







Community Survey Results




Do you support adding new, comprehensive requirements for the proper care and attention to animals such as food and feeding, water, veterinary treatment, exercise, and sanitation?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		57.2%	258
No		15.1%	68
I don't know		27.7%	125




Do you support increasing the maximum number of any combination of dogs and cats per household from three to four?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		55.5%	251
No		34.5%	156
I don't know		10.0%	45




Do you support limiting the number of litters from all dogs and cats per household to one per year to reduce the number of animals entering shelters and for population control?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		76.2%	345
No		11.9%	54
I don't know		11.9%	54





Do you support prohibiting the feeding of wild animals with limited exceptions i.e. bird feeders, lawful trapping?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		72.9%	329
No		17.1%	77
I don't know		10.0%	45




The state requires that dogs be licensed and immunized against rabies in the municipality where they reside. Do you support requiring all veterinarians in the city to provide copies of current rabies immunization certificates for all dogs to Animal Control?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		57.5%	260
No		24.3%	110
I don't know		18.1%	82




Do you support the following regulations in designated off leash dog parks? (check all that apply):

		Response Percent	Response Count
no animals other than dogs		66.0%	279
no person shall have more than two dogs		49.4%	209
dogs must be vaccinated and licensed in accordance with law		93.6%	396
no person under the age of 13 may be in charge of dogs		60.8%	257




Do you support broadening the section addressing nuisances by noisy dogs to nuisances by noisy animals (e.g. parrots)?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		63.0%	284
No		19.1%	86
I don't know		18.0%	81




Do you support requiring a dog to be spayed or neutered in order for a senior (65 and older) to qualify for a free dog license?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		71.1%	320
No		18.7%	84
I don't know		10.2%	46




Do you support prohibiting roosters over four months old? (Roosters often begin to crow around this age.)

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		55.2%	248
No		25.8%	116
I don't know		18.9%	85

Do you support prohibiting livestock (e.g. horses, goats, pigs, sheep) in residential zoning districts?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		54.4%	243
No		29.8%	133
I don't know		15.9%	71




Do you support limiting the number of small animals (e.g. rabbits, chickens) to no more than six per household?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		59.0%	265
No		28.7%	129
I don't know		12.2%	55








Do you support prohibiting small animals within 20 feet of any inhabitable dwelling unit, other than that of the owner or custodian?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		37.3%	166
No		36.4%	162
I don't know		26.3%	117

The current code requires a resident to exhibit their dog to an Animal Control officer as part of a dangerous or diseased animal investigation. Do you support broadening this section from exhibiting dogs only to any animal subject to an investigation?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		75.1%	337
No		10.7%	48
I don't know		14.3%	64

What category best describes your age:

		Response Percent	Response Count
18-29		3.8%	17
30-39		12.3%	55
40-49		20.5%	92
50-59		25.7%	115
60-65		17.0%	76
Older than 65		18.3%	82
Decline to state		2.5%	11

Comments: (Do you support adding new, comprehensive requirements for the proper care and attention to animals such as food and feeding, water, veterinary treatment, exercise, and sanitation?)

Yes, and by care I mean changing the current laws to allow citizens of Sunnyvale to provide daycare and petsitting services which are truly needed in the community.

I support the idea so long as the only cost is enforcement when someone doesn't comply, not monitoring.

The proper function of government is protecting individual rights

I've had to use the mass daycare facilities in the area which are not able to provide remotely the same level of attention or sanitation as housed environments.

I'd have to know what the proposals are, but lean toward yes.

And housing. No one should be able to keep a dog or cat outside 24/7.

I would need to have more information on what you are considering.

I think these common sense and humane expectations should be codified into law to give Animal Control more "teeth" in dealing with those who mistreat animals.

I said "yes" but it's hard for me to fully support it without knowing exactly what the new proposals are

Reasonable requirements, yes, but it's unclear what this means – exercise?

For cats, I've found that oversized litterboxes are effective for giving them enough, so I don't recommend putting the "have one more litterbox than you have cats" guideline into law. (We have Maine Coon cats, which can run quite large, and usually have cement mixing trays or 100 liter storage containers as litter boxes.) If you have to codify litterboxes beyond "must provide a litterbox and change the litter often enough for the animal's health", maybe base it on square footage instead?

Depends of how specific you are - don't define how many litter boxes, what litter I can use, how often to clean litter boxes, how often to feed of what food, that sort of thing because that's way over the line. There are automated litterboxes now that even eliminate having to ever change litter and litter that's designed to be changed out 1 x month. Some of this is great as general requirements (you should be consistently feeding, watering, and exercising your animals.) Not everyone can afford vet insurance. How and when would this be enforced? Would you remove pets from poor or homeless people?

What are the current standards and proposed changes?

primarily, I support improving public area sanitation and placement of any burdens to be the responsibility of the pet owners. One exception to that is the control of nondomesticated animals. Minimum requirements yes so animals aren't mistreated but comprehensive is overkill.

I haven't seen the language. Any language needs to be common sense and not unduly restrictive. Food, water, sanitation, vaccinations, not being chained, not being crated all day - yes. Government should not tell me how frequently to take my animal to the vet or exercise him.

I am not an animal owner

City of Sunnyvale could require signed read form to be returned when applying for rabies tag.

It depends on the requirements.

I'd rather the city's resources to help the people not animals. Animal owners should be responsible for their pets, not the general public.

depends on the new requirements! we shouldn't animals away from poor people who can't afford annual vet appointments...

As a bird breeder, I don't want the City telling me what I have to do to care for them, my experience is more than even vets know.

What are the requirements that you want to add? I am concerned about legislating use of vets and then turning something that is already extremely expensive into an opportunity for vets to take advantage of a captive market.

Yes, but not if this means inspections of peoples homes

Sanitation would be most important. Most people take care of their animals because they love them. A law won't prevent animal abuse. But, some pet owners are lax in picking up after their pets and that affects the community at large.

Seems hard to enforce

It is not the city's business to micromanage (nanny) animal owners to this extent.

Pets, like people, need less veterinary care when they are healthy. Mandating a care schedule may impose a financial burden on some.

Depends how invasive. Not a nanny state fan. But if it's used to prosecute egregious abuses it's not bad.

I would want to see specific requirements first

It should be a jail time & high fine offense not providing proper food water shelter or abandoning pets.

Keep government out of my house!

It obviously would depend upon the new requirements.

Some animals, yes, such as chickens, but unaware of a problem with cats and dogs

Not all pet owners can afford professional veterinary treatment. However they can all clean up after their pets and provide them with appropriate food and water. Dogs need healthy exercise; cats take care of this without any human assistance.

What are the requirements? How will they be enforced?

I would want to know exactly what kind of requirements were being added. Of course I want all animals to be treated properly but I dislike when there are too many hoops to jump through.

I would have to see the details

I will take care of my animals properly without government intervention

Owning a pet is a commitment, as well as a responsibility.

Need specifics on the requirements being considered here

Yes, but do think the question needs to be more specific, or people will not be sure how to answer this question. I assume you mean individual owners?

Yes but I need more information about how one would prove that and what vaccinations would be required

What are the new requirements? I have not seen any link to see what they are.

Don't make it complicated. Pet owners should be responsible for the welfare of the animals they claim ownership of by word or deed. (Deed means exercising control over).

The exact wording is important. Who decides what proper care is? I don't want the care of pets to be over regulated. But I also don't want pets to be abused or neglected.

Really depends on how comprehensive... people need to care for their pets properly but don't know if strict monitoring is needed in most households. But maybe if someone had a complaint against them or something, definitely.

Comments:(Do you support increasing the maximum number of any combination of dogs and cats per household from three to four?)

I think the amount of animals per household should increase - especially for petsitters who provide valuable services to people in the community. The visiting animals at a sitters' home should not count as their own pets.

The only considerations on a per case basis should be whether the animals constitute a health or nuisance problem to others, thus violating their rights, regardless of the quantity

Four sounds like a lot to me for one house. Is there anything written about how much space and the size of the creatures? Having four Pomeranians is not the same as four great Danes.

After using a variety of daycare options throughout California, I would recommend up to 6 pets per household at the very least.

For dogs I think size of the dogs relative to square footage (especially for apartments) is important to consider. Perhaps only allowing up to 4 based on size of dogs on average.

It depends on the size of the house and yard. Yes if someone has enough space, no if they are in a small apartment, for example.

4 pets is a reasonable number

Four doesn't sound unreasonably high to me.

Yes, I especially support this with licensure for dog sitters. 4 dogs is not enough to run a dog sitting business in this area! I have lost my daytime and dog boarding sitter because of the restrictive rules!!

It makes sense for Sunnyvale's code to match the state's, which I believe says four.

Visiting pets should not be included in this number

No idea we had such a low limit Given that folks can also be fostering puppies and kittens, this number seems low.

in regards to having a home business of dog sitting. The number should be increased for dogs that do not live on the premises

While increasing the maximum number of any combination of dogs and cats per household seems like a good idea (i.e. two cats and two dogs) for companionship reasons, I do not support more than two dogs per household. I think households with more than two dogs could lead to an increase on public burden. On the otherhand, caring for four cats in a household (primarily licensed indoor cats) would not pose additional public burden.

I support 5-6 animals per household. Please change the code so that visiting animals aren't considered as part of household as it currently does.

This makes no sense with increasing housing density. The city is just inviting more animal complaints

Three pets are enough per household in this dense downtown area.

This should depend on sq ft available and number of people in the household.

It should be 2 per household in any combination of dogs and cats and 1 a small animal, other than a dog or cat, e.g. rabbit, chicken, hamster, bird; As homes are becoming smaller and more than 2 cats or dogs will be crowd.

Should be higher than four

Does this include fostering dogs and cats? If so YES. Please differentiate between permanent pets and fosters. Multiple pet owners often are the ones to take in more to help out the various rescue organizations.

