and they had two dogs, the poop was never cleaned up i couldn't sit in my back yard because of the stench. Can you imagine the stink of more than two. Im not talking about if someone has a batch of puppies they plan on getting rid of.
Six is WAY too many, why do people in town need 6 dogs? If they are fostering they can get a special permit from the town but no how can they take care of 6 well and responsible
this is for the health and well-being of the dog as well as the humans. people don't need up to 6 dogs - and most people can't afford to properly look after more than one dog. The smell from one dog not being looked after is sickening - let along 6 dogs.
This should be based on household size and dog size instead of a simple maximum applicable to both a 600 square foot apartment and a 3200 square foot home with a yard equally. Something about pounds of dog per 100 square feet makes more sense.
Three dogs is way plenty (excluding the puppies as you have noted).
We have had one incident in town, honestly this much attention and tax payer \$ is a little sad
We need to be considerate of neighborhoods and recognize that we are not in the country. As a dog owner, I feel strongly about being respectful of those around me who do not need to be disturbed by the actions of my pets.
* What a person wants should be the limit. As long as yards are clean and no complaints what t does it matter how many you have. Most people in this town are impeccable owners
*Who the needs to have 6 dogs at a residence in town? No one.
why are up to six dogs permitted per household? knowledge of owner a factor should be based on size of dogs, facility - inside? outside? facility, and likely based on evaluation after one dog. nothing sent to BO. 6? You've got to be joking. is the town pro dog breeding? Frequent letters (1 per hear if not two?) laid on dog - not fair to neighbors or owners, except financially.
Why not, I see families with more kids than that who are more trouble then dogs.
Will there be a grandfather for people that have over the limit now?
You don't own the house. Stop telling people what they can do in their own house. Unacceptable olds unacceptable

## 7. Should Commercial Dog Breeding operations be allowed in residential areas?

A business is a business.
A limit of two breeding pairs per residence.
Absolutely NOT allowed in residential
absolutely not. the noise and smells are sickening - not to mention the safety and health of the humans who have to live beside these breeders.
Absolutely not. This is a business with a lot of side effects that may be a negative for The neighbourhood and property values.
Additional inspections and Management needs to be in this. If complaint arise they need to be looked at
And more provision should be made for security
As long as it is within the current bylaw rules. ie. Max of 6 dogs per household.
As long as the dogs well being are being considered. I am absolutely against the new puppy mills know as dog rescuing from foreign countries. Foreign dog rescuing should be made illegal and I will go one further and say they should not be permitted in Olds. Foreign dogs are not vetted properly and carry diseases that have been eradicated here.
As long as they aren't a puppy mill.
Backyard Breeders should have a Hobby Licence in order to keep more than the maximum allowable for the fee of \$500--all neighbors should be informed of this business--Should the Peace Officer deem the hobby a nuisance,(complaints from residents) the license can be revoked at any time
Breeders should be held to a higher standard. They should be providing enough outdoor space for their facility without interfering with the neighbors, constant barking etc. Refer to the behavior of unaltered dogs previously. Bylaw is not around on weekends when we are all out in the yard, and the dogs next door are barking at the fence regularly. I have 2 dogs, and they are not at my neighbor's fence barking.
Breeding small breeds is very different than breeding large breeds. There could be room for breeding small breeds in residential areas.
BUT definitely should be restricted to a qualified breeder not puppy mill type operation (these type of operations should be shut down and fined heavily())
But must be inspected and fees paid
But Only if they are a registered breeder with the Canadian Kennel Club in order to keep out puppy mills.
But they should have to register with CKC and meet guidelines in order to prevent back yard breeders and puppy mills.
Commercial breeding restricted to industrial area.
Commercial breeding requires some special items: it is not an animal control issue alone but rather LUB.
Could. They be put under a home base business

<p>Definitely not. Female bitches are generally the most territorial and aggressive type of dog. Allowing breeding in town invites barking and aggressive behaviour of dogs. More dogs are unaltered and there are more problems with defecating ie. territorial behaviour by both male and female animals. Also, the local dog park becomes more dangerous for everyone when you don't know if an animal has been fixed or not. Most times we have any issues with other dogs interacting with ours has been with unaltered males and females. Much more dog handling skills and attention are required when animals are unaltered. All the barking problems we encounter at our residence is due to unaltered dog's territorial behaviour.</p>
<p>Depends if they are clean, noisy etc.</p>
<p>Depends on the size of dog. If they are large breeds known for causing destruction, then no they should not be in residential areas.</p>
<p>Dog barking is bad enough when you're outta town so in town could be deafening</p>
<p>Due to noise issues, the higher possibility of animals escaping, maintaining a facility that helps animals (and people) remain healthy--these are all considerations that I would think might make me lean towards "no" answer. However, I'm sure there are many people who are thoughtful and do a good job in their homes of a dog-breeding business who should not be penalized for those who are irresponsible.</p>
<p>Enough with telling people how to live their lives. If the dogs are well cared for and properly kept on the property, butt out. If they create a nuisance or hazard or are being abused, that's when intervention may be required.</p>
<p>especially not in multi unit residential homes</p>
<p>For the same reasons that I'm not permitted to have sheep, beehives, nor miniature ponies in town. Govern dog breeding under the same restrictions as livestock in town.</p>
<p>hard to monitor, there are very responsible breeders that can operate residentially and there are those that should t have pets or children!</p>
<p>I definitely believe that people should be allowed to have a breeding operation within their home, as that is the best situation for the puppies being part of a family and learning how to interact with in a household which is exactly where they're going to end up once they go to a new home.</p>
<p>I would hate to live next door to someone breeding dogs. The noise would be unbearable. Go buy an acreage if you want to do that. Your bylaw officers do nothing but hand the person that complains a sheet of paper expecting them to document it.</p>
<p>if a dog is being bred strictly for profit, it is a problem. dogs should not be a primary use to gain money, as it is unfair to the dogs and the puppies. i would presume that if a person is breeding dogs for profit, they would not take much time to find the correct living environment for the puppies.</p>
<p>If it is done properly</p>
<p>If it's clean and organized, why not? There must have rules to create a standard and make sure that the animals are well-groomed and fed.</p>
<p>If responsible and does not impact neighbours negatively</p>
<p>If someone is running a proper breeding facility they should have enough area not offered in residential areas for dogs to run around and have different buildings for sexes of animals and ages of animals.</p>
<p>If they are quiet and don't bother the neighbors why not?</p>

Is a guy who breeds his one hunting dog once or twice considered commercial? More than one litter per year considered commercial to me. Less than that a hobby.
It is very cruel to confine dogs in a residential area for breeding purposes. They should have a designated square footage per animal and have a by law officer inspection annually with authorization to see vet vaccination records.
It's a person's choice. Town officials shouldn't be able to take away a god give right of CHOICE
no - we pay the same taxes as the breeder, with no money return.
no puppy mill's and no breeding at all should be aloud in town let other towns deal with breeding regulations and controls
No... just as I'm not permitted to breed batches of chickens here in town, or even have a miniature horse. Animal breeding should be under most of the same laws as agricultural production. And even more so with animals that could pose a risk to neighbours. Example: dogs vs. homing pigeons.
Nobody should be breeding dogs. They are profiting off of a helpless animal. Usually these kind of people are breeding the Bully breeds. Then they can sell them to scumbags, who then breed more and sell them to more scumbags.
Non-commercial / unlicensed dog breeding should not be allowed within town limits either
none in residential
Not unless they are capable of adhering to appropriate biosecurity, safety and space protocols.
only in inside enclosures in residential areas
People who are constantly breeding their dogs should also have to comply as a home business.
Possibly if they are registered businesses and not running puppy mills
Registered dog breeders. Not backyard dog breeders...
safeguards need to be in place for all breeders and it must be regulated
Should require an inspection of the conditions and living setup for the dogs that ensures they get adequate time being socialized, their own sleeping space, adequate room for exercise, and that breeders are following responsible selection practices
So long as standards are defined and followed accordingly. Things like noise issues and cleanliness should be followed.
The noise and the space needed to care properly for these animals cannot b done within town.
The noise of the dogs outside would be unacceptable. Not all breeds bark, but many do.
The title says it all. Commercial isn't residential.
There are already too many unwanted, neglected and abused animals. Backyard breeding should be illegal.
There is NOT enough room to breed animals in town!! Some dogs may have litters of up to ten pups if not more these animals need space. There should be correct facilities for breeding residential homes are not the correct facilities to breed dogs. If someone wants to breed they should obtain a facility that is set up and operate as a business as such. In commercial zones not residential

They are too noisy.
they should have different licencing for a breeding and rules
this falls under business designation and should be regarded as such.
This is how the ckc pure breed dog club have operated since the very early days. Ckc members breed and raise pure bred dogs in their homes. We do not want to commercialize dog breeding that would be tragic.
This needs to be more in depth. As in a single family unattached dwelling, with suitable yard space.
Those activities should occur in industrial or out of town spaces. Again, same response as the number of dogs in a home- there is no reason there should be that many dogs in a home in a residential area. Our spaces do not allow for the needs of so many animals and still allow for a level of community respect.
To licensed breeders who are responsible
We allow people to have farm animals in town ... what's the concern here? As long as the area is clean and well kept I don't see why this is an issue
Where else would they be? Animals being breed should grow up in a family environment, would you rather they were locked in kennels and left alone overnight while the breeders went home? This question is ridiculous and I hope that is not a consideration.
If someone wants to run a breeding operation from their home they should be under the same regulations if someone wanted to open a hair salon in their home. Neighbors are notified and can object if warranted. In our neighborhood someone wanted to have a salon and we were sent a notification that it could cause more traffic, so Neighbors objected and it did not happen.
why are there commercial dog breeders or dog breeders at all - there are SO many animals in shelters WAY TOO MANY ... when those numbers are at the minimal, then perhaps dog breeders would be needed
Why not
With business license and proof they are registered with a CKC, UKC or AKC and are responsible breeders. This will discourage people from breeding backyard. People should not be allowed to just breed 'pure breed' dogs with out registration.
With everything else we allow in this town why would we be worried about dog breeders?
With permitting - is that an option? Thus allowing the Town to be aware, and can check on progress, etc..
Yes as long as the residence is set up to properly handle the dogs.
Yes under these right circumstances. Random checks to make sure the animals have enough room and aren't just living in kennels in a puppy mill.
Yes, if the dog is not deemed vicious.

