



2020 Responsible Livestock Survey



Report prepared by Phil Kreisel, Ph.D.
Communications

September 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
I. Introduction and Purpose of the Study	1
II. Methodology	1
A. The questionnaire	1
B. Sampling design and data collection procedure	3
III. RESULTS	4
Appendix A: Other comments about livestock	16

Executive Summary

In late July 2020, Strathcona County conducted an online survey of rural residents related to livestock on rural acreages. Based on the survey results, focus groups will be held to better understand some of the key themes and responses. Together, the survey and focus group feedback will help inform a proposed new bylaw for Responsible Livestock Ownership that will replace the current Animal Control Bylaw.

The survey was made available online through both SCOOP and Survey Gizmo. It ran from July 23 to August 16, with 935 rural residents completing the survey on both survey platforms combined.

The survey included questions about the respondents' type of property and zoning, whether they owned livestock and what a *country lifestyle* means to them. They were also asked their opinions on the type of livestock most suitable for different property sizes; their experience with livestock in County subdivisions; and topics of interest for potential learning related to livestock.

Overview of results

Responses related to the type of property and livestock ownership of the respondents included:

- 64.1% of respondents had properties of 5 acres or smaller.
- 49.8% of the respondents owned some type of livestock.
 - The percentage of people who owned livestock increased as the size of the property increased.
 - Of those who own livestock, 63.8% have a provincial premise ID number.
- 72.6% said a *country lifestyle* includes the *ability to have livestock*.

Respondents were specifically asked questions related to the suitability of different types of livestock on both 1 to 3 acres and 3 to 5 acres.

- Generally, respondents felt that small animals were better suited to small acreages, while larger animals were less desirable on small acreages.
- The presence of larger animals was more acceptable to respondents for properties that were 3 to 5 acres.
- For both sizes of properties, respondents were not as supportive of the presence of swine, cattle and bison.

The survey included the current animal unit limits for each type of livestock based on the size of land, as outlined in the Animal Control Bylaw.

- Overall, it was found that 74.4% of respondents felt that the existing animal units in the current Animal Control Bylaw were correct, while 35.6% did not agree. Those that did not agree were primarily concerned with cattle, bison and swine.

Respondents were asked whether they personally had experienced any concerns with livestock in any of Strathcona County's rural subdivisions.

- Overall, it was found that 67.9% of the respondents had expressed concerns
- Most of the people who expressed concerns did not have concerns with livestock on smaller acreages of 5 acres or less, while just under 65% had concerns with livestock on acreages of 5-10 acres in size.
- Specific concerns included animal noise, manure build up, manure smell, effects on their own property (smell, noise) and neighbour relations.

Overall, 29.8% indicated that they would like to learn more about the care and raising of livestock. In terms of preferences, *chickens, horses, cattle and honeybees* were tops in the number 1 spot.

Finally, it was found that 16.9% of the respondents were interested in participating in focus groups.

Next steps

Focus groups will be held with interested participants in October to further explore the survey responses related to livestock in order to build a clear understanding of the issues and potential solutions. Input from the survey and focus groups will be considered along with other key principles to inform the new draft bylaw. This includes the goal of balancing country lifestyle with the need to minimize disease risk and support animal welfare, land stewardship and opportunities for agriculture.

I. Introduction and Purpose of the Study

In late July 2020, Strathcona County conducted an online survey of rural residents to obtain their views on having different breeds of livestock on rural acreages. The information obtained from the survey will be used to create a proposed new bylaw for Responsible Livestock Ownership that will replace the current Animal Control Bylaw.

Obtaining primary data directly from residents provides Strathcona County departments with information and enables County officials to make decisions that accurately reflect the perspectives and attitudes of residents.

This report provides a comprehensive review of all steps undertaken in the development and implementation of the survey, as well as a detailed summary of the results.

A review of the methodology associated in the development and implementation of the survey can be found in the next section of this report.

II. Methodology

A. The questionnaire

The questionnaire used in this study was newly created specifically for this study. The creation of questions was originally done by members of Strathcona County's Transportation and Agriculture Services. Wording modifications and other aspects associated with the development of the questionnaire was done by members of Survey Central. The only demographic question required for this survey was that it be completed only by rural residents.

The survey consisted of 14 questions pertaining to having different types of livestock on rural properties. These included:

- The size of one's property, and how the property was zoned;
- Perceptions of what *country lifestyle* means to the respondent;
- Livestock types deemed to be most suited to rural properties of 1-3 acres and 3-5 acres;
- Whether properties that are between 3-5 acres should have more (or less) different types of livestock compared to what is currently suggested by the present Animal Control Bylaw;
- What experiences pertaining to livestock in Strathcona County's rural subdivisions;
- A general outline of the various concerns that rural residents had (if any);
- Whether respondents to the survey owned livestock, and if so, did they have a provincial premise identification number;
- Type of livestock that was of interest to rural residents; and
- Topics of interest (pertaining to livestock), as well as other comments on the subject of livestock.