Three dogs and/or cats seems like a reasonable limit. If someone wants more than that, there could be a permitting system with owners needing to justify their desire for additional dogs/cats.
No meaningful difference between 3 and 4 animals

One yappy dog next door can be too many when I want to be in my yard, and I often do, and it too often is.

I would say it is more about space and resources

I have a neighbor with three chihuahuas who lives next door to a neighbor with two mid-sized dogs. The amount of barking is enough to wake the dead. Neighbors who breed service dogs should be able to raise and socialize each litter until it's time for them to go to service dog training centers.

What is the reasoning behind the current limitation? Are size and area considered?

There are already enough pet owners who have their hands full. How are they supposed to walk and master 4 dogs when walking down the sidewalk that is narrow? I have small children and they come awfully too close already. Furthermore, my neighbors who already breach this rule have a lot of noise given the dogs sometimes not getting along. How am I supposed to get a noise ordinance enforced on this?! 4 dogs is a lot of barking! Especially as we expect laws like SB50 to come into play and our neighborhoods to get denser.

I didn't know there was currently a limit

I think that 3 dogs and cats per household are plenty.

However, four still seems too low to me. I'd raise it to 5.

Animal behavior changes when in packs. People lose ability to safely manage animals when they have too many animals.

There should be no maximum. If I CAN, LET ME!

If the pet owner has an adequate amount of space for the pet
As long as their owners can properly care for them (including vet care).

I support 4, in my lifetime sometimes we had 2 dogs and 2 cats. That does not seem excessive. I would not want to go beyond 4 UNLESS there is some sort of system developed to give permits to people who meet qualifications for neo-natal kitten rescue, foster dog care, etc.

Shelters are full and the animals need homes, but it is very hard to help when the city limits the number if animals one can have. Especially if people can afford to take care if them properly.
3 dogs, 4cats, max of 4 total.

There should be some leeway for temporary pets such as foster dogs.
As long as the home is a proper household and not overrun with problems, neighbor complaints and whatnot it shouldn't be an issue.

Comments: (Do you support limiting the number of litters from all dogs and cats per household to one per year to reduce the number of animals entering shelters and for population control?)

The only considerations on a per case basis should be whether the animals constitute a health or nuisance problem to others, thus violating their rights, regardless of the quantity
Campaigns to support local shelters/educate on this topic would be very helpful in encouraging animal adoption. However, since many people rent here and shelters are full of restricted breeds, these dogs still have issues finding good homes because people can't adopt them.
People should not be breeding creatures for money.

I'd say one per household every five years.
With the caveat that licensed breeders should be allowed in Sunnyvale and could do this as a home based business.

assuming registered breeders can be exempt

This should only apply to owned pets. It should not be applied to those who foster pets who are already pregnant or have newborns. All responsible pet rescue organizations have the mother spayed as soon as the babies are old enough, and the rescues should not be penalized for providing humane care.

This would be prohibitive to registered breeders

For people who aren't licensed breeders, yes: you should spay and neuter your pets. Licensed breeders should have an exception.

I'd make sure that catteries and the like are exempt because they are licensed. How would you even enforce this? Again, what are you going to do for poor families. If you offer free spay/neuter clinics, as well, then sure.

Possibly have an exception for responsible breeders?

Exception to limiting number of annual litters to one would be for licensed breeders.

I think 0 litters should be allowed without a permit and written statement that these animals will not go to shelters or rescues!

Animals should not be a burden to the city

I think all animals adopted from any rescue or other agency should be neutered or spayed before being released to new owners.

Seems like overreach, and impossible to enforce.

Legitimate breeders should be able to have this hobby. For example, allergy-free cats are in short supply and more need to be home bred.

Some shelters are overloaded now.

If they aren't spayed then how do you control the number of litters?

It would probably be best for the health of the animals to limit litters to one per year.

Seems hard to enforce

And just how do you intend to enforce this? More excess micromanagement. Ridiculous. "Horrors, the cat and the dog are both knocked up. What shall we do? Let's move to Mountain View..."

My animals are spay/neutered anyways, so this is not an issue.

There should be free spay & neuter for all owners below a certain income level, handicapped, & seniors.

Absolutely! I'd prefer people spay/neuter animals if they aren't breeders and rescue animals if they want more

I had a neighbor who raised service dogs. They were very careful about breeding. Part of their livelihood depended on having more than one litter per year. I would certainly be in favor of stronger encouragement for the use of low-cost spay and neuter clinics.

Breeding should require special licensing.

Is this even a problem in Sunnyvale? Most shelter dogs are brought in from outside of the bay area.

Yes however consider adding an exception for breeders category. Breeders could register with City, require a business license and have reporting requirements to City and animal control. Reporting litter information and purchases.

One litter per animal type.

How are you ever going to enforce such a limit?

Frankly I'd prefer only licensed people breed dogs and cats, but I understand this isn't really doable.

How the hell do you think you're going to control that? STUPID punishment for human caregivers.

I'd even agree to 1 litter every 2 years.

Absolutely. Not sure how you would monitor this, but yes.

Unless the owner is a licensed and responsible breeder.

I don't know how many litters per year is healthy for a dog or cat. And I don't know how many litters a certified breeder should allow their animal.

All animals must be neutered/spayed. Create a lightweight breeders license for possession of an unspayed animal. Licensees are subject to inspection. Animals turned in to shelters is cause for revocation of the license.

not sure how this is controllable

Comments: (Do you support prohibiting the feeding of wild animals with limited exceptions i.e. bird feeders, lawful trapping?)

Government should protect the rights of individuals, not violate them

Depends what you mean by wild animals. Overall, in most cases, the benefits of feeding wild animals outweighs the consequence of not feeding them in many cases.

Definitely do not ban bird feeders. :-)

I don't know enough about feral cat colonies to know what's best for the environment/other animals, but I do know that feral cats are a nuisance and a danger to my chickens. After hearing a little more about Catch-Neuter-Release programs for feral cats, I can see the benefits (especially rat control, which is SORELY needed where I live) of having feral cats around, but... For wild animals other than feral cats, this is a no-brainer. Just not sure what's best when it comes to the cats.

Please do not ban the feeding of feral cats!

The limited exceptions should include trap-neuter-return management of feral cat colonies; this cuts down on predation on birds and prevents creating a void that will be filled by unaltered cats looking for territory.

Be sure to look at the effects of having clowders of fixed cats (where volunteers get any non-fixed cats to the vet as soon as they can) - as a way to not have to kill the animals and in reduction of rats in an area. Not sure we should be feeding other critters since we have so very many rats and raccoons running around.

we took their homes

I actually think there should be no exception other than lawful trapping. Any fixed location feeders such as bird feeders, squirrel feeders etc... becomes a public burden with feces buildup over time.

There's no reason wild animals should be fed.

Don't disturb the Nature

I remember a flea infestation caused by someone feeding stray cats.

I don't see how this can be fairly enforced without spying in back yards.

Show me the law

Emphatic yes. Wild animals need to stay wild. They will always do fine and stay in balance with their natural environment. Some of the food intended for "desired animals" will inevitably end up attracting vermin as well.

Important for environmental concerns and safety of animals and people

Good luck enforcing, but turning the neighbors into spies should set up the SWAT team assaults and calm any ongoing petty snits.

I had a neighbor who fed roasted peanuts to our excessive squirrel population. The squirrels gnawed their way into crawl spaces and attics. No feeding wild mammals.

I don't know what this might be addressing? Do people feed other wild animals than birds?

I feed the birds in my yard and the squirrels eat the birdseed
Keep wild animals WILD.

Dog & cat food should not be left outside as it attracts wild animals into neighborhoods

Yes, but some reasonable allowance for people who inadvertently feed, like having an avocado or fruit tree that becomes a food source for local critters, AND a specific exemption and a permit process for those who are willing to feed feral cat communities (assuming the permit also requires them to capture and neuter)

I support this and can not think of any other exceptions except bird feeders, but I'd like to see how the law is worded. Certainly agree with no encouraging general wildlife feeding.

Comments: (The state requires that dogs be licensed and immunized against rabies in the municipality where they reside. Do you support requiring all veterinarians in the city to provide copies of current rabies immunization certificates for all dogs to Animal Control?)

this sounds like it will increase costs (vets to provide, someone in Animal Control to maintain)
The burden should be on the owner to provide that information, not the veterinarian. The city has no right to enslave someone for something that is not their property

Does this mean added paperwork for veterinary offices? If a dog already has the rabies tag on their collar, why would you need to look at paperwork? Animal control could request documents for a dog that does not have a tag. Could this be information that is added to microchips?

I have been practicing veterinary medicine for nearly 40 years. In the 1970s it was commonplace for veterinarians to provide the county with copies of rabies certificates so that Animal Control could enforce licensing requirements. Often this included a fine. Pet owners resent this. Furthermore, it appears to clients that veterinarians are colluding with Animal Control, which creates an adversarial relationship between veterinarian and client. If clients are aware that vaccinating their pet for rabies obligates them to license their pet, it is possible that less pets will be vaccinated; this leads to all sorts of problems, including more animals having to be quarantined after a bite incident, more animals having to be examined post-mortem for rabies, not to mention the potential for an increase in the incidence of rabies. I wholeheartedly support Animal Control and encourage pet owners to license their dogs to support all the services Animal Control provides, but requiring veterinarians to provide the city with vaccination records is a proven means of alienating clients from seeking necessary and appropriate veterinary care.

I'm not sure what the effects of this would be.

I'm unclear as to why this burden should be on veterinarians. The burden should be on the animal owner to ensure the animal is properly vaccinated by any licensed veterinarian and to provide certification to that effect when required. If the intent is to force Sunnyvale animals to be vaccinated by Sunnyvale veterinarians, that is unrealistic since just like human doctors, veterinarians vary widely and the best option for an animal may be a veterinarian in a neighboring municipality.