**8. If Commercial Dog Breeding is allowable in residential areas, how many litters per year should be allowed per household?**

A dog should only have one litter a year
Again your wording reflects dogs should be raised commercially this is not how our bred dogs are bred.

<p>Again, commercial dog breeding is a business. Litters are sold for \$500. to \$5000. a pup. These funds are usually cash income with no records kept. Ten puppies a litter, with an individual looking to make money, not be a responsible dog owner.</p>
<p>As long as they stay under the required number of dogs per household, have licenses for each dog as well and a Town of Olds Business License, I don't see why a number needs to be included.</p>
<p>Breeders should not be allowed in town limits at all.</p>
<p>But each animal involved should be fully vaccinated and microchipped</p>
<p>But should be spayed after a specific amount of litters.</p>
<p>but should register free to town to keep track for later use if needed.</p>
<p>Depends on how many registered dogs they have, ie. 3 bitches then that will vary... but 1-2 litters per year</p>
<p>Fine line between puppy mill and responsible breeder.</p>
<p>Hmm, should the government be allowed to dictate how much money a business is allowed to make... When did Olds turn into Beijing? Again, none of your damn business. Butt out.</p>
<p>How would you monitor this? Do dog breeders currently require any sort of business license? If they do, is it reviewed annually or semi-annually? Are they required to report the number of litters they have/year? Unlimited litters/household=puppy mill If there are any bylaw complaints against a breeder (eg. barking etc), will their license be renewed? Higher fines for breeders are needed.</p>
<p>I do not agree any commercial breeding should be allowed in homes so the answers are irrelevant that are listed but I had to choose one.</p> <p>However there is no allowance for private breeding if the definition commercial is used. "Backyard" or "home" breeding shouldn't be allowed in a residential zone and should also be monitored and enforced. Breeding regulations are in place for breeds by organizations (kennel club etc) and someone breeding out of their home is unlikely to be following these breeding regulations.</p>
<p>I do not think breeding should be allowed in town, however, more litters per year means more chance of puppy mills etc. and out of control animals. A dog should not be bred more than 3-4 times in its life and 1-2 litters per year per animal would mean that it is open for only up to 3-4 years of its life. This is reasonable for females and good breeding practice. More than that is asking for problems again.</p>
<p>I don't think commercial dog breeders should be in town. Hobby breeders (1-2 litters) only.</p>
<p>I don't think this should be allowed in residential areas</p>
<p>I don't believe dog breeding should be allowed. There is an epidemic of unwanted, homeless dogs and until we don't, we need to put a stop to all dog breeding. This question doesn't give me a zero litter option???</p>

<p>I don't think you can put a number on an amount of litters per year as 1 breeder could have three or four Bitches, depending when they're coming into season when their last season was, how old they are, whether or not they have found the right stud for that female is going to play a huge role as to when that Bitch will be bred.</p> <p>I breeders could have five or six litters in a year, and then have zero litters for 2 years. Every situation is going to be different, I believe the biggest thing is going to be the quality of breeders that is more the thing that needs to be weeded out.</p> <p>Such as only allowing CKC or other entity registration, where all of the dogs are being Health tested to ensure that quality puppies are being produced.</p>
<p>I feel it should not be allowed.</p>
<p>I guess this would all come down to the allowed amount of dogs</p>
<p>I really don't know how to answer this, since we know that the dog breeding in question here isn't dachshunds or tea-cup poodles.</p>
<p>I said 1-2, but if it is treated as a business then I don't think you can regulate that, but when they apply to have their business they should have to state the number of litters they will be expecting to have each year.</p>
<p>I think this question is not important.. but I don't believe dogs should have more than one or two litters a year...</p>
<p>I would answer 0 if I could.</p>
<p>i would keep commercial breeding to a minimum, as there is an issue with how many dogs are in shelters, and if we increase the amount of dogs in the world by a fair amount, the dogs in shelters could face very unsettling situations.</p>
<p>It all comes down to respecting your neighbor. If you're a breeder you need more room than a small back yard. So more than 1-2 litters could lead to noise, smell and a mess that the neighbors have to view.</p>
<p>It will depend on how many females the household have. I think it should be 1 litter per year per female, so the female is not overused which can harm her health in the future.</p>
<p>It would also depend what was deemed safe for that animal by a licensed veterinarian.</p>
<p>It's not about litters per year, it's about livestock production being permitted or not. There are many more species that would be more acceptable to neighbours than dogs.</p>
<p>Should be no 0 occur exceeds suggested 1 or 2 dogs</p>
<p>The question is irrelevant - there should be no breeders in residential areas.</p>
<p>no breeding at all in residential</p>
<p>No one needs to breed more than that in a year.</p>
<p>None at all!!!! Not be allowed. The local shelters are already overflowing with dogs. NO MORE BREEDING</p>
<p>I want to click on zero for the above options but won't let me.</p>

<p>one, preferably none  one if for personal replacement of a dog or two  NO multiple litters</p>
<p>Only if a registered business as a official dog breeder. Puppy mills must be shut down!</p>
<p>poor dog-moms that have to endure more than one litter per year - when does it become a puppy mill?</p>
<p>Same as q7. Standards should be defined and followed.</p>
<p>See answer to 7.</p>
<p>Should be based on an inspection and the breeder should be able to prepare a written plan that outlines who is responsible for making sure every pup is socialized and cared for, has adequate living arrangements and veterinary care</p>
<p>Should not be allowed</p>
<p>Should not be allowed in residential areas.</p>
<p>Shouldn't be allowed. By the way, there is no option for 0.</p>
<p>Shouldn't be an animal control issue: who write this stuff?</p>
<p>Still think dog breeding should be commercial industrial not in residential use areas.</p>
<p>That varies for the amount of dogs they have for breeding. How many go into heat at a given time. I think as long as they are ethical, this question shouldn't even be asked.</p>
<p>These questions are all good, but what is the real question or problem here?? If noise problems, then there should be an ability to report and respond to that. If noise is the problem, then once again, limitations on dogs is a great idea. If unkept yards/homes is the issue then there should be opportunity for reporting and response. Does the town require more authority to make these decisions (seizure of animals, fines for unkept yards).</p>
<p>They are going to report them all anyway</p>
<p>This is also a question with limited information ... how many females is the breeder allowed? Dogs can have litters once a year is safe ... so if there are say 5 females in the household then the answer is 5  And as long as a licensed vet ( clearly not in the towns payroll) has no concerns then what gives the town the power to make such decisions ?</p>
<p>This question would all depend on how many dogs were allowed .... 6 dogs for example ... 5 females and one male .... that's a potential if 5 litters one year and zero the next , It's not as simple as how many a year and I don't believe the town not many residence are educated enough to answer a question such as this</p>
<p>This should be determined by the canadian kennel club not us ignorant home owners</p>
<p>This should come with recommendations from veterinarians on what is safe for the animals but also won't cause additional disturbance to community/neighbors.</p>
<p>This shouldn't be legal as there's many a dogs to adopt</p>
<p>This would be dependent on the number of females the breeder has in their program. That being said they should only be allowing a bitch to have 1 litter per year beginning at age 2 years or older.  I have selected 4 litters as my response assuming there are 4 bitches.</p>



What does it matter. A good breeder or person will not over breed a dog. Put this in and one. How do u prove it's the same dog being bred
With no complaints from other residents due to noise (barking)and or sanitary conditions. If there are issues the number then become even more restricted like 0 due to poor performance.
Would need to understand the dog breeding pros/cons in more detail in order to provide a valid response.
You cannot limit the amount of litters as it isn't up to the municipality. Unless there are complaints then investigate them

## 9. Should Dog Kennel operations be allowed in residential areas?

A limit of 200 pounds of dogs allowed per 1000 square feet of residence which also includes those owned by the resident and boarded.
Absolutely not allowed in residential no business operation in residential opens the door to issues unforeseen
Again I think you are unable to provide the appropriate suitable space requirements in a residential area.
Again where are you going To put these dogs? Isn't it better that they are at someone's residence so they can keep an eye on them 24 hours?
Again, the noise issue. Your neighbors don't want to hear that all day.
Again, this is an issue for the LUB, not community standards/animal control.
Again. A PERSONS CHOICE. A BUSINESS. Is the town really taking away business now
As in previous answers. The smell, sounds and now added traffic to a residential neighbourhood would be better suited for a commercial area. If the decision is made to go ahead with it. Then they should have to have a business license, sign showing its a business, preset number of off street parking for customers, posted in paper for people to have their say. This should be reviewed on a quarterly basis for 1st year and 2x year for 2nd year then yearly.
As long as the setup is clean and well-run, and not disturbing Neighbors I wouldn't have a problem with it
Barking would be an issue, dogs encourage other dogs to bark
But only two or three in Olds at one time. And limited availability such as five boarding dogs or less.
But should be under more rules and a way to revoke if there is a problem
but the number of dogs must be 5 or less
change to number of hours - 72 consecutive hours, to accommodate weekend vacationers / trips
Definitely not. constant barking, odours all kennels should be the outskirts of town
Depends on size/number of dogs maybe