Respondents were also asked if they would be interested in participating in a future focus group with other rural residents to have further discussions on the issues of livestock on rural properties.

B. Sampling design and data collection procedure

The survey was made available online on two platforms. The first was through the Strathcona County Online Opinion Panel (SCOOP). The other was an open online survey where information was gathered with Survey Gizmo, which was geared toward those who were not members of SCOOP. As this survey was aimed at rural residents and their experiences, those people who did not live in rural Strathcona County were excluded from further analysis.


The online survey ran between July 23 and August 16, 2020, during which 935 rural residents took part in the survey. Although online based data is based on people who decide to participate and were not randomly selected and have access to the online poll, the margin of error for a comparable probability-based random sample of the same size is $\pm 3.1\%$, 19 times out of 20. The data was analyzed by Strathcona County's Communications using SPSS for Windows.

III. RESULTS

This section of the report presents a summary of the results associated with the perceptions of residents with respect to aspects of livestock on rural properties.

The initial question asked respondents to indicate the size of their property in rural Strathcona. The overall results are shown in Figure 1. It can be seen that there is a wide variety of property sizes represented in this survey, with 64.1% of the properties being 5 acres or smaller and 35.9% being larger than 5 acres.¹

FIGURE 1
Size of respondents' property



All properties in Strathcona County are assigned Land Use Districts (which are sometimes referred to as zones). Overall, 73.5% of respondents knew their property zoning. The breakdown is as follows:

¹ Overall, 8 additional respondents were either unsure of the size of their property or did not answer the question.

- 44.8% were classified as a rural residential/agriculture (RA);
- 21% were classified as a low density country residential (RCL);
- 20.4% were classified as an agriculture: general (AG);
- 8.3% were classified as a hamlet (RH);
- 4.2% were classified as a small holding (RS);
- 1.3% classified themselves within the “other” category, which people listed as RE, RR, RS, RSL, which to these people were rural residentials, which might or might not allow livestock on the property.

Respondents were then asked to indicate what a *country lifestyle* meant to them (working off a list of options). The breakdown is as follows:

- 90.6% indicated that *space* was a key factor;
- 88.8% noted *privacy* as another factor;
- 73.8% agreed that the *ability to have a large garden or flower beds* was a factor;
- 72.6% wanted the *ability to have livestock*;
- 67.0% wanted a *place for children to play safely*;
- 85.7% were drawn to the *quiet* of the property; and
- 10.2% had other suggestions. A wide variety of ideas were put forward, including being able to have a large shop and/or run an independent business, being away from the city, experiencing cleaner air and being close to nature, feeling safer compared to living in a city and being able to have a self-sustaining lifestyle.

The next question in the survey asked respondents to indicate which livestock types they thought would be most suited to properties that were either 1-3 acres or 3 to five acres. The overall results pertaining to the percentage who agreed with each type of livestock is summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Animals suited to properties of 1-3 acres and 3-5 acres

Animal Type	1 to 3 acres	3 to 5 acres
Chickens	84.5%	88.1%
Rabbits	76.7%	80.4%
Ducks	72.5%	80.2%
Honeybees	72.3%	79.6%
Roosters	60.8%	72.4%
Goats	59.7%	78.1%
Sheep	55.5%	74.5%
Horse	46.2%	77.4%
Llamas / Alpacas	36.7%	63.4%
Donkeys	35.4%	64.2%
Pigs	28.1%	48.6%
Cattle	13.5%	33.4%
Bison	4.4%	12.5%
None	8.2%	3.4%

It can be seen from Table 1 that respondents felt that small animals were better suited to small acreages (1-3 acres), while larger animals were less desirable, though goats, sheep and to a lesser extent, horses, were still okay to have. The presence of larger animals was more acceptable to respondents for properties that were 3 to 5 acres. For both sizes of properties, people were not enthused with the presence of pigs, cattle and bison.

In the survey, the County previously established animal unit limits per acre that varied depending on the type of animal. After given information on the number of animals allowed for each type of animal on a property that was 3 to 5 acres, respondents were asked to indicate whether there should be more animals (or less) per acre for these sizes of lots (unless they believed that the current ratios were correct). Overall, it was found that 74.4% of respondents felt that the existing ratios were correct, while 35.6% did not agree, and were asked an additional set of questions pertaining to whether the ratios per acre should increase, decrease, or not be allowed. This information is summarized in Table 2. Some of these people also

indicated that given a choice, the existing ratios were acceptable for a particular animal.