Yes. Please make sure that it's an easy process for busy veterinarians.

Caveat - without microchips to help ID pets, I'm not sure this is useful, since many animals running around not vaccinated are probably not chipped as well.

I'm not sure about adding this overhead to veterinarians. I think the pet owner should do this with the licensing.

Don't understand the ramifications of doing or not doing this

I support the concept of controlled immunization against rabies. However, I am not sure that requiring veterinarians to provide such proof of immunization to the municipality will accomplish the intended objective. I think a more effective method of rabies control is municipality hosting some periodic public event to educate pet owners on importance of immunization, and making immunization more convenient for pet owners. An example of a periodic event is 'Pets in the Park Day' where local veterinarians, breeders and pet daycare business owners set up booths and promote their services. Too burdensome for vets.

Get real. It is an unfair burden to make vets become policeman for the city. Plus many residents take their pets to vets located outside the city

Other cities in the area apparently do this already.

Indoor only pets should not be reported by vets, that may cause people with multiple indoor dogs to not vaccinate if they have more than the city allows.

The dog owner when licensing the dog has to provide the immunization records.

My pets have their shots up to date, but my vet is not in Sunnyvale. I don't want a vet in Sunnyvale, nor to be "bad" because I don't....

If the goal is to ensure pets are immunized/licensed, then Sunnyvale pet owners should have the responsibility to register their pets with the city, not the veterinarians.

What would Animal Control then expect to do with that information? What they REALLY need is a list of the unvaccinated animals.

Will this create an extra fee from client and an extra burden and cost for the vet?

If an offending biting dog injures any person or animal, proof of immunization shall be required and same applies to loose dogs. No comply = \$500 fine.

I'd lean in the other direction to report those who are not vaccinated, but I will defer to the people who are more aware of the issues here.

There are pet owners in Sunnyvale who use vet services outside of Sunnyvale or who never take their pet to a vet. A better approach might be to have the pet owner provide that immunization record. For dogs, the dog's collar should hold a current rabies vaccination information tag.

Is this even a problem in Sunnyvale? Why burden vets with paperwork?

In theory, yes however to what extent would that be beneficial? Perhaps requiring vets provide access to certificates on demanday be helpful. Many people do not see vets within their own city. Sunnyvale would potentially be collecting data on non residents.

Most people do not know they're supposed t license their dog in the city of Sunnyvale

Seems like a lot to ask of the vets. They are likely to treat animals who don't live in Sunnyvale and pet owners in Sunnyvale are likely to have vets outside of Sunnyvale. I would put he burden of proof on the pet owner, not the Vet.

Underwhelming though because of the nature of Sunnyvale as a small town in a large metropolitan area where people are moving in and out a ton and go to vets not in Sunnyvale itself. Also, I worry that someone will start to think this is a good idea for cats (It is a bad idea for cats).

What is the reasoning for this? It should not have to be provided unless it is needed for a dog or cat bite incident.

I don't know how onerous this would be for vets.

If Dogs are properly tagged, this is unnecessary

Yes , but I worry - vets would be required to consistently update every time a pet gets their rabies? I could see them objecting. I think perhaps a simply website so vet staff could easily update without a lot of hassle, otherwise vets would not want to take on a repetitive task

If it was ALL dog breeds and not just put bulls, sure

Is Animal Control based on the city? We live in Sunnyvale and our vet is in Cupertino as we live on the border. Unless Animal Control is a state-wide organization, I'd have to say no.

If the person does not register their animal, will the presence of a rabies certificate trigger a follow-up? Does this mean more work for administration?

Not useful at the city level. Database at the state level or maintained by an association of veterinarians would work. Our vet is out of city.

Comments: (Do you support the following regulations in designated off leash dog parks? (check all that apply):

I support the idea so long as the only cost is enforcement when someone doesn't comply, not monitoring.

Off leash dogs must be supervised closely to prevent children and other dogs from being mauled.

No unattended children should be in a dog park, dogs asked to leave by majority of park should do so, dogs who have not been neutered should not be onsite, puppies who have not received all vaccinations not allowed, Dogs should wear collars, dogs must be under supervision at all times

How many people are bringing non-stop to dog parks? Seems odd to write that into law. Dog walkers should be able to bring their charges to the dog park, even if its more than two. And, if the legal number of dogs per household is four, you can't then limit two at the park, that's dumb. A child should be able to learn the responsibility of looking after another being. It should be phrased, persons under age 13 must be accompanied by an adult.

No person shall have more than two dogs at the park' is an unreasonable code

Seen some young kids who are a hell of a lot more responsible than some adults

I generally agree with the under 13 rule, but I think an exception for a single dog that is under say 25 lbs. (or maybe 20) would be fine.

I think the two-dog limit is too restrictive. I know many people who work with dogs who regularly bring 3-4 dogs to a dog park to train and work them, and they are easily able to keep all the dogs under control. Maybe 3 is a good compromise number, as this would prevent dog walkers who don't necessarily have great obedience from their client-dogs from bringing them all to the park at once.

If a responsible 12-year-old is in charge of dogs, I don't have a problem with that; make sure their parent or guardian has incentive to be sure the kid is responsible. Similarly, I'd rather have someone with four well-trained dogs off leash than one badly-trained one. If we don't already have free resources for helping people train their dogs, I would support subsidizing our local humane societies to offer some, and empower community service officers to reach out to folks to encourage them to use those resources.

Given that problems can happen with dogs at any time, even with all adults watching them, I don't see an issue with mature 12-13 year olds.

None

Dog walkers are important life balance aides and should be able to bring more than two dogs into an off leash dog park. Any person under the age of 13 should be in charge of only one dog which should not weigh more than the under 13 person

Especially the last. A pitbull was in the care of roughly 10-year-old a few years ago. I complained to SVPD and was told that "pitbulls are good animals."

Perhaps the age limit for being in charge of dogs can be lowered to 9 years old?

All dogs must be neutered or spayed before entry-those dogs are the ones causing problems at the dog parks- we stopped going.

Depends somewhat on size of dogs - a child with a big dog is more of a problem than a child with a small dog - go by weight.

Since I have never been to such a park, I hesitate to comment further.

A one dog limit would be better

Do we have a problem with this now?

For the safety of all ,being vaccinated makes sense. All dogs should be required to be licensed anyway, so that's a given. The other measures seems unnecessary. The age limit seems arbitrary and should depend on the maturity of the child and the size/temperament of the dog.

Not sure about the age requirement. Look at behavior instead. Adults can misbehave worse than youngsters.

All dog parks should have divided sections for small and large dogs. Adult should be in enclosed area with dogs assuming direct supervision.

Maybe children under 10?

Professional dog walkers can have far better control over their dogs than a dog owner. So, a limitation of 2 dogs per adult/adolescent puts the onus on the wrong person, I think.

Age limitations are too arbitrary.

Again, these are all reasonable given the fact that our parks are for HUMANS first and Dogs SeCoND.
And

if you allow up to 4 dogs per household I don't see how you can limit the dog park to only 2 dogs/person.

Pigs should be included. All animals should be vaccinated

I would say no person should have more than 3 dogs

There are no designated off leash parks - why is this even on here?

I also support off leash hours at non-dog parks.

I would limit it to 3 dogs, and to age 12. But if those changes are not acceptable, then I would still vote Yes on the limitations as listed.

Unescorted children obviously under age of 13 sometimes enter Las Palmas dog park when they do not have a dog. Sometimes we owners get distracted and miss what one dog does.

Do something about the groups of people with dogs off leash that meet at Ponderosa school.

Simple regulation. Dog owners must be able to maintain control of the dogs. Eg. bring in 6 - fail. 100 lbs woman with an uncontrollable Great Pyrenees - fail. 10 year old with a well behaved beagle - pass.

Comments: (Do you support broadening the section addressing nuisances by noisy dogs to nuisances by noisy animals (e.g. parrots)?)

seem fair it applies to all noisy animals

Cats fighting can be worse. What about chickens?

Freedon

Yes, but there does have to be some allowance for birds which do NEED to actually make SOME noise as their normal expression. Not fair to require them to be covered all day, so do think there has to be some decibal level or something like that for birds.

Need more specific details on this

Why are most of the city animal codes singling out dogs?

I think it's going to be hard to get the wild parrots to be quiet. How are you addressing this? Will it result in enhanced better treatment of the pet?

And we should make it easier to deal with noisy dogs. Shouldn't require months complaint logging.

This just punishes animals for existing in city limits

How do you stop a bird from squawking.

Address the nuicance of loud music and exhaust pipes. Leav the animals alone.

I don't know what the nuisance ordinance currently states

Don't know enough about it.

less govt regulation is always preferred!

It should include any animals, such as chickens.

Rules should be consistent.

The noisy dog situation is out of control. The way the municipal code is written, a dog could bark off and on all day long and nothing would happen, even if that dog was reported. With animals like parrots and cockatoos, it would be the same.

But our feral parrot population has to be immune to this like the wild geese & ducks.

Are there laws about noisy dogs? Wish I had known that when I had a next door dog who barked and howled all day!

Dogs also make noise when they are happy and playing. Some judgement on the part of the Bylaw officer is needed.

There needs to be better enforcement of the current regulation. We had an issue with a neighbor's dog barking at all hours of the day or night and it went on for years, despite being reported.

parrots can be as noisy as dogs when they get going

A neighbor has three dogs which often bark for extended periods. The owners rarely do anything to quiet their dogs. I would like to see such circumstances addressed.

How will the parrots be quieted - little gags? And who will put them on? Please publish the date and time, I want to come watch. Oh, wait, maybe install a cannon to be fired routinely to scare the birds away. Perfect.

Noise is noise regardless of its source. No need to discriminate against dogs in particular.

I've almost called the city several times because my neighbors have noisy parrots and when they keep them in the room closest to my house it's like they're living with me! I often squawk back and they get the message.