Doggy day cares are great but kennels are different in terms of how long the dogs stay. This type of business should be left to the country and/or industrial areas of town, not residential.
dogs can be loud animals, and they need a lot of space. i just dont think that a kennel would be best fit in a residential area for those reasons.
For 1 - 2 dogs only per household unless in commercially zoned area.
Home base business
How the heck does anyone have proper pens and runs and exercise areas - large enough to properly accommodate dogs in a residential area? Not even feasible.
I believe that a kennel in residential areas has the potential to be very loud which is unfair to neighbouring houses.
I would not want to live next to something like this.
If the dog is not barking all day every day.
If the guidelines are properly followed
Is there a tax payer in the Town of Olds that would want this next door? No one in Town limits wants a breeder, dog business or kennel next door!
It could be too loud for neighbours
It drives me mad to hear just one dog constantly barking. I cannot begin to imagine having to live next door to a boarding kennel. Even those a couple of streets away would hear the noise.
it is a commercial business, therefore it should be in a commercial zoned part of town that has 24 hour care and appropriate indoor and outdoor space
It must be regulated to create a standard and make sure that the animals are well-groomed and fed.
It would depend on land space available and amount of dogs being "kenneled" at one time.
Kennels ate noisy and smelly.
Limits of three dogs is needed. Provides an oppportunity for dogs that are in unfamiliar situations to bark and cause noise. Greater oppportunity for dogs to be unfriendly when in nonfamiliar environments.
*situations on individual assessment basis by someone who is knowledgeable - not a BO. Time should be limited to rehabilitation needs. suggested conditions - outside your house? Next door? Location and time are huge factors here.
No, too noisy.
No. Not outdoor ones anyway. Smells and barking are my concerns.
Noise levels should not bother neighbors.
Once again, in town yards, not enough space. Space, noise, feces.
Out of town limits is fine but noise issues would be in effect residentially. There is already dog barking issues in our town!
Same as above. Dogs are expected to be well cared for and not create a hazard or nuisance. Besides, how many people in Town have properties large enough to house a couple dozen kennels, let alone dog runs?
Same comment as commercial breeding

Same rules as other livestock.
See answer to 7. This should not be a residential operation.
Smell, noise and mess
There should be a maximum in place for the amount of animals being kennelled in residential areas.
Too many dog barking is disrespectful of the enjoyment of backyards. We need to be mindful that we are not in the country and that people have the right to enjoy their neighborhoods free of continuous barking.
Unless it's a situation where it's only 1-2 dogs at a time. Since that's how many dogs an average household would have.
Why not.
With a Low limit to number a dog s, dog sitting with one night stay home occupation business ok, but larger business operations should not be in residential.
Within a limit, 3 dogs per household would still apply to kennels.
We already have design problems!

**10. In what circumstances should the Town of Olds enforce that a Dog to be euthanized?**

2 separate bits of severe nature; and should be accessed by a behavioural veterinarian, or a panel of canine Behavior experts.
A behavioural specialist like Ceasar Milan should be treating the animal to see if behaviour and temperament can be changed.
A dog which causes severe injury to a person cannot be allowed to continue to live in town. The option to euthanasia is to move the dog out of Olds.
A professional dog trainer should assess the behaviours and determine if the behaviours can be addressed while maintaining quality of life for the dog, determine the reason for the incident (self protection, guard/hunting instinct, natural temperament), develop a plan including environmental modifications, neutering, and training, and/or rehoming with a more suitable and experienced handler/environment. If the interventions required would significantly impact the dogs quality of life then euthanasia should be considered.
A vet or professional animal behaviourist should make this decision.
A veterinarian is not trained in behaviors or behavior adjustment training. What a dog does at a vet is not the same as what the dog does at home. Vets are not a realistic choice for someone to deem a dog unfit.
*Can this even be enforced?

Any aggressive dog should not be allowed in Olds.
Any severe injury caused by an animal is a cause for concern and the dog should be removed from a residential and potentially euthanized.
As for definition of "bite" and "severe injury" Laceration could be more clearly defined by size or #of sutures. A small laceration may need only 1 suture that would seem a "severe injury " instead of "bite"
Behaviour assessments are a must. So depending on the outcome of that will determine what actions to take.
*Bite severity should never be taken into account, should be based on intention There are known multiple PERSON biting dogs that are still in Olds and am sure there probably not a fine given.
Bites at least 2 people with severe injury, not just a nip.
Bites would have to be reviewed on a case by case basis. Someone trespassing on private property that gets bit by the resident dog, for instance, does not warrant putting the dog down.
Check policy in innisfail. vet comment "there is no animal that cannot be rehabilitated." If dogs are allowed responsibility goes all the way, good and bad, with town, there is much that can be done. In depth research is necessary.
circumstances should be considered... there are a lot of times that it is the person or other dog that instigates the aggression or protective nature of a good dog
Depends on the severity of the attack, and a vet is the best judge
Dogs give signs and if they are ignored, a person ignorant to them could be bitten and it's not the dogs fault at that point. If the dog is vicious and unprovoked that's different but alot of dogs just have anxiety
Each case needs to be reviewed by a case by case basis
Euthanasia should be the very LAST option. The dog should have the opportunity to go to trainers to see if the behaviour can be improved- a lot of animals can be "de sensitized" and placed in a home where the owners know how to deal with the animal and knows not to take it to places that will trigger the dog (dog parks, around small children etc.) Also, the dogs home life she be evaluated. Animals who are abused or kept in small areas constantly do not have manners and often get very enraged and will lash out- just as humans do. I think it's import and to understand that behind every behaviour is an explanation of some sort. I think the dog should be deemed unfit from 3 separate vets all form different locations. I would say no to euthanasia but If a dog is going to have the be muzzled and chained up in a small pen all it's life that is not fair to the animal.
Every case is different. People overreact. A Chihuahua bite is completely different than a big pit bull ripping your throat out.

<p>I believe that most poor dog behaviour is not the fault of the dog but rather the owner. If an incident happens once, I believe it should be mandated training for both the dog and owner. If a second incident occurs, the owner should be required to relinquish ownership of the animal to someone who is qualified to handle it.</p>
<p>I believe this should be left up to the police to determine and the courts, the town has no business making that call. I will make sure to be at that meeting to speak to this.</p>
<p>I believe, as I stated previously, that when an incident occurs, the owner should be legally responsible to have to enroll in behavior classes for the dog. Dogs can be rehabilitated and are often aggressive as a result of their situation. If it continues happening and no classes are attended, the must surrender the animal or have it seized.</p>
<p>I do believe a veterinarian should be consulted on any possible euthanasia. Owner should be notified and given enough time to say goodbye to animal.</p>
<p>I think any decent human should be able to make that call for themselves, I believe it should already be in place that all dog bites need to be reported, and that there should be fine for such an incident</p>
<p>I think the nature of the bite needs to be considered. If the bite has happened because the dog is protecting itself that should be taken into account</p>
<p>I would add bites at least 3 people in separate incidents.</p>
<p>I would consider one minor bite to a red flag, but not enough for euthanization. But when a pattern develops into multiple bites that is a concern. A dog's behaviour issues should never be allowed to continue where the possibility exists whereby a dog has opportunity to inflict severe injury on another.</p>
<p>If a dog causes a minor injury once, it isn't too serious, depending on the situation. However, if a dog causes severe injury, bites at least two people in separate incidents, is imminent danger, or is unsafe, I believe it should be put down. Not only for peoples sake, but also for the dog. If a dog is punished to a large extreme, they should be put down as that is unfair to them. In addition, the owner is responsible for most of the dog's actions, making it unfair for them if the dog is deemed "untreatable" or causes harm regularly.</p>
<p>If an animal has an incident with biting, they should be fined and have restricted access to the town or be asked to remove the dog from the town. Euthanasia is EXTREME and unfair in a lot of situations. Even the best trained dog can bite in the wrong situation.</p>
<p>If the dog could be required to go to some sort of rehabilitation away from it's current owner, that would be better</p>
<p>If the dog does it once they will do it again.</p>

It should only be decided by a licensed veterinarian who can professionally assess the behavior of the animal.
Minor injuries can result as an accident and may not be on purpose. An attack is usually due to an animal who is not adequately trained, bred or supervised and in return usually ends up leading to severe injuries. Once a dog causes a severe injury the animal should be impounded by law enforcement and taken to the veterinarian. The animal should NOT be released back to the owner again. A dog that has viciously attacked once is very likely to attack again. An owner who has a dog in this classification should not be allowed to have any animals after the instance of a vicious attack - bylaw should be able to enforce this by not selling an animal license to said individual.
Need to be case by case. As well as why it happened ie. pulling tail and got snapped at, or pulling tail and person gets viscously attacked.
No one should have a dog that will harm others.
Not your call.
Only a vet should determine whether an animal needs to be put down or not.
Only after a licensed Behaviour Specialist for dogs deem the dog(s) unadoptable or rehabilitated.
Owners should have control of there animals at all times.
People who say never have probably not been attacked by a vicious dog.
Perhaps in the case of a dog biting and causing severe injury there should be some option for the dog to receive mandated training or assessment and if not received and/or proven as received then euthanasia is a potential outcome.
prefer relocation option
Severe injury/ or kills other dogs or pets: euthanize
Should also depend on the situation if the dog is defending its self or feels threatened it should not have to be put to sleep but if there is no reason for the dog to hurt someone then it should be put to sleep
That is an extremely offensive question as no one at the town has proper training to determine this, it should only be a licensed vet after 3 separate incidents
That should be decided by a licensed Veterinarian NOT residence. Veterinary professionals can assess the whole situation and decide if euthanasia is needed. A lot of dog bites (children, infants) are because of uneducated owners /letting kids approach dogs in an inappropriate manner. Over 80% of this incidences are NOT the dogs fault!!!