TABLE 2
Number of animals suited to properties of 3-5 acres
 (excludes those who were fine with the existing animal ratios per acre)


Animal Type	Current number per acre	More animal units per acre	Fewer animal units per acre	Keep it the same	Don't allow these animals on 3-5 acre parcel
Goats	2	30.8%	17.8%	28.4%	23.1%
Sheep	2	30.6%	18.9%	30.1%	20.4%
Chickens	20	28.8%	31.3%	23.6%	16.3%
Llamas / Alpacas	1	25.4%	19.6%	29.2%	25.8%
Rabbits	20	25.0%	28.9%	29.9%	16.2%
Bison	1	24.7%	9.8%	16.3%	49.3%
Donkeys	1	24.3%	23.3%	22.9%	29.5%
Ducks	20	24.2%	31.4%	28.0%	16.4%
Turkeys	20	21.8%	33.5%	22.8%	21.8%
Roosters	20	21.3%	30.4%	18.8%	29.5%
Horse	1	20.6%	34.3%	21.6%	23.5%
Swine – all pigs	1	16.6%	15.6%	19.0%	48.8%
Cattle	1	13.6%	18.8%	12.7%	54.9%

There are several suggested trends with respect to the number of various livestock currently allowed on parcels of 3 to 5 acres in Strathcona County, based on the 35.6% who did not initially like the ratios in the current bylaw. While a portion of these respondents felt that some animals should not be allowed on properties of this size, this was particularly the case pertaining to cattle, bison and swine. The rest of the answers varied from more, less or the same depending on the type of animal.

Respondents were then asked whether they personally had experienced any concerns with livestock in any of Strathcona County's rural subdivisions. Overall, it was found that 67.9% of the respondents had expressed concerns.²

A breakdown of the percentages of the subset of people who had concerns is shown in Figure 2. Each bar chart is tied into the percentages of those who perceived concerns for each size of acreage. It can be seen that most of the subset of people who expressed concerns actually did not have concerns with smaller acreages of 5 acres or less. However, people that had concerns with livestock centered more on acreages between 5 and 10 acres, as just under 65% of these people indicated one or more problems.


FIGURE 2
Concerns on acreages of different sizes



² This percentage was derived based on subsequent responses acknowledging concerns with properties that were less than three acres, under five acres and/or 5-10 acres. It should be noted that an additional 12.9% of the original sample (113 people) expressed concerns, but it was not with the properties shown in Figure 2. Concerns that these 12.9% (113 people) had may be with smaller properties, commercial properties or properties larger than 10 acres, but since a follow up question specifically asking what other concerns people had was not asked, we have no way of knowing what the concerns were.

A breakdown of those who had concerns, based on the size of the respondents' own property, is shown in Figure 3. It can be seen in this figure that regardless of the size of the respondents' own property, concerns rested primarily with parcels that were between 5 and 10 acres. On this size of property, the percentage of people who had concerns were lower among those who lived on properties that were 3 acres or smaller (e.g. 57.3% of the people who lived on properties that were under 1 acre in size, while 72.1% of people who lived on acreages that were larger than 20 acres had concerns with parcels that were between 5 and 10 acres in size).

FIGURE 3
Those who had concerns with acreages that ranged from under 3 acres to those between 5 and 10 acres
(By size of the respondents' property)




Respondents were then asked what their specific concerns were. The following issues were noted:

- Animal noise – 22.9%
- Manure build up – 22.3%
- Manure smell – 21.7%
- Effects on your property: smell – 20.7%
- Effects on your property: noise – 20.4%
- Neighbour relations – 20.1%
- Effects on your property: value – 18.8%
- Animal smell(s) – 17.8%
- Number, size and type of outbuildings (sheds, shelters, barns) – 15.6%
- Pet safety – 13.7%
- Attracting wild animals – 11.8%
- Other – 18.8%. A large issue that was mentioned multiple times included aspects of animal welfare/not being cared for properly. Other issues mentioned included livestock on the loose outside of their designated property, people abusing the rules with respect to the quantity of animals being kept and manure being left on the roads.

Overall, it was found that 49.8% of the respondents owned some type of livestock. Of those who own livestock, 63.8% have a provincial premise ID number.

A more detailed breakdown of livestock ownership of the respondents by the size of their rural properties is shown in Figure 4. It can be seen that the percentage of people who own livestock increases as the size of the property increases.


FIGURE 4
Livestock ownership by size of rural property



Overall, 29.8% indicated that they would like to learn more about the care and raising of livestock; 56.1% were not interested, while the remaining 14.1% were not sure. Of those who own livestock, 63.8% have a provincial premise ID number.

A breakdown of whether or not people wanted to learn more about livestock topics by their current ownership of livestock is depicted in Figure 5. It can be seen that ownership of livestock was not necessarily a criteria for one's interest in livestock topics.

FIGURE 5
Interest in livestock topics by ownership of livestock



A comparison of the types of animals that people would be interested in learning more about based on a ranking of the interest in each type of animal is summarized in Table 3. In terms of preferences, *chickens*, *horses*, *cattle* and *honeybees* were tops in the number 1 spot; *cattle*, *goats*, *chickens* and *honeybees* were highest in the number 2 spot; and most animals (with the exceptions of *horses*, *cattle* and *bison*) were relatively close together in the number 3 spot.