Is this really a problem, given that Sunnyvale has many wild parrot flocks?

The noise ordinance in Sunnyvale is already difficult to interpret for field officers. Defining a nuisance for animals will need to be carefully crafted. This needs to be approached with reason.

As long as we do not go hunting for wild animals.

Except for the wild parrot flock I am aware of, is this an issue for someone?

Cockatoos in backyard aviaries can be extremely loud. Indoor birds can be kept quiet by covering the cage or moving them to an unlit room at night.

We have a neighborhood dog who barks excessively and has for years.

We have wild parrots too in this city, and black birds, woodpeckers, etc... Wild life is noisy so make sure that it's really a pet that's the problem. However, to your point, I think if you have a pet parrot in a household and its is way too loud over a very extended time, that's a nuisance. I'm just not sure about what things you can do about it.

People are just getting too sensitive. Close your windows. The city is just setting itself up for increased nuisance complaints between neighbors. We have wild parrots in the city and Canada geese. They all make noise. Next thing, people will demand that school yards are quiet because they don't like the noise children make.

This would not be about any of the wild parrots, right? I would not want animal control to kill/trap the wild parrots using this as an excuse. Other than that, sure. soundproofing your home might be a consequence of having a loud animal. How much of a problem is this?

Please work with some parrot experts on this; there is a certain amount of noise that parrots make as part of expressing themselves, but too much is a sign that they need better care. Also note that we have a wild parrot population here and we should think carefully about how an ordinance would interact with those.

I love our sunnyvale parrots - they are loud but fun!

I have neighbors that keep multiple barnyard animals in their backyard that are noiser than dogs so I support the expansion of the rule to other animals.

I have neighbors that keep multiple barnyard animals in their backyard that are noiser than dogs so I support the expansion of the rule to other animals.

Maybe. Is this really a common problem? What other pets might fall in this category?

Send your dog to school to learn manners & parrots should not be allowed in aptmnts they are noisey & dirty if you dont clean up after them.

The current noise nuisance ordinance about dogs is not enforced. There is little purpose to expanding this section unless it is going to be enforced by city officials.

These noise ordinances should be addressed by HOA's and Apartment Complexes themselves and should not be a responsibility of the city

Holy crap. Guess what... Dogs Bark. It's what they do. Now, if you could help me with the bratty kids that live behind us, or the other ones that throw parties all the time, I'd love help there. Or the ones behind us that did construction from 8 am till 7 pm Monday through Sunday for 6 weeks. .

Noise nuisance is SO subjective its annoying. If a neighbor does not like non-human animals they are going to complain regardless of if there is a noise issue or not. Humans are far more noisy and are allowed to get away with it.

Not all animals are equally as trainable as the dog.

“Coming to nuisance” should be the guiding principle

Comments: (Do you support requiring a dog to be spayed or neutered in order for a senior (65 and older) to qualify for a free dog license?)

what if a grandchild wants offspring of their grandparents pet?

See earlier comment on breeding

Age discrimination

Absolutely

Actually for any age.

Exception only if the dog is a senior and/or cannot undergo surgical operations.

Anyone that has their pet spayed or neutered should qualify for free license.

All animals should be spayed/neutered.

Spay/neuter makes sense but what if owner can't afford

Reimburse seniors with low income

this would be discrimination

Way too much regulation?

I would also suggest offering free/low cost spay neuter access for seniors.

No handouts for seniors! Why should a senior get a free dog license when I have to pay? Most seniors don't even pay their fair share of property taxes.

My main question is how someone came up with the age of 65. It makes sense to limit any family to one free dog license, depending on their household income. "Free" should be based on ability to pay, not age.

Yes if the city provides a voucher for free spay or neuter as they can not afford it themselves in many cases

yes obviously

Unless the spay or neutering is provided free of cost to Seniors on limited incomes!

When did we start putting dog licenses on seniors?

I honestly do not know what is the intent of this restriction. Seems like one free year of licensing should be available to anyone who spays/neuters their pet.

Many seniors can benefit from owning an animal and should get a break.

Absolutely!!! Great idea.

Seems discriminatory. If your really worried about overflowing shelters give everyone a free or discounted license for having a neutered. Or free the first time.

Seniors who are hobby breeders can pay for the license if they can afford this hobby, which should pay for itself in puppy sales or stud fees.

How much of a problem is this?

I believe all animals be spayed or neutered.

The breeding of pets is a personal choice and possibly a side business.

But grandfather in pets already owned that aren't fixed if they are older.

Will the city pay for the neuter surgery for seniors

I believe all domestic animals should be spayed and neutered. However if you are forcing a senior to license their dog then you should provide some financial incentive to help them fix their animal.

With free spay and neuter clinics

There are sometimes medical reasons a dog should not be fixed, like if the dog is elderly or has a heart condition that makes anesthesia dangerous. I'm supportive of this idea in concept but there should be allowed exceptions.

There are can be medical reasons that make it unwise to spay or neuter some dogs but the free license should prohibit a dog from breeding.

As long as the cost to spay or neuter can be paid for by the city or others in cases where the senior does not have the money to do so I do support this. But, if the senior cannot afford to spay or neuter, and we know animals are great for seniors (and people in general) then I'd hate to see a senior be unable to get a dog due to lack of funds for spaying etc.

This has to be the dumbest Survey I've ever filled out. Yes, punish a senior. Perfect. one of my dogs wasn't feeling well. I took him to Emergency. It cost me \$3000 for them to tell me my dog was getting old. Oh, Thank you. Got it. Why not help take down the cost so people can afford to take in animals that need homes.

Do the seniors have to pay for the procedure? Doesn't that negate the point?

No one should get a free dog license. Everyone should be treated equally before the law and pay the same amount.

the animal may rarely go outside and then is unlikely to breed

Comments: (Do you support prohibiting roosters over four months old? (Roosters often begin to crow around this age.)

None in my area to complain about.

why? Roosters are better than sirens waking us up.

That's kind of a tough one I hate so many freaking lies but I can see that it would be more than a nuisance

Absolutely

Seems more like prohibitions chickens is the answer to that. You need a rooster for your hens.
Depends on the size of the lot

I don't mind roosters crowing, but may think differently if they were crowing next door to me

I love the sound of roosters

This question misspells the word roosters "Rooters often begin to crow..."

Just prohibit crowing roosters.

This should be addressed with a noise provision.

There are devices that can be used to significantly decrease the volume and frequency of crowing roosters. If that was used, I believe that roosters should be allowed.

Depends on the noise impact and new rules mentioned above.

It's disturbing the peace. Ditto for peacocks. And their voices could pierce eardrums blocks away. The main problem with roosters is that they can be abused by owners who put them into fights.

Only in closer residential areas where it's an issue.

Rooters? Rooters? I'm sure your author meant R O O S T E R S, eh?

But I know of owners who keep rooster confined until mid morning, so if could be kept without nuisance, that would be OK.

Rooters?

Wouldn't this already be covered under the "noisy animals" section?

there's no excuse for anyone to have a rooster around here, are you kidding

In cities yes / Outside City Limits NO!

Most sensible suggestion yet, even with the typo. Again, though, focus on the behavior - if it crows, it goes, even if it just hatched.

This might be reasonable, but it might make sense to have a process for allowing owners to apply for an exception.

Roosters belong on a farm out in the open space not in the city.

Even clucking hens can make annoying noises, when a neighbor has the windows open and is trying to sleep. Roosters should not be allowed in areas with small yards and close living quarters, like Sunnyvale. The smell from chickens can be unbearable when cages are not cleaned often enough. People with

chickens should be subject to random inspections to ensure that neighbors are not adversely effected by smells or noises.

If the roosters aren't bothering anyone, who cares?

This could allow for 4H or Vets or other exceptions.

Why not prohibit the crowing noise itself rather than the secondary fact. Can older roosters be silenced?

If anyone opposes this, tell them to take a vacation to Kauai and try to sleep at night.

I would do something only if people complain.

Fortunately we don't have this problem in my immediate neighborhood but I've experienced this problem elsewhere. Wouldn't like roosters next door!

In city limits, yes. We chose not to purchase a house near the Mercado Theater because a neighbor had chickens with a rooster and several loud dogs.

We live in an environment surrounded by noise. Cars, planes, emergency vehicles. I welcome the sound of something natural

If annoying. People can complain via noise ordinance

I am more likely to support this under the nuisances by noisy animals.

But, if crowing bothers neighbors, some noise abatement solution needs to be deployed

Generally, I support the idea of backyard chickens, but SVL is too densely populated for that to work everywhere in the city.

If the noise ordinance goes in - the costs of the rooster crowing (fees) might just resolve the issue. How many people have roosters in the city?

I recommend that the prohibition be in the form of the amount of distance between the coop / yard and the neighbors who might be awakened by the crowing, rather than a blanket prohibition. If someone manages to find enough space that they aren't actually bothering anyone, it shouldn't be a problem.

Would be helpful to include a grace period for rehoming/disposing of roosters as they make themselves known

If the city is going to impose limitations of this type, the city must also put measures in place to deal with animals abandoned because of the limitation. As recently as this past winter I was told by Sunnyvale and Santa Clara county animal control that no entity would spend resources on a rooster that had been abandoned at the Sunnyvale Baylands park.

I support this if the rooster crows, but if it doesn't then I don't see a problem.

I support this if the rooster crows, but if it doesn't then I don't see a problem.

I think this is covered by noisy animals so may no longer be needed.

They are wild animals & should not be allowed in the city limits.

depends on the neighborhood and property area of the person occupying the property.

If someone has a rooster, what are they supposed to do with it at four months? Either they are allowed or not.

The only considerations on a per case basis should be whether the animals constitute a health or nuisance problem to others, thus violating their rights, regardless of the animal

Comments: (Do you support prohibiting livestock (e.g. horses, goats, pigs, sheep) in residential zoning districts?)

each person owns various size property, why restrict a multimillion dollar properties use?