The courts of law with the advisory of a licensed veterinarian should be the only people to deem a dog not worthy of life
The dog is not of concern to me so much as the owner....the owner is the problem.
*The people on town council have zero education on the matter and should never be given more power than they are entitled .... the rcmp can not enforce this why would the town push for this power
The town has zero legal right to determine this ,the town does not have a trained official who is properly educated enough to make such a decision
The Town is our only authorization for enforcing this. This is not RCMP jurisdiction, and then who else if there?
The town of Olds should absolutely not have the ability to determine euthanasia. The town of Olds is not the owner, the dog does not belong to them. If a dog is continuously aggressive or abusive there should be fines in place and mandatory behaviour classes to correct their behaviour. No dog is bred aggressive. It is how their owners train and raise them - whether ignorantly and carelessly or purposely.
There are always extenuating circumstances in every situation - that have to taken into account. This is not a "black and white" question. Most dogs (that are vicious) are trained that way; or not properly trained not to be vicious. It's the stupid lazy disrespectful human that should be dealt with.
This is not a choice or right the town has ,
This is not the towns place
This one is hard. Many dogs get a bad reputation because they were provoked and I can't blame them for standing up for themselves.
This should be determined by a qualified dog trainer
Town of olds should not decide this fate
Town should be able to recommend euthanasia after obtaining a professional opinion who specializes in pet behavior.
Unless the dog severely bit someone committing a crime on the dog-owner's property, the dog should be put down. Trespassing and crimes are fair game. But a dog that bites a child, or someone on the sidewalk, or in a park... I believe it should be put down. Unprovoked and unthreatened?... there's no saying when it'll happen again.

You are not the experts on animal behaviour. Every dog - like every person - is different. Assess the fines as scheduled then step out and let an expert determine if a dog is dangerous.

You really want a town staffer making that call? Why not say: "How can the Town of Olds, increase legal activity?"

**12. Do you feel there is enough public awareness regarding the Town's current requirements of dog ownership?**

I believe there should be more public awareness regarding the towns current requirements of dog ownership because some people may not pay too much attention to it when it is only provided in a select few places.

If there is no one follows them

There is a lot of policy but major lacking in situational awareness and enforcement.

I feel this is only out there now as a knee jerk reaction to an isolated instance.

I arrived in Olds two months ago from Brazil and I didn't know even that we have to pay a license till today. I saw it on Town of Olds Instagram Profile talking about this survey, and only because I decided to check the survey I figured it out. I think it should be better advertised.

I have never gone to look. I suppose that is my fault, not the towns. That said, the newsletter may be an ideal regular reminder.

Many dog owners have no clue about the town's requirements or they simply choose to ignore the bylaws. Currently, my neighbour's dogs are let out at 6 am and start barking. It wakes me up every day. Grrrr. A number of years ago, my own small breed dog was attacked by a dog wandering the neighborhood while I walking with my 2 year daughter. She was traumatized for years after.

And even poorer enforcement.

I think people don't care. There are a lot of idiot dog owners in this town that think the neighborhood wants to hear their dog bark all day while they're at work.

More information easily available to residents on how to report disturbances from dogs/report bylaw infractions.

Most people are unaware of their rights to peaceful use of their property. Dog barking is a problem where we live and most of the neighbors are completely unaware of their ability to complain to bylaw and to have the bylaws enforced regarding the need to control animals in our area.

Seems like a free for all if you want to run a breeding operation and make fast money.

I had no idea someone could have six dogs in their home.

Include dog, garbage recycling brochure with annual tax statement

I did not know bylaw 6.22 hopefully "entering private or public property for the purpose of impounding a dog" does not include opening private FENCED properties without the homeowners permission.

Most people just don't care - they need to be educated and bylaws and fines strictly enforced.



The public awareness is so skewed. It seems that the only way we hear what is going on is if something bad happens. You wouldn't know that people shouldn't be with their dogs off leash because there are always people in Ralph Maybank park with their dogs off leash and no one has been ticketed. No one has been fined for not cleaning up their dogs poop but yet I see it every day along the sidewalks and walking paths
As a responsible owner I seek the information I need. Maybe more info available in paper, social media, with the renewable letter
Again awareness is pointless if there is no enforcement. Town has made written statements they do not enforce bylaws if a neighbour complaint is involved, so what if a neighbour complains that the council passed a community standard bylaw (regarding an LUB issue) to allow 100 dogs in a home of say 900 sq feet and only a 10x10' back lot?
There doesn't seem to be any rules at this time. It is a free for all
No more than all the other by-laws; it is a citizens and municipalities responsibility to research and share (respectively) all the by-laws
We have two small dogs and they are licensed, therefore we have pertinent information. For people who do not have dogs or do not license them, they may not have the information.
I never knew the amounts of the fines/penalties until reading them during this questionnaire. Perhaps there could be a way of ensuring dog owners are aware of the rules and penalties before getting a license.
Until the town tries to change things to absurd rules. Then they try to hide information to push laws through quick and quietly
If there is all information on the website, and provided at the time of registration then the Town is providing the required information. As a pet owner, there is a requirement to do due diligence and find the needed information.
Are you asking the public do they know where to find out the towns current bylaws on owning a dog? Because I hope they would know to look it up at the website.
If you know where to look
It there already isn't it? Irresponsible owners will be just that regardless.
Town laws pertaining to where dogs can be and how tends to be restrictive. Off leash can be under control. On leash can cause problems too.
All dog owners should know what the rules are before owning a pet.

**12. Where would you expect to find dog ownership information?**

Veterinary Clinics; any form of media; educate the masses, local papers – extra reminders in spring and summer; welcome wagon; new utility hookup; new home permit; whenever someone move to or within the town - this info should be delivered by a bylaw officer; Perhaps a yearly notice in the newsletter about where to find the information; Please add fees onto the website recently moved here and it was nowhere on the website how much a license for an altered dog; vet clinics, breeders, pet shops, posted at Vet Clinics and Town Office.

**13. Please indicate whether you support having dogs on a leash and under control being allowed in sitting/spectator areas in proximity to: (check all that apply)**

Many people who own dogs view them as a part of the family. They should not be excluded from family activities. Limiting the places you can bring dogs leads to less socialized animals. You can't train a dog to be around strange people if they are never given the opportunity.
It's the bad egg that destroys it for everyone.
Most dogs are family members
*Dogs around my area, or at the park/school are rarely on a leash.
When these places are occupied dogs should be on leashes. However, I have a small dog that I'm too afraid to take to the dog park because of larger more aggressive dogs. I have let him off leash in the school fields when there is no school, events, sports or any other people around. I would be sad if this was taken away.
*I think it is unfortunate that this whole bylaw requires updating because irresponsible dog owners. It has negative consequences for those of us who are responsible dog owners.
If we start dictating where we are not allowed to have dogs, all that is going to do is make it so that the dogs are actually less social if they are not allowed to leave the house, then we will have bigger problems.
I think dogs should be on leash at any & all public places. Mostly for your own dogs safety. Even if you own a well behaved animal, you do not know about anybody else or any other animal's behavior.
Animals who are leashed and under control should be allowed anywhere when outside. If the animal is no longer under control they should be asked to leave the area. This means bylaw officers need to do their job and protect the citizens of the town by enforcing regulations correctly.
Pets do not need access into indoor recreation facilities.
Service dogs, therapy dogs and service dogs in training should be allowed anywhere - no exceptions! Outside and indoors. These animals are doing a job and the greater governmental law should override the towns bylaw.
It is very difficult to socialize your dog with other people and animals as it is, the best way to create a friendlier pet is to socialize them, I do not think limiting those opportunities is beneficial. I understand the want to control these interactions and prevent injuries but you are creating unsocialized animals as a side effect, which could potentially be worse if they do get out.
Animals should not be allowed in the aquatic centre other than the front lobby.
I would limit indoor recreation facilities to hypoallergenic dogs (which are under control).
On leash, under control - key factors