TABLE 3
Ranking of topics pertaining to animals

	Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Chickens (Hens and Roosters)	33.9%	24.3%	14.3%	9.5%	8.5%	5.3%	1.6%	---	2.1%
Horses	29.1%	9.1%	7.3%	2.7%	6.4%	1.8%	2.7%	0.9%	4.5%
Cattle	22.7%	33.3%	6.7%	9.3%	9.3%	6.7%	4.0%	1.3%	---
Honeybees	21.1%	21.1%	16.2%	9.2%	7.0%	8.5%	4.9%	6.3%	2.1%
Swine (Pigs)	14.3%	15.7%	28.6%	10.0%	10.0%	2.9%	2.9%	2.9%	4.3%
Goats	13.8%	25.9%	21.6%	19.0%	7.8%	6.9%	4.3%	0.9%	---
Sheep	10.2%	16.7%	17.6%	20.4%	16.7%	12.0%	2.8%	0.9%	2.8%
Llama/Alpaca	4.6%	9.2%	20.0%	21.5%	7.7%	4.6%	12.3%	4.6%	7.7%
Donkeys	3.8%	16.7%	16.7%	10.3%	17.9%	6.4%	7.7%	14.1%	1.3%
Ducks	3.1%	16.7%	18.8%	17.7%	10.4%	10.4%	8.3%	5.2%	3.1%
Bison	---	2.7%	10.8%	16.2%	5.4%	10.8%	10.8%	2.7%	10.8%

Only a small number of people expressed interest in learning more about other types of animals. Most of the other animals mentioned were types of birds, including *turkeys*, *pheasants*, *geese*, *emus*, and *quail*. Rabbits were also mentioned numerous times.

A comparison of livestock-related topics that people would be interested in, based on a ranking of interest is summarized in Table 4. In terms of preferences, *general care and management* was the first choice; *livestock health and wellbeing* was second overall, and *pasture management* was third.

TABLE 4
Ranking of livestock related topics of interest

	Ranking						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
General care and management	68.8%	12.6%	7.8%	6.1%	3.9%	0.4%	0.4%
Livestock health and wellbeing	23.1%	49.3%	16.0%	7.6%	1.8%	1.8%	0.4%
Pasture management	11.4%	25.0%	31.8%	11.9%	12.5%	4.5%	2.8%
All about feed	7.7%	12.8%	25.6%	20.0%	14.4%	9.2%	10.3%
Manure management	6.7%	10.4%	15.2%	25.0%	19.5%	15.2%	7.9%
How to find a vet	4.1%	4.1%	11.6%	12.4%	10.7%	30.6%	26.4%
Livestock end of life decisions	0.7%	8.7%	10.0%	16.7%	22.7%	20.0%	21.3%

There were a variety of other topics associated with livestock that people were interested in. Bee keeping was one that was of particular interest to multiple respondents, as were commercial opportunities (livestock/gardening on smaller acre lots). Other topics mentioned included:

- Abused animals / How does the County ensure that livestock is properly look after
- Animal products - how to safely gather and store (eggs, milk, wool, etc.)
- Animals best suited for Co-habitation
- Appropriate ways to control weeds in pastures that are safe for animals to graze on
- Farm tax credit
- How to best deal with invasive weeds and prairie dogs
- How to build functional buildings to house livestock easier and more efficiently
- Legalities involving sale of livestock / livestock products (i.e. eggs and honey)
- Livestock's role in sustainable agriculture
- What kind of pesticides/herbicides the county uses
- Organic management
- Pasture rental
- Processing chicken and eggs for market

Respondents were also asked to indicate if they had other livestock concerns that they wanted to share with the County. Overall, 21.1% had other things to say. These are collected in Appendix A.

Finally, it was found that 16.9% of the respondents were interested in participating in focus groups. This list will come as a separate document to representatives of Transportation and Agriculture Services.

Appendix A: Other comments about livestock

- 20 chickens/ ducks etc., per acre seems like a lot. 10 per acre should be enough.
- 3-5 acres is still small if the neighbor has livestock, especially roosters! This is not a farm. It's basically a large lot with neighbors you can still see and hear. Anything noisy should still not be allowed unless you're over 5 acres.
- A limit of 0 should be for any large animal such as cows, horses, sheep, pigs so on acreages of 5 acres or less. Roosters are not required for egg laying so zero needed with chickens. Altogether chickens, ducks, geese, and rabbits sized animals should be limited to 2 on acreage of 3 to 5 acres or smaller. Dogs are really noisy in acreage areas so these should be reduced to no more than 1 on 3 acreage, 2 dogs on 3 to 5 acres. More of these animals attract coyotes.
- Accessible disease management and vaccines widely available in Strathcona County are needed.
- Acreage living has charges significantly over the last 20 years. We purchased our acreage close to 25 years ago because we wanted quiet, space, and clean air country living. To have cattle backing on to our property would great reduce the value of our property as well as our peaceful living. The current bylaw is outdated and should be removed.
- After many years in animal rescue, it still astounds me how easy it is for people to own animals that they have no business owning. It is great to want a rural lifestyle, but there should be protocols in place that ensure that education and a license are required and there should be spot checks by Livestock Peace Officers to ensure proper food, care, shelter, fencing, and protection are provide. Maybe that's idealistic, but this survey is perhaps a good start to get at least the conversation started. An acreage does not a hobby farm make. Someone who buys an acreage does not a responsible farmer make.
- allowing animals on 3 to 5 acres is insane, NOISE for one, how would you like a donkey braying all day long, or goats climbing on your roof and eating the shingles, or roosters crowing at the break of dawn, OR ALL OF THE ABOVE or more noise. Secondly, how do you get rid of the manure? oh i know dump it in the lake, reserve acreage or throw it on your neighbour's lawn. ONLY acreages of 20 or more should have animals. PERIOD.
- Although I didn't include pigs, cattle or bison, I have no issues with one per acre. Pigs, however may have a particular smell if kept in pens outdoors, and manure may be an issue if not dealt with.
- Animal health issues currently fall under the province (Alberta Ag) or federal (CFIA). This sharing of responsibilities is somewhat confusing as the question of who is looking after what comes into play. I'm