But space must be reasonable and system of waste disposal set up eg. odorless digester with methane capture.

Crazy! I've seen a pet pig on a walk near Las Palmas Park; horses have been used as therapy... To me, livestock implies farming, i.e. raising for resale or work, not therapy.

We are too too urban

Absolutely

I believe the animal waste could pose a potential health hazard

Consider exception for 4-H & FFA

As long as the animals are pets and not grown for food/slaughter.

Goats pigs and sheep are already prohibited. Exception maybe for a miniature horses for disabled.

Depends on quantity kept and condition...

As long as they are properly managed by animal husbandry standards, let us have some enjoyment of them.

This is a tough one. I have a neighbor who has two emotional support ponies. She and these ponies are beloved members of our community. Initially I was really surprised she was allowed to keep them in her back yard. And I have heard that the neighbors are bothered with a lot of flies. So I am conflicted on this one.

i love animals. it would be fun

2 livestock allowed.

Would this impact any existing situations?

Pigs for example can be clean and quiet & smart pets both inside and outside of the house. I would hope that they would be allowed.

What's the precise definition of "livestock" here?

These animals have no place in residential areas. I realize that some people have smallish pet pigs, but these are not "livestock."

It depends on whether they are well cared for and have space. I'm fine regulating it if we let people petition for exceptions.

Animals need proper amount of space.

I support prohibiting ALL such animals within the City of Sunnyvale.

Goats & pigs are good pets & are as smart as dogs.

Miniature horses OK?

It would depend on the animal, size, and quantity. It would also depend On the size of the yard them on space for their pen and how many other animals they have on the property example dogs cats small animals like chickens and rabbits.

the kind of people who think urban farming is cute are always the most entitled, least responsible twits in the world

I would allow certain miniature animals (pigs, goats, etc.) smaller than a large dog..

Move to the country and buy a farm if you want the smells noise and flies that go with these. As your neighbor, I don't care to share.

Rather than a prohibition, it might be more reasonable to establish sensible space, shelter and other requirements depending on the species. It could be that sensible requirements would effectively create a prohibition.

Wouldn't it be fun to have a goat in the back yard to mow your lawn? - LOLor just to have as a pet. They are fun to watch.

Not a blanket prohibition

Maybe full sized horses. But some people have support animals like mini horses. Some individual livestock make fine pets like mini pigs or goats. Dint prohibited these outright but develop good guidelines and a discretionary permit process for some flexibility.

Can you quantify the specs for a residential zoning district? Maybe some of the lots are large enough or isolated enough to support those animals.

If you have the space, you should be able to keep miniature livestock.

Prohibiting seems like overreach.

After growing up on a farm, I know animals need lots of room and most residential lots aren't large enough.

Miniature pigs would be acceptable as pets.

There should be no livestock in residential areas.

Any restrictions should exclude support animals that are documented to be certified support animals. Other small livestock should be considered carefully. Some people have mini-pigs. Restrictions should be related to the animals size and the size of the homeowners lot.

Miniature horses are recognized by the federal government as independent living animals. As such, you cannot prohibit them.

Pigs should be allowed as pets.

As long as clean. It's ok. We are losing our contact with nature on Sunnyvale

I am more likely to support limitation to size of livestock.

There should be a lot size requirement for keeping such animals

While livestock is important for the health of soil and carbon sequestering, SVL is too densely populated for these animals to live well in the city.

I know someone who has a small pig, so it would be hard for me to say prohibit all of them.

Most lots are small and large livestock need a certain square footage of pasture so most of Sunnyvale is too packed to do this. However, miniature animals need far less room. So, it's more about the animal and the size of lots. Also, the animals (usually goats) that you can rent to eat your grass should be allowed for the day or two for the work.

I'd like to see the rule phrased in terms of animal density, square footage, and distance to the neighbors to avoid noise and smell being an issue. I'm always delighted to see Goat-R-Us helping to trim the grass outside the SMaRT Station, and I don't want to have a blanket forbiddance that would prevent someone from doing something neighborly and clever along those lines.

I answered "I don't know" because I know that there are breeds of pigs that are small and can easily live indoors like dogs. I think larger livestock should be prohibited, definitely.

They belong in the country not in the city limits.

I generally support it, but if it's a home with enough space, and a single goat, sheep, etc. this should be allowed.

I can have a pony?!

Really? Who in our over condensed area can even fit a horse?

This is another matter of looking at space and size of creature. The amount of space a horse needs is not the same as a goat. Would all pigs be considered "livestock"? Pigs that are slaughtered are very different from say a potbelly.

The only considerations on a per case basis should be whether the animals constitute a health or nuisance problem to others, thus violating their rights, regardless of the type of animal

Comments: (Do you support limiting the number of small animals (e.g. rabbits, chickens) to no more than six per household?)

Exception again if they are egg layers and they are well cared for.

property size should be the determining factor.

I guess that would mean parakeets, too, which some people breed commercially at home.

It depends on your property and the proximity to others I don't like lies for the sake of freaking lies

Absolutely

Depends on the distance to the nearest neighbor. Larger properties should be allowed more.

Consider exception for 4-H & FFA

As long as the animals are pets and not grown for food/slaughter.

Really depends on so many factors. Not every person or dwelling is subject to the same circumstances

For example, 10 mice or hamsters would be no problem.

Wait how is this different than cats and dogs? Should it be the same? Are these pet rabbits? Surely we don't allow breeding rabbits for food in town.

6 is a pretty high number. I'm afraid to ask what it was before.

Why does anyone care?

Fish should be exempted though.

less govt regulation is always preferred!

With the caveat that owners may register their existing pets prior to effective date and given an exception. This would avoid animals being dumped

Too vague.

Rabbits should be treated like cats: kept indoors, played with outside in protected areas. Please contact The Rabbit Haven's director, Heather Bechtel, for assistance. Chickens are kept as food, either to be slaughtered or to produce eggs. They are not pets. So, the number limit of 6 should be based on the use of chickens as food producers.

With exceptions allowed by permit.

yes but: broods happen & you'll get more than 6. So no real punishment other than to ask to bring the count down "as soon as reasonable"

I would NOT support keeping of animals (maximum of two) unless the property holder/cleans their space daily and no smells/noises therefrom offend ANY neighbors.

Small animals like mice or rats are sociable (need companions), but live QUIETLY together indoors. Add a couple of other standard pets and it would be easy to go over the limit of 6. Seems like whether you are causing nuisance or noise is the problem; not arbitrary numbers.

It would be better to have regulations concerning the care of animals rather than the number of animals

Four is better, two is even better than that.

Seems hard to enforce

Perhaps a limit based on lot size might be more flexible.

I would make the limit even lower, like 3 or 4. If people want to have a menagerie, they should move to the country, where they can be far away from neighbors.

I support this because in some areas of the city houses are pretty close together. Even with this, guidelines in care and noise are important. Not sure chickens are as loud as parrots but they can be early risers. Also consider smell and fly's and that other pests like rats can be attracted to outdoor pet areas.

I think this really depends on how much land one household has. Some people can care well for many pets, others cannot.

Depends on the residential area and proximity of neighbors.

Kids should be able to raise these for 4H.

Would support a lower number such as four per household

Should be reduced to 2 or 4.

This should be by sq ft, not per household.

What is the size limit? What about hamsters, pet rats, gerbils, etc.

Be specific - for what purpose? What sized lots? There are some large lots that you could have oodles of animals without crowding and not have neighbors complaining about manure smells. After growing up on a farm (in another state), I'd say, if folks want to use their back yard for having rabbits or chickens as

pets (or for chicken eggs) - likely six would be enough. But, as food (you could go through a lot more if you have a large family.) Owners just need to know how to keep things clean to avoid rats.

In cities one will need to live with some restriction and obey, obey law and order to keep the city safe.

I am more likely to support limitations of the summed, total size (weight) of household pets.

What problem are we trying to prevent? Is there someplace else for them to go?

There should be a lot size requirement for keeping such animals

This should really be determined by the owner's space. Rabbits as indoor pets or living outdoor for resale/food? More questions need to be answered.

I think 10 and under would be OK.

You could easily have a couple of rabbits and several chickens with a pretty small footprint. If there are people trying to live off the eggs and rabbit meat, this is probably not a common issue and, as long as they are dealing with the manure in a responsible manner (which helps to reduce rats), this should not be a health issue.

I'd like to see some studies on animal health, humane treatment, and disturbance of the neighbors relative to pet density before picking a number here.

This seems very restrictive for small animals such as rabbits (mice, hamsters, doves?). Assuming animal welfare and consideration for neighbors are key concerns, looking at space per animal makes more sense. For example, bantam chickens require only a third of the space needed for standard chickens, so a small coop might comfortably house 3 standard hens or 9 bantam hens.

For people who have never kept small animals, six may seem like a large number; however, I currently have three chickens and could easily imagine having 6 or 8. Six seems too restrictive, especially for a house with a larger yard. I would suggest 8 as a better number.

Small vegetarian animals can provide eggs, meat, and fertilizer for gardens. I would prefer a maximum of 12 per household but want to make sure there is adequate space for these small animals so depends on the size of the property.

It depends on the size of their enclosure. I wouldn't think it would be a good idea to have more than 6 rabbits in a house, but it would be OK to have more than 6 chickens if the coop is large enough and they are able to roam freely within a contained area.

They also should not be in the city limits. Bunnies are cute & chew walls, carpets etc if left out of their cages. Chickens can attract rats, mice, roaches.,

If they can take care of them and clean up after them, then they should have as many as they want.

Why would I care if they had 100 rabbits? As long as they take care of their animals... Good for them.

Same issue as mentioned before, size of "household" should determine number of residents.

number should be based on zoning and not by household (single family house on large lot may be able to accommodate more, multi-family units (e.g., condo) need to be much less)

6 of one type, yes. 2 of each, not really. I grew up with lots of animals in a residential area and it helped me become a more informed and compassionate animal owner later in life.