ONLY if they have completed an appropriate advanced training class such as K9 good neighbor. Essentially making it a privilege to able to go to these places.
Conditional on the dog's behaviour and history, perhaps in designated areas as some children are afraid of dogs.
It is a responsible dog owner, who can take care of the animal in these situations.
The owners must be responsible in cleaning up after the animal in case of mishaps.
no dogs allowed at a splash park
Dogs should ALWAYS be on a leash in public areas. Even if that dog is "good with other dogs", that doesn't mean that all of the other dogs around are also good with others. Strange dogs running up to dogs that are uncomfortable is exactly how people and animals get hurt
Animals need socialization as much as humans do. If we limit their interactions with humans it will create increased inappropriate behavior in both humans and animals we they do have the opportunity to interact with each other.
Let's put some focus on the dog owners... we know our animals best. A *responsible* dog owner knows 'yes, Fido is great with kids, not other dogs, therefore I will decide *for myself* not to take Fido to Billy's soccer game because Suzy's mom tend to bring Fifi their Shitzu...' or what have you. Most dog owners are responsible. Dogs are part of the family. Educate through the wallets the ones who are *not* responsible.
None of the list. Dogs should be leashed at all times in all areas of town. Your off leash dog may be really friendly BUT when it approaches my On Leash dog who is shy/frightened/leash aggressive - then I have to deal with both my dog and your off leash dog ! Not Fair!
lots of time it is the leash and the tension that produces that leads to protectiveness or aggression - perhaps training for humans could be offered regularly - even those dogs on leashes are approached when they are not invited to do so - that is a big issue - no one should approach a dog that isn't theirs unless invited to do so (on a leash or not); plus parents need to teach their children and discipline their child, not just stand there as the kids torment or go quickly at an unfamiliar (to them) dog
Only licensed service dogs at indoor facilities.
People should be aware of their dogs behaviour and whether they are comfortable in those situations. More responsibility needs to be placed on the owner and choosing where they take their dog.
on leash only and under control
As long as there on leash and in control who cares
if a dog is leashed and not causing any harm or disturbance to the environment and they are kept in a spectator/sitting area, i believe they should be allowed there. in indoor recreation facilities, unless the dog is a verified service dog, i do not think it should be allowed. one reason for this being: people with allergies can not control their allergies, so if they are in a closed in environment with a dog present, they either have to distance themselves from the dog or leave the facility (depending on severity of allergies). i find this extremely unfair to the people with allergies.

There shouldn't be any kind of pets (excluding licensed caretaker pets) allowed inside a town operated facility. Ignoring the fact that there's food at some of these places, its also putting other users in danger as allergies and traumatizing fears are a factor
Unfortunately, "under control" is subjective. All spectators deserve to feel safe when attending events.
Yes, if the pet has a responsible owner.
Again, people need to realize whether or not their dog is capable of behaving in each situation.
As long as they are on a leash. Many dog owners are comfortable with their dogs and assume others will be too, because "my dog would never hurt anyone".
Don't get too restrictive here. I know the town likes control but don't go overboard.
In outdoor areas, on leash and under control. Of course, picking up feces etc. (especially around splash park and playgrounds). The only dogs that should be allowed inside Sportsplex, Aquatic Centre etc are Certified Service Dogs. A certified handler/dog will have a license issued under the service Dog Act. . "Emotional Support" dogs are not licensed for public access under the above act and typically have not completed their "public access test". This is different than assistance dogs for PTSD. Fake service dog licences/vests can be purchased online and this is not legal.
Having the ability to socialize a dog in these surroundings is the best way to teach them to be socialized in general
Any outdoor space as long add the dog is under control should allow dogs on leashes.
on leash with responsible handler ( not a child in control )
only out door allowed, no indoor facilities
Indoor as long as they do no poop or pee
current leash laws are constantly being broken and desperately need to be enforced better than they are now
Outdoor venues and under control and leashed would be fine.
Inside areas should be left to licenced animals vs. just under control animals. There is a need to have an animal very under control in public and only licensed animals are trained and tested well enough to be trusted in close proximity to people indoors in public.
If animals are behaving and with responsible owners they should not be restricted. For some homes animals are their children and as long as the owners are in control and a disturbance isn't being caused. Don't see any issue with animals in public places. Love that animals are being welcomed at restaurant patios in the cities
Definitely not indoors. People have allergies and food is served.
None of these areas need dogs as spectators. The survey would not let me move forward without checking one, but I do not think that any should be allowed.
Not in the pay area, but with a responsible owner while children play.
Just because it's on a leash does not mean that it's under control. No dogs allowed unless they are service dogs

Playgrounds are not subject to large crowds. Ball diamonds, soccer fields, skate park and splash park are subject to large crowds. Dogs should not be present in large crowd situations. No animals should be permitted inside town recreational facilities.
Dog owners in my neighbourhood have their dogs offleash in the Leatherdale Playground all the time. And the animals urinate wherever and that seems unhygienic for children.
If families/teams are having games there, I see no reason they can't bring the dog. Given that the leash law is enforced. Could put in ground stakes for owners to clip dogs to during said games
None of the above
Generally, Only service and/or therapy dogs should be allowed in any of the above areas.
Dogs do not need to be in areas where children play. We live by a school playground and it is used as an off leash park and it is covered in dog poop and pee. Its disgusting! I don't agree with animals being in any of these areas but I had to pick one to move on to the next question.
This question did not have the answer of NONE. Which is what I would select. But it would not let me continue without an answer. Unfortunately many dog owners are not unbiased enough to realize their dog should not be in a public place.
None. Kids are around all of these areas and can approach a dog too easily. Not all children are aware the threat a dog can be, or may be too young to understand.
No, to all, unless someone is there to enforce. Gross to see dogs on the splash pad.
None of these areas are appropriate!
None
None
I don't really support this. Dogs should not be allowed at any of the above facilities or parks. i thought this is why we have dog parks. I don't approve of a soccer field either but this won't allow me to move onto the next question
YOU DIDN'T LET ME SELECT NONE, SO MY REAL ANSWER IS NONE. Same rules as livestock. To be fair, a lot of people treat their dogs like human children and expect others to share events, parks, and stores with their dogs. I love dogs, but I don't want to spend my life with everyone's dog. Keep them home or within designated areas for dogs.
I don't support any and there's no option to select none.
None of the above but your system wouldn't accept no answer
None of these answers!!! Dogs can get stressed by noise and excessive movement around them. These type of places have high energy and too much stimulation for dogs to handle. Dogs show multiple signs of stress - yawning, licking lips, whale eye and acting sleepy.
I did not want to check any of these but the survey forced me too. I believe dogs should stay at home or be taken to dog parks. Walk them in your own yard. Often very hard on the dog to be out in public areas. You can't stop them from bathrooming when they need to go and when many dogs are in the same area

behavior is unpredictable. I am very adamant that they should not be allowed in stores and indoor facilities. They should not be allowed in the cabin of airplanes. I am allergic to dog's hair and dander. If they are near me the allergies kick in. We do not allow peanuts on airplanes due to allergies but dogs are allowed. This does not make sense. These are animals not humans. Could I bring a goat or a horse to any of these facilities?
Again, it's only when there's an incident that I notice most dogs. (sudden loud dog-fight, etc) Truthfully, I'd rather be sitting next to a smoker at the ball diamond than next to someone with a leashed pit-bull. I personally dislike dogs all over the place. They have teeth and they are animals, after all. I've seen (non-service) dogs in the hospital (gross) and in grocery stores in arms... Personally, I'd like to see more dogs muzzled in public. I realize they can't pant in that case, but it would sure solve the biting concern.
Dogs should not be in public places where a lot of children and activity are happening. Any dog can switch at any moment no matter the breed or upbringing.
I do not agree with this at all, dogs behave differently in public situations and it is difficult if there are lots of people or animals around to predict how your dog may behave. I had to pick one to go through to the next question, but I don't believe they should be allowed in any of these places unless they are service dogs
Bad question. I'm not allowed to answer...None of the above. DO NOT ALLOW THIS at any of the above.
Flawed survey tool as I am forced to select one of above. Only dedicated dog parks should be the choice.
depends on the dog
Public places, generally little dogs on leashes - a bit unnecessary.
left at home a not allowed in any of the areas above
None of above
Absolutely none of the above. Most humans are stupid and clueless as to how to control a dog or numerous dogs. Everyone's' definition is different so to eliminate any confusion on how to manage dogs - they should not be allowed at time of the above mentioned places.
These are not suitable environments for dogs and especially vicious dogs.
No dogs should be allowed on any parks and recreation areas.

**14. In your opinion, is there anything else that Administration and Council should take into consideration in bylaws regulating dogs?**