- totally against the county getting involved with health monitoring as this is a very expensive endeavor and is already handled by others.
- Animal Unit is too general as livestock come different sizes -- horses, cattle, pigs, and poultry. Horse - small pony to large draft horse, Cattle - Angus, Semimetal to the miniature breeds, Pigs - Not sure of the larger breeds but the small Pot Belly, Poultry - turkeys to Bantam breed, these are just few examples. There is a BTU rating that is expelled by the animal that I will find more details as I heard this years ago but didn't pay that much attention to it but that it would be a better way to rate how many animals were allowed on a property.
 - Any acreage less than 3.5 acres should not be allowed live stock. In order to have a Horse, Cow, Sheep, etc. I feel the acreage size should be more than 5 acres and then the number of livestock should be determined by size.
 - Any contact we had with you was thru Mr. Alf Kolenosky and we were always very very happy with his actions and responses. It would be nice if all county employees were as good
 - Anyone who wants to raise livestock needs to move to a farm, +160 acres. There are plenty of other issues that sour neighbor relations; do not add livestock to the problems.
 - As indicated promote environmental stewardship and animal welfare. Perhaps acreage owners be required to provide a small stewardship plan...if they are placing a horse...demonstrate how the well-being of that animal is prioritized. Demonstrate the long term plan for that animal...what happens if it's a poor pasture year? Proper fencing, buildings, shade, shelter from cold, water, manure and pasture management (no weeds, and over grazing) on big or small properties. Same for all animals.
 - As long as livestock are taken care of, there should be no reason why people on acreages shouldn't be able to have them.
 - As long as people have the appropriate shelters, fencing and are care for livestock and animals in a responsible manner, I feel that having animals is a wonderful part of the country lifestyle. My biggest concern is that too many people get animals without doing the proper research on the care and commitment that is needed and then the novelty wears off and the animals suffer. Sadly I see this far too often.
 - As long as the residence is properly taking care of their livestock, there should be no issue, especially if the neighbors are okay with the livestock on hand.
 - As mentioned earlier, there is one family in our subdivision that recently got chickens. If I was their neighbour, I would upset about this. My understanding was when we bought our acreage that no livestock was allowed - however, that timeframe might have expired. I would be upset if we had livestock living next to us - mainly for the

- noise and smell, and attraction of coyotes coming more frequently around.
- As urbanites encroach on rural properties, building high density subdivisions right beside rural properties, there should be consideration to the fact that they moved into a position where _they_ are required to accept the existing conditions.
 - Backyard chickens should be allowed in Sherwood park proper
 - Bee keeping should be allowed on ~3 acre lots without consulting with neighbors within 1km radius. Often honeybees swarm make temporary or permanent hive without the getting same permission and live there just fine. In the city of Edmonton only immediate neighbors are too informed. In most cases that is 4 neighbors. In the Strathcona County it's 1km radius.
 - Bison can be difficult to house and fence and very difficult to catch if released.
 - Certain things under the heading of livestock that you have provided, I feel do not belong on small parcels. For example Bison and bulls they can be dangerous, and can if need be go through most fences. Donkeys can as well as roosters be very noisy and disturbing to neighbors, so should not be allowed, as well as bees which I love but many people have allergies to them.
 - Concerned about inadequate housing of livestock. Concerns of neighbor disputes over noise, smell and cleanliness.
 - Controls on animal hoarding and condition of animals on the property. More focus on animal abuse and mistreatment of animals.
 - county needs a program to deal with bad animal owners
 - Current rules are adequate
 - do more to promote small farms /hobby farms
 - Do not appreciate smelling horse or other animal manure while I am sitting on my patio. This devalues our property. The County does not reduce our taxes if we get manure smell from our neighbour's animals. Do not like horse poop on the roads when they ride them. Why don't they have poop bags like the dog owners do?
 - Do not reduce number of animals. Do not restrict location of keeping animals
 - Don't feel people should be allowed 1 horse or 1 donkey as they are social animals In some countries it is illegal to only have one
 - Don't have livestock currently but have owned cows/bulls, chickens, roosters in the past.
 - Due to government regulation on the use of antibiotics and the economic realities of calling a vet in for smaller animals, animals are