The only considerations on a per case basis should be whether the animals constitute a health or nuisance problem to others, thus violating their rights, regardless of the quantity

Comments: (Do you support prohibiting small animals within 20 feet of any inhabitable dwelling unit, other than that of the owner or custodian?)

This is too vague for me to comment on - also unsure how this would be enforced.

some of these small yards do not have that distance but there is no reason they cant have rabbits or chickens. its good for children and adults, don't punish the poor.

I don't understand this one. If the animal is in my back yard, that can easily be within 20 feet of my neighbor.

In other words a person's cat can't leave their own yard?

A family's pet rabbit used to get out of the house and roam neighboring front yards; I did not have a concern. Would be concerned if feces pile up and/or stink.

As long as there's some exceptions for grandfathering in existing situations. With the explosive growth of houses that sit so close to the property line, I wouldn't want anyone to get caught out. Also, I would require that the inhabitable dwelling unit be up to existing codes.

Too many rules this survey is beginning to annoying me

Can't answer this, not sure what this means. What about condo's, attached dwellings? What do you mean by small? This question is just not clear enough.

This question isn't clear enough to answer. What is the purpose?

Allergies, noise and other nuisances (smell, flies, etc)...

Why

Animal itself is ok within 20 feet - should not be permitted to urinate or defecate in front of dwelling other than owner

Can you draw a picture?

There are feral cats... so that doesn't seem enforceable, but I'd like to see people keep kitties inside so they are healthier and safe, and don't harass my kitty.

let the owners use their land as they see fit. This is further urbanization to the detriment of current residents,

It should be that an inhabitable dwelling is more than 20 feet from the property line but in our neighborhood there are a lot of pre-existing garages that have been converted to un-permitted ADU's that are right up against the property line. They would be within 20' of a place we have previously had a small animal, rabbit, hutch.

That 20-feet thing pretty much eliminates having small animals for the majority of the city. What's the point? This is too restrictive.

less govt regulation is always preferred!

I support prohibiting or rectifying a nuisance.

Not if the dwelling unit encroaches on the 20' rear setback.

Is this really a problem?

What does this regulation mean? Our house is not 20 feet away from our neighbors' houses. Are we forbidden to have our guinea pigs??

What does that even mean?

Not just small animals. Large dogs should not be allowed within 20 feet of someone's residence. They should be kept to the sidewalk or curb when they need to relieve themselves.

This implies: no dogs in apartments. That should be up to the apartment owner.

My fenced back yard is within 20 ft of 2 neighbor houses. I want no unleaded dog within 20 ft of me..one urinated on me.

I like the direction - If you're going to have an animal, be a good neighbor - but always worry about additional city permitting requirements being onerous in different situations.

What?

Pets should be able to free-range within your own yard.

I don't understand the question. Squirrels are small animals. Birds are small animals. And when I'm walking a small dog I can't get within 20 feet of the building?

YES

If you mean a coop, hutch, or pen, 50 feet is a better number. Need to resolve how this affects people with dog and cat doors.

Seems hard to enforce and may be in violation of property rights of owners of chattel

So, the intent is to prevent a homeowner from placing their animals near the edges of their yards and annoying their neighbors? A prohibition seems rather drastic and assumes proximity is the primary cause. Perhaps there should just be a requirement for potential owners to notify immediate neighbors before they get the animals, so they can work out any potential issues.

I don't understand this question.

How is this practical? Sidewalks are sometimes less than 20 feet from homes.

20 feet from the property line not the adjacent house. Keep in mind this would prevent anyone in a town home from having outdoor small pets.

We can't figure out what this means.

Fish are small animals.

I don't know if I completely understand this question; however, I agree that small animals shouldn't be allowed to roam or be kept within 20 feet of a dwelling that doesn't belong to the owner or custodian.

I don't know if I completely understand this question; however, I agree that small animals shouldn't be allowed to roam or be kept within 20 feet of a dwelling that doesn't belong to the owner or custodian.

cats dogs in a ackyard??

This question is too vague. What constitutes a small animal? Just walking with your dog on the sidewalk would be within 20 feet of my house.

I am thinking of cats and dogs here. Previously I was a long-time cat owner, and learned that, for the benefit of wild birds as well as the animal itself, they are best kept indoors. And definitely dogs need to be on leash.

Yards are small in Sunnyvale, this would make it harder to have backyard aviary, rabbit hutch, chicken coops, etc.

What problem does that solve?

I don't think anyone could even walk their animals in thier own back yards or inside thier house - given granny units and placement of other people's homes on their lots so near the side fences. We don't have much space so this is not feasible.

The residents/owner of affected dwelling units should be able to waive this restriction (as current Sunnyvale code indicates for livestock such as chickens)

Given the housing density, there are very few dwellings that could have a small animal (chickens, rabbits, dogs, cats, birds, etc.). If the building code setbacks are good enough for buildings then they should be good enough for small animals. Small animal housing units should not be within the setback area between dwellings. The city is setting itself up for a lot of complaints. If my cat or dog, is within 20 feet from my neighbor's house (even if it is in my own backyard), it is crazy to set up a situation for the neighbor to complain unless there is a noise or smell issue.

I don't think this is enforceable. I think the this can be covered with the nuisance regulations.

I might support it if I knew what it was for.

Parcels are often too small to allow a 20 ft distance

What problem is this restriction addressing?

With 50 x 100' lots and people building so close to the fences - this would make it almost impossible to have small animals.

What does this mean? My backyard pond is within 20 feet of the house, and the fish there attract herons, egrets, and hawks, as well as smaller birds coming to bathe in the waterfall. If our usual red-

shouldered hawk decides to nest in one of my trees and scare the squirrels away from my fruit trees, I certainly don't want her prohibited!

hard to do with the setbacks we have. this would eliminate any small animals...

Way too restrictive. This would essentially prohibit small animals for a great many households. The deepest point in our yard is 20' to the fence, with the neighbors' house immediately on the other side.

This is very restrictive. With houses' proximity to each other, this would preclude many residents from owning small animals. Small animals should be allowed to freely roam in the entire yard. *IF* this were to become law, there should be a way for neighbors to consent to it somehow. Furthermore, for those residents who already have small animals, this creates a pretty big burden to them to comply (fencing, moving coops/hutches, etc.) and change of living conditions for their animals. Hypothetically, if someone kept their small animals in their house (e.g. an enclosed sunroom or even the house proper), and their house was within 20 feet of the neighbor's house (typical), the animals/owners would be in violation even if the animals were kept indoors.

If the animals are contained within the owner's property, that should be enough. They should be able to go wherever they want as long as they're contained safely in the owner's yard and not otherwise being a nuisance.

For most residents, this might mean their pets cannot go outside. We have a larger lot than most lots in Sunnyvale and our pet would be prohibited from even going out our living room door to the patio.

Not enough info to answer properly, but if you're talking homes with large yards then small animals could easily be beyond 20 feet, in the yard, and "close" to a neighbors house or yard. The important thing here is that they're not out of the yard imo, so arbitrary rules on distance don't seem to make that much sense.

Almost impossible for people who want chickens. I would prohibit chicken coops in requires side setback areas.

Need more detail on this topic

Huh? I'd be more concerned if someone (owner or custodian) are living in an inhabitable dwelling and have pets.

I do not understand this question. What is the point?

in many cases this would outright prohibit animals, also unclear how this this addresses wildlife (squirrel, opossum, skunk, etc)

Cats are creatures that wander. We have to learn to respect their nature in order to live peacefully with them. This type of law will just increase calls to Animal Control.

It is a property rights issue. The rights of the inhabitant and property owner must be protected by the government. Protecting individual rights is the only legitimate role of government.

hard to control except for dogs

Comments: (The current code requires a resident to exhibit their dog to an Animal Control officer as part of a dangerous or diseased animal investigation. Do you support broadening this section from exhibiting dogs only to any animal subject to an investigation?)

if humans have to cooperate, no reason an animal shouldn't.

Cats hide when they are stressed. They will freak out if you try to apply this to cats.

Stand down

Absolutely

Clarify exhibit.

Exception for animal welfare/abuse investigation

Is this not true already??!

At a reasonable time, with reasonable notice. No government trespassing!

What are you going to do if they have an outdoor cat? Arrest them if fluffy doesn't come home at the usual time? This needs to be more specific.

less govt regulation is always preferred!

How widespread is the problem?

Rules should be consistent.

This question is poorly stated and hard to understand. I support Animal Control investigations of potentially neglected animals.

Any animal in the case of dangerous or diseased animal investigation only.

I would extend this to incidents when someone has reported animal cruelty.

I own backyard chickens. With that, I accept responsibility to stop diseases that could devastate agriculture!

yes obviously

Sunnyvale should not be a sanctuary city for rabid hamsters, fugitive mountain lions and undocumented armadillos.

If there's a law that applies to dogs, it would make sense to have it apply to any animal. Again, no need to single out dogs.

Is this addressing an actual problem?

If a cat, ferret or other animal scratches or bites someone, this should be investigated.

Any animal that's part of an investigation needs to be made available, if possible.

This question doesn't make sense.

That depends on the meaning of "exhibit". I would prefer it not be "you need to drag your shy indoor-only cat out of the house because we're investigating all cats in the neighborhood". If you're letting your cat run around outdoors, then yes, you should take responsibility for the cat's actions.

Animal Control needs to have the power to, you know *control animals*, so this makes sense to me.

Send your dog to school so he will not be any danger to others or himself.

Would need to know what constitutes a "dangerous or diseased animal", so not enough info here to answer.

I wouldn't want Animal control having that much power. They are already pretty heartless.

My answer would be yes if by "any animal" you include humans. There are plenty of dangerous and diseased among that group.