Age of victim and trauma caused. Therapy fees for psychological and physical; covered by dog owners for child victims.
Always consider the owner of the animal and how it was raised
Animals provide a welcome addition to the community as a whole, but RESPONSIBLE ownership needs to be expected. Reward those who are

responsible and ensure that those are who are not can be penalized as appropriate with solid, well communicated bylaws and fine process.
Any dog on its own or involved with a group of dogs that causes severe injury or death to an animal or person should be euthanized. There is no room for second chances in these scenarios. The stakes are far too high.
Are people ever stopped to see if dogs are tagged? I know of 4 dogs in my neighbourhood that are not licensed. When you have by laws they should be enforced but don't feel they. I witness people walking dogs every day not on leashes and running loose. Public land being used as a off leash park. I witness people cleaning their yard and throwing it on public property. I clean dog poop off my lawn everyday. Enforcement needs to happen.
Ban pitbulls.
Banning aggressive or miss behaved dogs from attending the local dog park
Barking dogs continue to be a problem in my area. I live on 60th St and behind me are yards from Destiny and Destination place. In the summer, there are dogs out in the yards barking all day long. I am sure that some are put out while the owner goes to work. Sometimes you can hear them barking, howling and snarling between the fences. I like to work out in my yard and do not feel I should be subject to all this racket that sometimes goes on for hours. I have previously talked to the by-law officer and nothing happens or the noise is reduced for about a week and then it starts all over again. I do not have a dog and I do not feel I should have to listen to dogs barking all summer while I try to have some peace and contentment in my back yard. I do not hate dogs, but I do not appreciate owners who think that their barking dog is not an issue.
Based on severity of Incident, or three incidents within a year's period, peace officers should have legislative authority to deem a dog vicious with an opportunity for the dog owner to appeal designation with council within 14 days. If appeal is not filed or denied, a Higher license fee for dogs deemed vicious should be required for the following year as well as requirement for dog to be muzzled when off of private property, and banned from off leash park, requirement for warning notice sign on fence of property indicating vicious dog resides on property.
Because dogs are living beings and have their own minds, provide room for situational factors to be considered in judgement of each individual situation. For example, to be able to bring into account what happened before the event in questioned happened - was a dog unfairly provoked and cornered before a bite occurred, did a contractor/delivery person leave a gate open and a dog get out who is routinely monitored and enclosed end up at large. I.e. make allowances for people who strive to be responsible and courteous dog owners but something unexpected or unfair has happened.
Bigger penalties for people who allow their dogs to bark outside and who do not pick up their dog's feces on town pathways, sidewalks, etc.
Breed discrimination. Not all pitbulls, "dangerous" breeds are bad. Its 99% owner. We have had multiple dogs over the years the best most loyal and friendly dog we ever owned was a rescued (Staffordshire terrier) "pitbull". He was constantly around kids they rode him like a horse and he didn't have a mean

bone in his body. Many smaller breeds are much more likely to bite than a larger dog. Ask the college animal health program they will tell you Im sure. It's the owners not animals...if you can control any animal don't own them.

Breed specific legislation accomplishes NOTHING.

Breeders should require a license to do so.

Bylaw should monitor the Olds and Area Lost and Found Pets group on Facebook on a DAILY basis and follow up with owners of 'lost dogs'. Check to ensure it was an accident and if the household actually has adequate outdoor areas (fences, dog runs, etc.) in their yards to TRY to keep their animals from roaming. Accidents happen, sometimes a gate or door is accidentally left open and the owner doesn't realize it, but I know there are some dog owners who don't even have fenced yards/dog runs and their dogs roam freely when they are let out to do their 'business'. I STRONGLY believe that it should be a condition/bylaw of all dog owners to have a fenced yard or at minimum, a dog run if they are in a dwelling which has a yard and Bylaw officers should be doing drive-by's during/after licensing time to ensure that they have provided truthful information. If they do not have a fenced yard/dog run they should be allotted a time frame to produce a fence or dog run or else they will get a penalty. Dogs who are simply 'tied up' on a lead in the yard are often capable of breaking free if they become stressed and will therefore become an animal at large who is not in the control of an owner.

Also as a side note about ANY pets I would REALLY like to see a STRONG enforcement of cats. They roam everywhere, defecate in yards, ruin flower beds and trees, get into yards (often staying there for periods of time), fight with other cats at large and are often walking across roadways and get hit. I see on the Olds and Area Lost and Found Pets Facebook page almost daily of owners saying they let their cat out and it 'always comes home, but it didn't last night'. CATS are a HUGE problem in Olds. I would like to see a survey about cat bylaws in the near future as well. Enforcement shouldn't be limited to dog ownership. I understand there is a very big difference between cats at large and dogs at large because dogs may inflict harm to humans and other pets, however I believe that if dogs cannot roam freely, neither should cats.

Bylaws need to be better enforced. We live beside a walking path and dogs are to be on leash. Every day we see this rule broken and often loose dogs go through our yard. Many owners do not pick up after their dogs. Olds spent money on an off leash park yet our grandchildren can't be alone in our yard due to loose dogs. This is not fair.

Define vicious dog more clearly: is this breed specific or case by case? Small dogs also must be considered as I have seen small dogs often act more aggressively than larger dogs and will sometimes instigate with other animals.

Do not start banning certain breeds please. I've seen that the town was looking at banning pitbull breeds and that is not fair, as they are not a vicious breed. Also the dogs aren't always the ones who should be punished when in accidents. 9/10 it's the owners fault for not training them properly, so I think that if a dog repeatedly goes after humans or other animals, the owner should be looked at to



<p>see if they are fit to own dogs, and if they are not, I think the dog should be removed from the home and they shouldn't be allowed to have another in their care unless they go through training and are monitored.</p>
<p>Dogs are getting a bad rap because owner's psychological insecurities and "wearing their violence" by having a aggressive or vicious breed. Address the issue, not the symptom. But remove the symptom (aggressive and vicious dogs) for public safety.</p>
<p>Dogs are not people, and this town is over run with people's dogs being treated like humans in most spaces, premises, and situations. It's like the wild west and unsafe for children.</p>
<p>Dogs are not an issue in the town of olds. Many dog owners are very responsible and take proper care of them. STRAY CATS/at large cats are the towns problem. They can cause just as much damage to a person or another animal as dogs. There needs to be sticker fines for at large cats and a spay/neuter program for feral or strays.</p>
<p>Dogs are not human beings, they are animals. I was in Germany recently and was amazed at how well dogs are trained by their owners who took them to public places. It is expected by the citizens of the city that dog owners control their pets and always on a leash. Dogs are members of a family, I get that, but they are animals.</p>
<p>Dogs are not humans, and while human handlers need a certain level of understanding to safely manage some dogs, dogs lack the capacity to understand the consequences for their actions or to operate outside of their instinct and training. The circumstances of a situation should be taken into account (i.e. a protective reaction if a child was in a dogs space and no adults removed the child or explained the dogs body language was showing they were afraid or uncomfortable and the dog eventually reacted to protect itself and bit the child) and dogs well being should be considered in any decisions. (I am not a dog owner because I do not have the space or time to manage a dog in a safe manner and ensure their quality of life, however I care very much about their well being)</p>
<p>DOGS ON LEASH. There is so many people who walk their dogs off leash in around town. There off pooping on lawns. And if you have a leashed dog who is not friendly is poses an issue to the off leash dog invading personal space. They should be fined.</p>
<p>Dogs should be on leash when being walked within town. I do not even feel comfortable walking my dog because there are so many off leash dogs walking freely in the local park by the Olds Elementary School.</p>
<p>Eliminate hobby license fee, for owning more than 2 dogs. Work harder at regulating cats, please.</p>
<p>ENFORCING THE RULES AT THE DOG PARK. If they were enforced that would weed out the irresponsible owners.</p>
<p>Excessive noise.</p>
<p>For aggressive or unfriendly dogs also be required to wear a muzzle as well.</p>

\*For the Public Safety of this town, The Town of Olds should provide a Animal Control phone number with After-hour calls that will be redirected to an after-hours answering service. The Report a Problem on your Website is not very efficient!

Peace Officers should have adequate training and be able to impound dogs running at large, as RCMP do not take any responsibility for this problem due to their lack of training.

Do not send dogs home with the owner/breeder after an incident. Dog Breeders need a Business Licence in this town, just as every other business.

Give the town of olds a break on fees as compared to other towns Olds fees are a money grab and a joke! Also the council has to remember about privacy, and free rights. And that most people in this town are good owners. Laws should not be completely decided over on incident

Having a professional trainer AND a licensed veterinarian to assist with decisions should be mandatory. Not necessarily on the board or in office but someone who can assess situations and behaviors of dogs. Someone who understands breeds AND behaviors. Someone who understands social disorders in fully competent breeds. Not just your average dog or cat owners. Some breeds are so true to their natural instincts or "wild" instincts if you please, they come across as problematic or an issue according to others - the owners may be fully accepting to these behaviors and how to deal with them, but that doesn't mean others are as accepting. What one dog owner may be able to handle and nurture for needs another would euthanize or abandon.

Hire people to enforce current bylaws. Mail any updates to people that have tags

How can you restrict a dog doing his business other than in/on owners property, how does a owner stop a dog from defecating while out on a walk?? More important would be that the owner PICKS UP the poo. I've noticed when out walking that unfortunately owners of big dogs are less likely to do this and I think the fine should be increased for all dog owners that don't pick up after their dogs. The town of Olds maintains a lot of beautiful pathways, as well as supplies poo bags, convenient dispensers and garbage disposal units along pathways. There is no excuse not to pick up after your dog. Not doing so jeopardizes the privilege of walking your dog throughout this beautiful town. We don't need more restrictions than already have but larger fines for those dog owners that don't pick up after their dogs. The walkways and parkways are excellent and enjoyable for all owner and their beloved dogs. The dog park is really good for large / medium dogs that need to have a run BUT I would not want to have to take my little dog there to be terrorized or intimidated by dogs running loose that are bigger than him.

<https://www.alberta.ca/service-dog-information.aspx>

Thank you for providing the opportunity to express my opinions on this issue. Over the past 17 years our family has had 3 dogs and has also volunteered for Pacific Assistance Dog Society (raising/training 2 dogs for this organization). We have 2 fur babes at home and take our responsibility as dog owners seriously.

\*The town does not do enough. Changing the number of dogs someone can own and increasing the fines from breeding and having the same outcome. You need to look at the complaint bylaw. It says if two or more substantiated complaints are made you could deny a license, (this is not consequence enough, as people

can breed without having their dog licenced, they would just keep them out of the public eye). So something should be changed at the town and how they address complaints, not the bylaws in my opinion.

i do not think there is anything else that should be taken into consideration.