- needlessly suffering or put to death over simple infections. It's not a county government edict, but perhaps the county could reallocate some tax money from the doomed horse palace or simply reduce taxes so people could afford vet fees to gain access to the drugs they need.
- During the current times we are living through with Covid-19 it is more important than ever for small landowners to have the flexibility of raising their own food source or to have direct farm sales. I feel the ability to raise an increased amount of Poultry (Chicken, Ducks, Turkeys) or Rabbits seasonally should be allowed.
 - Easing restrictions on honey bees in all rural and suburban portions of the county would increase garden yields, help the current bees death crisis and allow for a continuous corridor of bee habitat for urban Edmonton areas to purely agricultural and/or park areas outside the county. This would allow the free flow of bee populations allowing both genetic flow and the ability to repopulate in the case of colony collapse.
 - Empowering people to meet their needs locally and sustainably is a great position for Strathcona County to take.
 - Enforcement of problems - little gets fixed when owners are not responsible
 - Even though 3 horses are acceptable on three acres, management of manure and space for them to move is a challenge
 - Every year I have to deal with everything from animals that are loose to my annual swarms of honey bees in my yard. Both only happen if animals and bees aren't cared for properly.
 - Having livestock in our hamlet is very important for everyone I know in our community including my family of 5.
 - Having livestock on the average provides the family with connections to the traditional family farm. It provides children the chance to participate in the care and learning about farming in a smaller format while letting them participate with the broader agricultural community through 4h
 - Having only recently (last two years) become a rural resident of the county, I would like to say that we initially thought a 3 to 5 acre parcel would be what we would purchase in order to have our horses with us. It became very clear in looking at dozens of properties that the 3 to 5 acre size is incredibly difficult to manage well for any more than 2 horses to provide adequate care and turnout and not adversely affect neighboring properties. Hence the purchase of a 40 acre piece, although I think we could have managed with 10 or more.
 - Having the option to have more horses per acre
 - Health. Concern bad Smell. Yard maintenance looks like a farm yard, smell. Too close to our house, flies horse flies

- Horse owners should be held to the same standard as dog owners when on public property (roads, shared use pathways etc.)
- Horses should not be classed as livestock as they serve no agricultural purpose and are only used to help lower tax assessments. They are just another pet nothing more.
- How often does the county bylaw visit land owners to check on animals that might be in stress due to quantity and feed?
- I am against having 'livestock' type animals in an 'acreage' subdivision (2-5 acre lots). Especially if there are no other properties in that subdivision that have that type of animal. Thank you!
- I am generally pro animal. I like the animal unit system as it presently is and I find it appropriate.
- I am not anti-livestock at all. But I would as well as other neighbors like to be consulted. The 3 new families who moved in with chickens r trying to keep their livestock low keyed which tell me their real estate agent did not look into county bylaws nor did the families. That poses a problem right away to being a respectful neighbor or not. As well county should make it clear as a question on a census whether residents r raising livestock so it can be enforced if there r infractions.
- I believe having a few chickens or a goat on less than 1 acre (hamlet) should be considered.
- I believe responsible livestock owners should see livestock units per acre increased!
- I believe that it also needs to be taken into consideration if there are people that have always had livestock and if the current bylaw changes it must ensure that it accommodates the history of people
- I believe that it would be great to be able to have at least smaller livestock in rural residential such as cooking lake, Sherwood park, etc. e.g. chickens, rabbits, turkey, goat, ducks, etc.
- I believe the bylaw concerning apiaries is very restrictive. Even Edmonton urban beekeepers have much less restrictions,
- I believe you should be able to have at least 5 chickens on your property no matter if you live rurally or urbanely as long as you have some sort of yard. I also believe if you wanted a potbelly pig and or duck as a pet instead of say a dog then you should be allowed.
- I do have some concerns related the welfare of animals on small acreage downed by inexperienced animal owners. I also feel if things get out of control on a small acreage it will affect more people due to the higher concentration of homes
- I do not believe that any livestock should be allowed on 1 -2 acres of land. on land up to 29 acres, 1 acre should be living space and the

others designated livestock space. There should not be more than 5 horses in any subdivision with land under 20 acres.