The government must have cause and a warrant to search an individual's property, including animals

Overall Comments:

lifelong resident of Sunnyvale, who, while isn't financially poor, feels our city is constantly trying to find ways to impose on the poor. I don't want to sound like a San Francisco hippy, but we need to stop the gentrification.

Licensing needs to be simplified and automated. Most don't license because it's a pain to do.

Common sense is not always common...so guidelines and regulations are necessary.

I clean my dog's poop from our yard as soon as she goes or within 12 hours. I don't want my neighbors plagued by stink. They have dogs, too, and there is never stink from them, so I know they dispose of feces promptly, as well.

The policies, old and proposed, should have been laid out at the start of the survey.

I think we would all be better off if people cared properly for their animals without government intervention. Perhaps people need to be screened more before being able to own a pet.

Just wow

Chill with taking away individuals' rights and having severe restrictions.

I hope some of these questions, based on the first results, are asked again and clarified if a clear outcome is not obvious because a few are tricky to answer, not quite clear what is being asked. Thanks.

There should be harsher consequences for dog owners whose pets are off the leash on leash parks. My kids have been chased and knocked over too many times by dogs that are off the leash. Also, during baseball practices and games where the league has permits to be on the fields, dogs run onto the fields and the owners give us a hard time for being there.

Would have helped to have the specific details of these proposals listed at the front of this survey to read first for it to be more effective.

Pets are a pleasure and responsibility. I volunteer foster and animals need to be neutered.

I strongly support animal welfare.

Prohibit those with history of animal neglect or abuse from buying or adopting new animals.

I wish the city had a squirrel control ordinance in place or at least a policy which allowed trapping and killing of squirrels which are destructive to crop cultivation in home gardens.

Most people I know do not license their dogs due to the fee. Also, why must our dogs be licensed but cats do not? Cat owners are allowed to let their cats roam the neighborhoods off of leashes and into other people's yards hunting. When is the last time a cat owner picked up after their cat?

Should require cats to be licensed and spay/neutered also and microchipped.

It's important to also keep the lives of the pets in the forefront of our laws. There are way to many neglected and abused animals. It makes me sick to think of the way we allow animals to be treated. They really do have large emotional lives too. It's barbaric to think hurting an animal doesn't cause pain.

More dog parks will reduce a lot of these issues

Thanks for addressing this topic. There are many irresponsible pet owners.

Visit Las Palmas on any evening and start ticketing the owners with off leash dogs. I've seen many instances where dogs try to jump on walkers.

These rules sound difficult and costly to monitor and enforce and of little community value. Not where I want my taxes going.

One of the few remaining comforts of life is animal companionship.

There is already way to much regulation/restrictions in Sunnyvale. Most of which is not followed. Make it easier so people will follow.

There are off leash dogs in all parks in sunnyvale, not just in dog parks. I have been bitten by one. I support immediate ticketing of dog owners with off leash dogs who are not in a dog park.

All these animal laws are over reaching.

It is important to maintain the 3 dog limit. It is bad enough when owners have 3 poorly controlled dogs, and 4 makes the problems even worse!

The 20-foot rule negates the ownership of just about any small animal (or bees) for the majority of Sunnyvale residents. Not sure there's even a point to having the rule if you then negate it by stating no one can have them anyway because of property size. Maybe 20-feet in the back yard only as a rule? Not sure about this one.

less govt regulation is always preferred!

New rules should address noise, odor, etc. instead of placing arbitrary restrictions on residents.

Santa Clara Unified School District should be consulted, as they have a farm program. New laws may unduly burden their program.

I hope that Sunnyvale continues to allow its residents to keep and enjoy pets and small animals and perhaps discuss allowing some new ones like pigs in homes.

Not enough details; too much vague wording.

Animal control should not do house calls to animals with clean vaccination records.
Animal control should not charge owners for performing their own quarantines.
Frivolous reports should be prosecuted.

There are many complicated issues when it comes to people's pets! I encourage you to consult with experts, including but not limited to veterinarians, in coming up with adjustments to regulations for those who own and keep animals. I've mentioned Heather Bechtel at The Rabbit Haven (director@therabbithaven.org, (831) 600-7479 or (831) 239-7119) as an exceptionally knowledgeable resource about rabbits, for example. PLEASE contact her for consultation. Also, you can't have the same constraints for those in single-family dwellings as you have for people living in high-density housing such as owned condominiums and townhouses.

Aside: I find it humorous that people who are 66 years old are lumped together with people who are 95 years old when it comes to looking at age demographics, while there's something special about people who are between 60 and 65 years old such that they need a distinct categorization.

I think most people need more education about caring for animals than regulations, but I personally know more responsible pet owners than not. I am aware of more issues with wild animals like wood rats and coyotes that are harder to regulate. General licensing seems reasonable and responsible and if people don't want vaccinations or to spay/neuter they should pay a much higher (prohibitively) rate and be required to keep more control of their animals to protect others.

The questionnaire is awkwardly titled: "...changes to Title 6 – Animals of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code." It would be properly titled: "...changes to Title 6 of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code regarding Animals."

You could make the salary of a full time person to ticket unleashed dogs in parks...especially Las Palmas. Bg dogs should not be allowed to be owned by people in small apartments where they leave animals alone all day.

Dogs in day care (at a local pet store) are very unhappy creators. How kind is that to dogs...while on leash, owners hold big dogs a foot from their knees---while walking them in the park across from my house. Dogs now stop to talk to other dogs more than owners talk to adults. It is a robot territory with most adults on cell phons! One foot from almost eery baby buggy that is pushed by my front window. Tell people the dangers of cell phons near babies and children...20 countries ban/limit such action I schools and libraries. the coming 5G is damaging all around the world..Poland asks for a world ban on 5G...Belgum bans it. 5 towns in Marin are against it. Please tell the dangers of EMF around animals as walls children.

The city of Sunnyvale needs to put more restrictions on pets so that pet owners are more responsible for what their pets do.

this is a dense residential area with people trying to raise families and work hard and be productive in a fast paced, demanding economic setting. It's already hard to find a place to jog peacefully or take a

toddler where one won't be accosted by off-leash dogs. The last thing we need is more livestock around the place. You want livestock, move to the country. Don't make your weird hobbies into normal people's problem.

I think most of this is good; but, as always in a lot of cases is NOT going to fix any problem and in all cases WITHOUT RAISING TAXES: How is the city going to pay for all this added CONTROL! More people will be needed for all the added calls & complaints that this is going to bring in! So, ARE MY TAXES GOING TO GO UP???? If YES, then I DO NOT SUPPORT ANY OF THIS!!! It's all good stuff but SUNNYVALE, should be spending \$\$\$\$ on the issues that effect us all, that could pose a safety issue to residents! Most of this is just nuisance complaints not DANGEROUS SITUATIONS!!

Rules to report constantly barking dogs should not be prohibitive for filing complaints. Neighbor verification and recordings should not be needed for complaint to be filed and investigated.

I'd pay to see a 'best of' list of the responses to this survey, question by question. You could probably make the city some \$ by compiling and publishing it.

"Outdoor" cats are a problem that should be addressed. They defecate in others' yards which can spread various microbes (including toxoplasma which can affect pregnant women) and prey on native fauna. If not spayed/neutered, these cats can contribute to the problem of feral cats. If someone wants to keep a cat as a pet, that's fine, but it shouldn't affect the community and environment. Dogs are not allowed to roam at will, the same rule should apply to any predatory pet.

It really is all about responsible pet ownership. Pets are vital, and it would be great to make pet ownership cheaper and easier for the senior community.

Was hoping this law would also include stricter laws regarding animal abuse or mistreatment. Maybe another law does this?

You left out any discussion of beekeeping. Due to the increasing incidents of colony collapse disorder across the nation for honey bees and pollinating bees, beekeeping in urban areas is increasing. Sunnyvale is flying toward socialism. Too much government interference. Leave us alone.

There should be leash laws for cats--and laws prohibiting cats within 20 feet of any inhabitable dwelling unit, other than that of the owner or custodian. We are sick and tired of pet cats and feral cats coming into our yard. They kill wild birds and reptiles. They urinate and defecate. They howl and fight. Also, because we are also sick and tired of yellow/dead plants, how about a law prohibiting dogs from urinating on flowers, bushes and trees (on private property other than that of the owner or custodian)? And the large number of dogs that urinate on the decorative lamp posts in downtown Sunnyvale is disgusting (as well as damaging to the posts).

And is there any way to better enforce leash laws for dogs and educate pet owners to be more lawful and considerate? Seems to be a lot more people who will let their dog do anything. (Example: Dog pulls

on leash and barks at my walking-to-work husband. Owner leans over unhooks the leash. Dog runs to jump at my husband. Husband motions at large dog to stop and pulls out pepper spray. Dog owner is offended and tells my husband, "he only wants to smell you.")

There should be leash laws for cats--and laws prohibiting cats within 20 feet of any inhabitable dwelling unit, other than that of the owner or custodian. We are sick and tired of pet cats and feral cats coming into our yard. They kill wild birds and reptiles. They urinate and defecate. They howl and fight.

Also, because we are also sick and tired of yellow/dead plants, how about a law prohibiting dogs from urinating on flowers, bushes and trees (on private property other than that of the owner or custodian)? And the large number of dogs that urinate on the decorative lamp posts in downtown Sunnyvale is disgusting (as well as damaging to the posts).

And is there any way to better enforce leash laws for dogs and educate pet owners to be more lawful and considerate? Seems to be a lot more people who will let their dog do anything. (Example: Dog pulls on leash and barks at my walking-to-work husband. Owner leans over unhooks the leash. Dog runs to jump at my husband. Husband motions at large dog to stop and pulls out pepper spray. Dog owner is offended and tells my husband, "he only wants to smell you.")

enforce dog barking complaints

barking dogs is a huge problem. People don't always have their small dogs on a leash. And outdoor cats pooping in neighbors gardens is systemic. Why not strengthen these standards?