I feel that the responsibility of all pets comes back to the owners. No such thing as a bad dog. If there are problems with a specific animal it's up to the owner to find a solution. I am a pet owner and I'm often afraid when walking my dog as I've had other dogs escape their yard and come after us. Pet owners MUST ensure their pets cannot escape! I've had too many close calls and with recent incidents it makes me even more scared. I'm tired of pet owners not taking it seriously, if you cannot look after your pet and ensure their own safety don't own one!

I have a Beagle and we like to walk around the college grounds. I think dogs should be under control at all times. leashes laws and mussels should be enforced

I have followed national news coverage of pit-bull and pit-bull type dogs for years. Dog breeds are not all created equal, and should not be treated as such. They have different temperaments, and that is why people are drawn to different types. The statistics that are available show that pit bulls and pit bull type dogs are responsible for far more injuries and death than other dog breeds combined. This cannot be ignored.

At the National Post, Barbara Kay has written many times on this issue. One of her articles highlights the stakes involved:

"There are about three million pit bull type dogs in North America today, representing 6% of all breeds. But about 26 people die from pit bull type dogs in the U.S. every year (out of about 40 from all 400 breeds combined). Pit bull type dogs maul, maim, disfigure or dismember hundreds more. By no coincidence, when pit bulls were few in number — 200,00 before 1970, most clustered in marginal districts — dogbite-related fatalities in the general population were freakishly rare. In my youth, when middle-class neighbourhood dogs ran loose, and average families didn't own fighting dogs, years went by without a single fatality. If pit bull type dogs were cars, they'd be long gone.

Pit bulls are now the second most popular breed of dog in America (Labs happily still rule). Criminals favour them, certainly; but most now belong to naive mainstream people who believe pit bulls' association with thuggery has given them an undeserved "bad rap."

In reality, pit bull type dogs stubbornly remain what they have always been: fighting machines bred for impulsivity, pertinacity in attack and — thanks to their peculiar "rending" style of bite — a capacity for inflicting extraordinary damage on victims, usually other animals (pit bulls are responsible for almost 100% of domestic-animal fatalities, including cows and horses), but frequently enough, people, disproportionately children.

Given the statistics — pit bull type dogs are six times more likely to kill humans than all other breeds combined — and nothing extraordinary to distinguish them positively from other breeds, their rapid proliferation is irrational. Unless what we are witnessing is a mass projection of current social theories about people onto dogs, the animals in which people are most apt to invest their feelings and social values. Canine history supports that hypothesis."

<https://nationalpost.com/opinion/barbara-kay-what-pit-bull-activism-says-about-our-culture>

[https://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2014/10/03/pit\\_bulls\\_were\\_torontos\\_biggest\\_biters\\_before\\_the\\_ban.html](https://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2014/10/03/pit_bulls_were_torontos_biggest_biters_before_the_ban.html)

According to the Toronto Star: "From 2001 to 2004, pit bulls were more likely to bite people and domestic animals than any other breed, the statistics show. In 2004, the last full year before the ban, there were 984 pit bulls licensed in Toronto and 168 reported pit bull bites. That's more than double the rate of German shepherds, the next most aggressive breed. "

I get nervous seeing pit bulls on our streets. I know it would be wise to ban these types of animals.

I saw bylaw detail on not having dogs defecating on other properties, etc. but how about adding in that the owner shall not dispose of dog feces by: throwing it over the owner's fence. I see this on a regular basis and should not be considered an acceptable form of getting rid of dog feces even if you do border on town trees.

I think that when considering euthanizing a vicious dog, a certified behavior veterinarian should be included (at the cost of the dog's owner) in the process to determine future risk. Most licensed veterinarians don't fully understand dog behaviors and a reactive dog is not always a vicious dog.

I think there should be a complaint process for people walking their dogs and letting them crap on people's lawns and not picking it up

I think when considering licensing fees, perhaps consider higher license fees overall. These fees should be on a scale.

License fees should be non existent for certified service dogs.

License fees should be reduced if at the time of licensing owner can present proof of obedience training at an intermediate or higher level (for instance Canine Good Neighbour test)

Bylaw needs to consider service dogs in training and allow them to have same access as service dogs, however their should be a license fee for SDITs until they are fully trained.

When considering animal bylaws also take the time to consider other animals - especially cats - Olds has a major problem with people letting their cats out at night and they make a mess everywhere.

When developing the bylaw take serious consideration in having animal enforcement officers placed in town. These individuals can then ensure when complaints are filed they are followed up with.

I would suggest reviewing city of Calgary pet bylaws.

I think they are very reasonable

If a dog I under full control via verbal command. Off leash should be allowed

If after multiple warning's you do not try to correct the behavior in general, your dog should be rewarded too the SPCA.

<p>If dogs need to be under control SO DO CATS, the amount of cats on, in and around my property is unacceptable. There should be an accountability factor here, start trapping them. If as dog owners we need to have complete control of our animals the same is required for the cats.</p> <p>I am a very responsible dog owner I expect to see people walking their dogs ON leash...there are many people in this town that do not walk their pet on leash in on leash areas. By-law needs to start stepping up and monitoring this. The Centennial Park is bad and the park with the bike paths behind the schools is bad. Every time I have taken my dog on leash walking through there are dogs being walked off leash spring, summer, winter, fall any time of day does not matter start monitoring this. I would think for children safety this would be better monitored. People saying oh my dog is friendly or is good is not acceptable, so is my dog but I never let her off leash in town. It is unacceptable for people to think they are above the laws.</p>
<p>If the town does not have a location, they should consider a holding location for seized dogs.</p>
<p>If there is a complaint, the Peace Officer has both parties at the table to work through the issues or complaints. I'm sure that most complaints are between neighbour's this May assist in better relationships and less he said she said issues. These types of complaints should not have anonymity for the complainant they need to work it out not hide behind their doors, that solves nothing.</p>
<p>Increase fees, increase charges. Make the owners accountable. Define breeders under a business license, out of residential arrears.</p>
<p>Inforce them. There is people daily walking their dogs with no leash on public walking paths and it is not enforced given if they are reported</p>
<p>Introduce mandatory training for all dogs and owners if a extreme incident occurs. Also emotional support animals should have all vaccinations, microchipped and training before being allowed in retail places</p>
<p>It is a difficult situation you have been put in to come to a decision on this by-law that lets the people, family and friends of the family whose dog was killed get some justification.</p>
<p>I've read everything posted and can somebody tell me how dogs opened a gate to get out of an enclosed yard? How they passed by so many yards harmlessly to get where they ended up? How they got access to this dog in the incidence and did anybody actually witness how the altercation began?</p>
<p>Living situations that the animals are in should be considered as whether they are being treated correctly.</p> <p>People who have been charged with animal neglect or endangerment should not be allowed to own animals in town</p>
<p>make dog licenses multi-year</p>
<p>Maybe by breeds. Big dogs like pit bulls, rottweilers, german shepherds, should possibly cost more to license</p>
<p>More waste removal stations around town might be a good idea.</p>
<p>Most dog owners LOVE their pet &amp; try to keep them safe &amp; well. Don't turn bylaws into a Town cash grab.</p>
<p>No Breed ban. It doesn't help/change anything.</p>

No breed specific bylaws... I do not have any dogs but work closely with all breeds including bully breeds.
No breed(s) should ever be singled out and banned.
-No large dog breeding in town -Education for kids on how to treat/respect dogs
No suggestions for dogs BUT I think Cats need to be dealt with. I don't have one but clean mountains of poop out of my flower beds and had to stop using my raised bed for a salad garden because cats wandering in our yard kept using it as a bathroom.
*No, I don't think forced euthanasia is necessary unless the dog is deliberately going after people unprovoked. And actually attacking.
No. And leave bully breeds alone and recognize that it's the owners that are the problem. I've been bitten by more small dogs in my life than by any of the 4 larger dogs I have owned. Just because more people are nervous around them doesn't mean they're bad dogs. If anything there should be an owner competency test for those who want to own pets in town
Noise. Excessive barking day or night is really hard to live by. Dogs that bark more 15 minutes straight become a huge annoyance to the neighbours around them. Poor dog behaviour is usually caused by boredom which is really a result of the dogs not being cared for properly.
Noisy, barking dogs. We really need to address this. It is becoming a bigger issue every year. It seems that many more people are getting dogs and letting them bark outside. Also, feces on pathways and sidewalks. When walking in Olds you have to constantly watch your step. People are not picking up after their pets and they are allowing them to defecate on pathways or right beside. It is disgusting!
Not all dogs are devils. Attention should be also put on the owners, especially regarding aggressive or viscous dogs. Yes some dogs are raised and treated well but still act out, but if multiple dogs are deemed viscous by the same owner then maybe something needs to be done about the owner. When there is a fine for something an animal has done does any of the money go to the victim? It would be unfair if an innocent citizen gets their arm mangled from a vicious dog and the town gets the money and the victim is left on their own.
Not discriminating by breed but evaluating by case.
Offleash area in town so you can walk there and not have to drive to the one out of town.
Olds desperately needs an in town off-leash are for small dogs. The big off-leash park is great for large dogs but many of the large breeds scare or bully the smaller breeds (not necessarily in an aggressive manner but nonetheless). Some municipalities have small dog off-leash areas in parks where owners can walk from their home and let the dog run in the enclosed space with other small dogs. Small breeds, which are very common in town, do not need an entire field to run in, just a small fenced area in the corner of an existing park. This would be an excellent addition to the town of Olds.
Online licensing payments please