- I don't own livestock, but I have had sheep here for the summer for 25 years.
- I don't have a problem with the 1 animal unit per acre. I do think that 60 chickens on a 3 acre lot are a bit excessive!
- I don't have any
- I don't have any current concerns
- I feel farmers should only be allowed 1 cow per acre. Some farms have 4 cows per acres making it too much for the manure issues.
- I feel it is inhumane to keep these animals on small acreages. In our case the horses came within 50 feet of our house. With prevailing westerly winds and open windows at night, the smell is not appetizing.
- I grew up on a very large ranch. 3 quarters plus 2500 acres of lease land. I am very familiar with proper grazing practices, land rehabilitation and the effects of over used land i.e. manure and the creation of a mud pit. In short - it ends up being a
- I have been the victim of this by-law. A neighbor was able to gain special consideration and have 85 chickens within a city block range of my home. As a result, I was forced to keep my windows closed in the mornings to eliminate the noise that started at 5 am EVERY DAY. Initially, I found several bird carcasses in my yard which I had to clean up carried there by predators. Once the neighbor installed the electric fence, the predators decided to skirt my property looking for easy prey and I saw more fox and coyotes that I had seen previously. I am not talking large numbers but enough of an increase to fear letting my cat out on my back deck (he is tethered) for fear he would be attacked. This neighbor also was permitted to put signs outside his residential home (I won't insert the name for privacy) and also had people 'drop' by the house to buy eggs. All of this under the radar because by-law enforcement of the current law was lax at best and non-existent actually. If this county starts with allowing 'viable' agricultural business in a rural residential area, when does it stop - will you next allow 'light' industrial - will you allow a gravel truck company to carry on a business next door to me? If the county wishes to allow livestock in newer developments and ensure that individuals buying property are aware they could be living next door to chickens or pigs then that would be acceptable. What is not acceptable is to undermine the value of my property and arbitrarily override a restrictive covenant that exists in my subdivision. If the county is intent on pursuing this philosophy, then the simple and fair approach should be that subdivisions with restrictive covenants are exempt. This precludes pitting neighbor against neighbor and provides peace of mind for new buyers that their choice of lifestyle will be protected and if a person

moving to Strathcona County wants to have livestock, and then they would look in an area where it was approved.

- I honestly had no idea that the animals listed were allowable on an acreage. We have spent the past 25 years grooming and improving our property. I can only imagine how quickly our quality of life and property values would plummet should our neighbor bring in a couple of pigs and 20 Roosters. Our previous neighbor brought in a Donkey for a short while. The noise was constant. It just would not shut up. Another neighbor currently has a rooster that crows constantly. One Rooster is annoying; twenty would be a constant nightmare. This entire Bylaw should be tossed out. I have three neighbors who border my property and eight in my cul de sac. If they all brought in their own selection of Bison, Chickens, Pigs etc. to their current allowable limits, my property would be a stench of worthlessness. These animals are referred to as 'Farm' animals for a reason.
- I know this is about livestock but feral cats are a large problem. Next survey?
- I like having horses in the neighborhood, but I don't like the manure on the roads.
- I love people can experience raising and caring for livestock in our division.
- I must have missed the question but I think horses should be no more than 1 per 2 acres.
- I noticed in my rural subdivision, not allowed to have chickens but a neighbor has a Turkey...how is this allowed?
- I prefer that the administration stay away from my affairs as the body of individuals who manage the county just keeps getting larger every year. And it will just keep getting larger to justify the business model.
- I rent my land for cattle, they can be awful noisy be prepared for lots of complaints
- I think butchering on site should be allowed. Also it's really sad that you have to own your own cow or goat to get raw milk when one cow produces far more milk than our family can utilize
- I think people living in Sherwood Park should be able to have small livestock in small #'s, such as pigs and chickens
- I think people need to be knowledgeable about the land and the animals they intend to support on it before they choose to keep x# of any animals on land that may not support them in a healthy (both physical and psychological) manner.
- I think some consideration is useful area vs total area. If 3 acres is half swamp, and a quarter living area, then I don't know that you should have three horses on the remaining tiny space.

- I think that acreage owners should be free of restrictive regulations on the number of animals on their land. Small farms can be very productive and a family can feed themselves and a few neighbors on what is produced on a few acres. Strathcona County needs to stand up for the rights of their citizens and support this effort in order to responsibly reduce our carbon footprint. Big industry wants people to buy their produce and meats and in doing so we support their enormous carbon footprint. Our county needs to stand with its citizens in keeping our world a cleaner place and encouraging small landowners to feed themselves and their neighbors is 'one small step' for a council, but 'one giant leap' for mankind. Be a trendsetter, Strathcona County!
- I think that miniature horses should fall in the category of 2 equal 1 unit
- I think that residents should need a permit or registration for livestock.
- I think that some adjustments to the animal units per acre formula should be discussed. For example, medium sized livestock like sheep and goats could be allotted a value of 4 animals per unit as compared to the current 2 per unit. Pigs would stay at 2 as they have the capacity to grow quite large.
- I think the bylaw is fairly fair now. People with small acreages under 3 acres should be allowed chickens and rabbits and goats and sheep and bees even a cow or 2 with proper set up
- I would assume that most rural residence of Strathcona County do not have livestock nor-wish to have any. That being said country living is country living. Most livestock is not suitable for city living. The only place that people can have livestock is in a rural setting. People that live in a rural setting must expect that there are sounds and smells that go with country living. By laws do not cover every situation I believe you need to have a common sense judgment made in each situation because there are so varied situations across the county. If a bylaw is past I believe it should have an option for appeal. And that appeal board made up of people who own livestock or have a direct connection to the livestock industry in some way.
- I would like to see the animal/livestock bylaws changed to include allowing small animals such as chickens, bees, rabbits on properties smaller than 3 acres.
- I'd like to see it permissible to raise some chickens, rabbits, goat, sheep and pot-bellied pigs in town.
- I'd love to see a small amount of livestock being allowed in hamlets for personal use (eggs, poultry, honey)
- If a person has enough feed & space, I don't see the issue to have animals. If people move from the city & don't like the animals, then move back!!!