I love animals—pets as well as wild ones. I enjoy the very occasional possum we see in our yard, and all of the wild birds we see at our feeders. Both my wife and I had cats for many years.

Would be helpful to have a more complete description of the current law and changes attached/linked from the survey page.

I'm glad to see the City tightening the reigns on pet ownership with new guidelines and restrictions. Now if only drivers on our roads would stop driving distracted causing injury to pedestrians, bicyclists and other motorists!! TOO MANY PEOPLE DISTRACTED LOOKING AT CELL PHONES!
Dog excrement on the streets and sidewalks should result in fine for the owners

Raise the number of pets, please.

I not sure that the detailed care of dogs and cats needs to be codified - if the animal welfare/abuse/neglect laws are clear and presented.

I would like to keep the regulations minimum but effective and less burdensome to the city. I always wanted city to be fiscally conservative all the time. It's easier to go other direction because public wanted everything without paying for it. A responsible city will need to be fiscally conservative.

I got expert advice from my nephew who used to work at a bird rescue center. He is 40-49 years old.

This survey doesn't address my concerns that my house is considered a kennel if my daughters dogs or my friends/neighbors dogs come visit me. Other people's animals should not be counted as part of my household count, as it is currently written and enforced by animal control. Totally ridiculous that kennel is written as any structure containing more than 3 animals currently! This should be addressed in the new code.

If a dog daycare home is caring for several dogs daily, are those dogs counted as part of the owner's allotment?

I support updating and keeping current the Title 6 – Animals of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code to facilitate a healthy community. I do not support over regulating and burdening the public and public resources. Therefore, I support educating the public on 'community health' and 'pet ownership best practices' in 'open to the community' like events ("Pets in the Park" day events). Local veterinarians, breeders and pet daycare business owners are a great resource to provide such services to their community and a great way to advertise their business & services. Perhaps even discounts can be applied to their business licensing in exchange for their participation.

This survey should have been better written. I'm not sure how your going to capture the information you need with these questions.

Having a home business of dog sitting needs to be looked into in order to allow people to work and have their dogs taken care of.

How about stiffer penalties and more enforcement of dogs off leash at city and school fields during soccer and baseball games.

Stephen

The City should have guidelines for those that have a legit home business of dog sitting. Some dogs do not acclimate to a commercial daycare therefore need a home environment to go to so their owners can work. The home business needs a variance of the number of dogs allowed as they do not actually live in the premises I

Consilt with wildlife rehab facilities for Wild animal complaints or rescues.

Having pets improves overall health and well-being. (I had to surrender my cat due to a traumatic injury that disabled me, and I feel the loss deeply.) Some of us would adopt every living thing if we had the space/time/money to do so. The question is finding the balance between resident well-being and the overall health and safety within the city. Some ordinances might be better based on "per person" than on "per household". What about residents with a few pets and many foster animals (mother + litter of 6-10)?

I like the new proposed regulations, but I'd also like to see some flexibility within the guidelines. For example, if someone has two dogs and three cats and takes very good care of these animals, I think that should be OK. And in some small lots, it's hard to keep a chicken coop exactly 20 feet away, when it makes sense to keep a coop in the back corner of your lot. Just some thoughts.

It would have been nice to actually see the full comprehensive pet requirements - given that different animals at different points in their lifecycle require so many different things. We've have pets with cancer and diabetes so their care was much more expensive and complex than when they were kittens. And they required much more care, in bathing, etc.. than when they were young.

Maximum number of dogs per household should only apply to dogs that live permanently in the household. This number should not count towards visiting dogs or foster dogs.

Comprehensive animal welfare regulation is critical but it must also be well considered. The vast majority of questions on this survey indicate that the information sought would do little to improve the welfare of animals within the city. I hope that the city of Sunnyvale is seeking the guidance not only of veterinarians and animal care experts but also government entities like Santa Clara County Cooperative Extension Service.

I am curious why cats are not subject to the same rabies vaccination and licensing requirements as dogs. If the reasoning behind dogs' licensing is to control rabies, and cats are another species prone to rabies, then why don't they have to be licensed and vaccinated? For those who will argue that cats can't wear a collar with tags, we could require microchipping of cats, which would seem especially smart since many owners allow their cats to roam outdoors where they can be injured or trapped and need to be identified when taken in.

I'm not sure how/where penalties are spelled out in the municipal code, but I'd like there to be clearer escalating penalties for nuisance violations (noise, trespassing animals, etc.).

Thank you, Sunnyvale DPS, and especially to our two great Animal Control officers.

Remove the limits on the number of dogs for pet sitters (with a business license). The number if dogs makes no sense, it should be based on how disruptive they are to the neighborhood. For example, put limits of smell, sound, cleanliness, etc. But don't limit the money of dogs! I've lost my dog sitter because of the restrictive rule on the number of dogs and it's been a serious help having then take hey regularly during the day and for short overnight stays while we are out of town on work business.

Remove the limits on the number of dogs for pet sitters (with a business license). The number if dogs makes no sense, it should be based on how disruptive they are to the neighborhood. For example, put limits of smell, sound, cleanliness, etc. But don't limit the money of dogs! I've lost my dog sitter because of the restrictive rule on the number of dogs and it's been a serious help having then take hey regularly during the day and for short overnight stays while we are out of town on work business.

My former employer and mentor was adamantly against private practice veterinarians providing rabies vaccination information to (at that time) the County because it created a situation whereby clients felt their privacy and trust was violated by their pets' doctor. If clients understand that having their dogs vaccinated automatically results in notification of the City of Sunnyvale in order to verify licensing, the licensing revenue to the City will decline because fewer pets will be vaccinated; additionally, fewer pet owners will seek essential veterinary care in general because of inherent distrust once they find that veterinarians are sharing medical information with the City. Veterinarians should not provide vaccination information to entities that can enforce penalties, it creates an adversarial situation-- and in this day and age, an understandably upset client can become a violent client. As much as I support Animal Control, I cannot agree to share information that can lead to corrosion of the doctor-patient-client relationship. Requiring veterinarians to provide rabies vaccination status to the city is like requiring kindergarten teachers to provide authorities the names of children with Spanish surnames that don't speak English so they can check on their immigration status. Licensing should be mandatory, but not enforced via surreptitious means.

I own a 4 year old Bullmastiff who I sent to school when he was a puppy & today he has better manners than alot of people. School worked for him. He is 100 lbs & is a big baby.

Please have a plan to enforce these laws once modified! Currently, the city attorney tells law enforcement not to issue citations for violations because they will not be enforced in court. It is crazy to spend time on these ordinances unless there is agreement with the city attorney to allow law enforcement to issue actual citations carrying fines for violations.

No more dog parks. Fewer parks mean more dogs per park. Consider banning unfixed males beyond a certain age from dog parks. Get some turf at las palmas for the big dogs, as well as some lighting for winter.

Thanks!

I am a tech professional, working in Sunnyvale. I have a 2 year old dog that I need to set up in daycare everyday I work, as he cannot be left alone due to health concerns. Until recently, I used a babysitter for daycare that I found through the website Rover. She is an amazing woman who provided an incredible environment for my pup and gave him personal attention. The current Title codifications have forced me to place my dog in a dog boarding facility.

While I appreciate the work this kennel provides, I do not believe it's the most suitable or healthy place for my pup. After his first week, he developed a slight cough. Luckily, this was a short term ailment and he has since recovered but I was forced to stay home from work in order to monitor him, as dogs showing any symptoms are not allowed back at the kennel and I couldn't use any other emergency sitters due to his ailment. Additionally, the attention he receives at the kennel is not ideal, with moments where he is alone, exposed to mess from other dogs, and generally in contact with far too many dogs as is reasonably safe. Despite my dog being vaccinated, vaccinations are not 100% effective and only treat certain specific ailments. His new daycare conditions, which although are within city

regulation, are clearly far inferior than his former daycare provider, where he was staying in a nice clean house, had access to furniture he could sleep on, and was completely supervised.

Thank you for reading. I believe it is apparent what is best for our community, including our pets.

You guys need to focus more on the City Planning and how miserable you have made it for all of us. I live off of Wolfe and have gone through YEARS of construction for our Roads. (The area by El Camino has changed SO many times). Now we have everyone cutting and speeding through our area to avoid Homestead. You need to stay in your lane and have a better focus on what is important.

These are fine, but Sunnyvale lacks enough dog parks. I think part of Baylands Park could be dog friendly. These laws just further regulate, but I'd prefer to see them supplemented with something equally positive for pet owners who follow the rules.

I appreciate the effort being put forth for this. However, I don't see anything stating what the penalty would be for those found neglecting the creatures in a human's care. If this code is from the '70's I doubt the penalty was anything more than removing the creature from the premises. A human capable of doing harm is capable of doing harm, period. Also, it would have been good to have a link to the code so that we could read through it and have a better idea of what we're talking about here.

Add turf or grass back at Las Palmas dog park for the large park. Fix the water "stations" on the large dog park side. With water in the buckets, dogs often play/pee in the buckets - leading to unclean water. Gallons are thrown out daily in this park alone. Add some lighting for winter so we can use the parks later than 4:00. Consider an auto shut gate for the 2 gate system. Often people don't use this correctly and dogs get loose.

The laws must be based on principles, and not concrete bound. The legal principles must be "Coming to nuisance" and human health.

My answers really depend on the cost of all these additional requirements. I'm not in favor of spending much money on this.

Please consider updating laws to reflect the populations' current needs - dog sitters who operate legitimate businesses (with licenses) using sites like Rover and Wag! rely on watching other peoples' pets to make a living. If the animals don't cause a nuisance at someone's home, the number of dogs one sits shouldn't arbitrarily be set. This crackdown has affected an amazing, caring sitter who we trust with our dog more than we trust ourselves.