Owner responsibly
Owners need to pick up their dogs feces!!!
People are the problem, not dog breeds.
People come first. My kids come ahead of someone's "fur baby" ...my kids are little. and dogs should not be scaring them off playgrounds and other childhood experiences. We have left events and sites due to peoples' dogs. I've been bitten by a dog (unprovoked), and know of several others who have been too. I'm not anti-dog, but I am opposed to tolerating bad dog behaviour, and accommodating peoples' animal's barking, biting, and poop.
People that allow their dogs to stay outside and bark for hours upon hours at a time. There needs to be somewhere to report it so maybe they can handle the situation.
Perhaps consideration of the dog breed, although the unpredictability of any animal would make differentiation based on breed of dog a delicate item
Please do not start classifying things based on "breed specifics". Everything boils down to responsible ownership and informed animal handling. It is never a "breed" thing.
Pro rate the town license
Properly designed survey tools that do not force undesired selections on participants.
Public safety is top priority. As a dog owner I enjoy the privilege of bringing my dog along to different public parks when we go out as a family. Not all dogs have the training or temperament to be in public areas and owners need to be held responsible for managing their pet appropriately. I do not think aggressive dogs have a place in a town environment but I understand that we have to a humane way of managing them while keeping people safe. I think the risk is very high when aggressive animals are in highly populated areas where they overstimulated and more likely to become agitated.
Realize to put these issues under community standards is useless. This is about two areas that can/should be enforceable: Animal Control and Land Use Bylaw (commercial breeding).
Putting things in Community Standards is a feel good idea to quiet a stakeholder, but rarely gets things done.
regulate the humans - train them - there are a lot of stupid people out there that shouldn't own a dog and don't know enough to leave other peoples dogs alone
Remember aggression or vicious dogs are not breed specific. When incidents occur it's more likely the owners fault not the dogs
Should be on leash at all times
stiffer penalties for dogs at large and dogs allowed to walk on walking paths unleashed we witness it daily on the walking path behind our home and our fenced dogs are agitated by owners that have unleashed dogs wander up to and in our yard
Stop treating dogs like second class and start putting the blame on owners. The dogs aren't bad just because. It's the owners who cause it. Blame them.

That breed isn't the problem. Owners of big breeds need to be responsible for their pets, if they don't trust their pets then they should be taking more precautionary measures. I also think that if you're residence is in a duplex, that the number of large dogs should be limited due to the lack of yard space. I would say a max of 2 large breed dogs.  
And if the town of olds try's to bring in a breed specific legislation, there is going to be a ton of very angry residents, even residents who don't own that breed will not be happy. 10/10 wouldn't recommend.  
Have a wonderful day!

That checks are done on open areas. I am finding that some people are using the field at the side of Holy Trinity School as a dog park, mainly on weekends. Letting their dogs off leash to run free.

That humans sometimes cause the dog to be aggressive. The dog is acting in defence or raider to fight. Is not the dogs fault. They spent their entire lives this way and sometimes because of it, act out. They should enforce sending them to training instead of euthanasia.

The assurance that The Town WILL contact all/any licensed owners IF their dog is impounded.

The biggest one to me is the barking dog complaint. That's the most common one. Stop dropping paper off to the complainant making them document every time a dog barks. By the time the phone call has been made, the person has put up with enough barking. Get the bylaw officer to actually talk to the dog owner and tell them. But that never happens because people are working and I've never seen your bylaw officers work anything but regular hours.

The bylaw should take complaints against dogs seriously, especially when numerous complaints have been made against the same dogs

The bylaws are to assist owners in guidance of responsible ownership  
The Town has a beautiful off leash park, however on bad weather days it gets avoided because it really needs much more 'GRAVEL' in the parking lot area and the transition zone and the trail to the field area. It's naturally a wetland area. Too much mud on vehicle and dogs and I avoid the use of the area as a result..  
(on bad days)

The fines and enforcement of the byelaw for of dogs whose owners do not have them on a leash at all times. I have 2 dogs and in the warmer weather when I walk them more often, there are so many times that we are approached by other dogs not on a leash and under the control of their owner. This causes my dogs such anxiety that I usually can't take them out for another walk for several day. There are so many places in town that we avoid as there are ALWAYS dogs running free.

The majority of dog owner are people who try to obey the bylaws. Ultimately, you should not be altering laws to fit the most extreme cases of bad or irresponsible ownership. People own pets for a variety of reasons and these pets behave in a variety of ways. No one can predict the ultimate actions of an animal of any kind. That being said, owners who do have vicious dogs with a history of neglect or misconduct should be held accountable. My fear is that because all pet owners are passionate about their animals, extreme decisions can be made based more on emotion than on logic.



<p>There are responsible and irresponsible dog owners and breeders. It is hard to police and unfortunately the responsible ones suffer for the irresponsible. One must make laws to the lowest common denominator, whether a responsible dog owner (me) likes it or not. If one is responsible with their pets then the laws will have no effect on them at the end of the day. My dogs don't bite, are under supervision at all times and are well behaved citizens. I support harsher town policies on dogs. If people can't be responsible with their pet owning and breeding practices, then they shouldn't have the privilege of owning dogs at all, in my mind.</p>
<p>There should be a separate distinction for dogs who kill other dogs. They should be euthanized.</p>
<p>There should be much more awareness of the need to control dogs in all areas. Our experience with dogs is in raising two service animals and having had four of our own dogs (not all at the same time). We take dog breeding and training very seriously for both the health and well being of the dogs and of their owners and caretakers. Dogs are a wonderful way to provide companionship to elderly and people with visible and/or non visible disabilities. Support of these types of uses for dogs is important in a town like ours and dog control is for this reason also very important.</p>
<p>They are just dogs. Find something more important to do.</p>
<p>This is a very difficult bylaw to construct and enforce but safety comes first.</p>
<p>Ultimately, the owner is responsible/liable for his/her animal. The penalties need to be stringent enough that owners will take seriously the possible outcomes of not being responsible enough for their animal's behaviour. I see that as being the best deterrent without limiting freedom too much. I do believe some dog breeds (such as pit bulls) have such a high risk factor in their behaviour (one of which is unreliability, where they may be well-behaved for a long period, only to strike out in severe ways unexpectedly) that I do think the council ought to consider banning them outright.</p>
<p>We need a facility to house dogs running at large and it needs to be available 24 hours a day. By law officers also need to be available when the citizens of Olds need them. Not just within regular business hours. Better training needs to be give to those dealing with dogs. And proper protocols need to be put in place.</p>
<p>Whether the animal is a working "therapy" dog for their owner. Therapy dogs will protect their owner if the case arises.</p>
<p>Yes, barking dogs needs to be better enforced. By law officer needs to increase responses to barking dogs through initial warnings and subsequent fines.</p>
<p>Yes. There are several parks near or at schools. i see people allowing their dogs to run with children being close by. I feel that the children are at risk and this should not be allowed, even if they are deemed friendly.</p>
<p>You cannot judge a breed of dog, it comes down to ownership and training. Banning a breed will not change incidents happening. Actually when people are requesting licences, make it mandatory the dog goes to a training course or the owners do not get to keep it in town.</p>
<p>You must have a proper fence if you have dogs. And if you have large, potentially aggressive dogs, a lock on your gate.</p>

<p>All owners carry waste container. Nothing is done concerning dog owners and the waste. There is absolutely no enforcement on dog waste.</p>
<p>Dangerous dog classification i.e - pit bull - rotweiller</p>
<p>how long ago this issue was made aware to the town about, before it came to the loss of another animals life town needs to act on these matters sooner before incidents happen.</p>
<p>*Not enough time and study has gone into this - as this survey indicates. It is suggestive of an attempt to be more restrictive - space and money wise; control where education of owners might be of more value. Dogs are dogs; as numbers increase pack instinct arises. Dog breeders of larger types my pay licencing fees but they don't belong with people in residential areas. Dog catching does not make for positive feelings. Spend the money and hire advice. Education begins with involved town staff. Olds has a dog-unfriendly reputation - employ qualified personnel. I am a dog owner in Olds. Check the opinions - not the people who gave them to avoid bias.</p>
<p>I think 2 many dog owners have the attitude my dog - my yard - dogs bark so the neighbors can just put up with the barking.</p> <p>It is my understanding that dog owners have to have their dogs under control at all times.</p> <p>No they cannot just turn them out in the back yard.</p> <p>I suggest that an owner is handed a pamphlet stating that their responsibility are for their dog and towards their neighbors. The pamphlet could be given out with license.</p>
<p>There should be stricter and more frequent enforcement of dog feces/messes that are left in residential yards for more than 24 hours. The bylaw should insist and state that all do mess - no matter how big or small is cleaned up and properly disposed of within 24 hours of the dog or dogs making the mess. Also - when a bylaw officer sees a dog off leash within the town - the officer should immediately stop and issue a fine to the human and ensure that dog is properly registered.</p>
<p>Owners should be held responsible for any problems (noise defecation etc) as well as injury caused by their animals. I have observed that some young men who own large vicious dogs are less intelligent than the dog. They should not be allowed to own these types of animals in town.</p>
<p>When walking on walkways and sidewalks we find people are not picking up feces. Also too many dog walkers are not keeping dogs on leash and many are not in control of their dogs. Personally I have had my pants ripped by a dog at a ball park that was on a leash.</p>
<p>Be reasonable and research successful communities. It should not be an emotional reaction!</p>