- I'm in favor of backyard chickens, ducks, and bees inside Sherwood Park.
- implement a cat bylaw, I am sick of cleaning up cat poop on my property Stop people from leaving horse poop on roads
- In today's current world situation, the county should be taking steps to encourage livestock ownership as part of our county's self-sufficiency and food sovereignty. The current rules should be relaxed as members of our community strive to eat healthier and to eat local. Regulations on our ability to grow our own food, necessitating it being shipped miles is an irresponsible move in the light of carbon footprints as well as irresponsible in the light of social responsibility to our residents who wish to have food security in insecure times. Please consider this as you adjust the laws and please do so in favour of the residents of this county.
- In town chickens In town mini horse (more useful and cost less than a dog)
- Individuals should be able to choose the amount of livestock they have, as long as the amount is not harmful to the animal(s) and they have adequate space. As an example someone who wants 50 chickens on 3 acres and only has chickens. That to me is acceptable Having 30 chickens 2 cows 2 horses 3 pigs 10 turkeys etc. maybe not. However most people who are raising livestock know the space required and should not be limited.
- Individuals who have small parcels of land need to think about safe and appropriate disposal of their livestock manure and not spread it on their neighbours lot or land.
- Is this survey a solution looking for a problem? Strathcona has a country character and we should thank those wishing to make pointless changes to move to Sherwood Park where they can live the city life. If I want to have three horse, pigs or goldfish that is my business. We have too many rules now!
- It's all about balance. We love being able to supply ourselves with some home raised food. This allows our kids the types of lessons we feel important. Healthy choices, life cycles and a little hard work, all reasons we live out here. But we also realize there can be challenges with noise, odors and frankly quality of life for the livestock, thus unit limits per acre.
- It's often the way that animals are housed and cared for that I have concerns about. I wouldn't like to have a neighbor who raised pigs if they don't keep the manure well managed as it really stinks. Manure buildup can really increase the fly population unless it's managed correctly. Run off water from manure also has the possibility of contaminating a gardening area and possibly causing e-coli to be on/in your garden items like lettuce and spinach. Rooster and Donkeys can

- be noisy creatures, and rather irritating when the sun comes up early in the summer.
- Large animals such as cattle and bison and smaller noisy ones such as sheep, goats and roosters should not be permitted on small acreage plots in rural subdivisions. These should be restricted to 10 acre and larger parcels that are not in subdivisions.
 - Large pigs and Turkey's should not be allowed in Hamlet's
 - Let people decide for themselves what they wish to raise on their own private property, the county does not make the mortgage payments so it should take a step back and try not to dictate what people can or can't do. Keep in mind, everyone has different financial circumstances.
 - Like many urban areas, I would like to see Strathcona County allow small amounts of animals on lots less than one acre. I live in a rural hamlet. Lots of room and privacy but are unable to raise a few chickens. It would be great for the kids to learn the responsibility that comes with livestock ownership.
 - Limits on animals per acre are a foolish endeavor. It doesn't take into account the lay of the land nor any innovations by the farmer/resident. If animals are being abused due to lack of space or proper environment, it doesn't matter how many acres or what type of zoning. It's one thing to make a recommendation to landowners, it's another to micromanage their life.
 - Livestock should always have shelter from rain wind weather conditions also with high mosquito count they should have access to proper mosquito control whether they're covered or smudged
 - More horses per acre should be allowed per acre as people don't feed them on pasture but feed hay instead.
 - More information needs to be spread about how Strathcona County allows livestock. Our family has been personally harassed due to a neighbour not fully understanding that we have the right to have livestock on our property. All subdivisions should be mailed a copy of the bylaws; I know it would have prevented a dozen calls to bylaw and police to get our neighbour to stop harassing us.
 - More people should be encourage to have small numbers of livestock like chickens and honey bees
 - Most of the large animals (horses) that are kept on small acreages have little to no plan to deal with the manure that builds up over time. It eventually becomes an environmental problem with leaching in to the ground water. Farmers with cattle deal with the manure and bedding packs by spreading it on large fields. The small acreages don't do that because of cost and lack of land.
 - Most people don't have enough knowledge to responsibly own livestock.

- Mostly concerned with subdivision spaces on smaller lots, the animals are usually not the issue in regards to noise, however very few of the subdivision people with livestock deal with manure appropriately. 3 horses on 3 acres is a lot of poop piling up! I am on 20 acres and house no more than 10 horses at a time, I compost the manure at the back of the property which has no people nearby and have it spread and or removed annually,, I work hard to protect the natural water tables and manage animal waste so it's not an issue however I can say that my neighbors on smaller lots do not do the same. Several homes in the subdivision across the road have massive manure piles from horses that have never been removed. I also do not think it is responsible animal husbandry to have so many animals on 3-5 acre lots,, the lot is usually split 50/50 house yard and barnyard so you're really talking about 1.5 acres dedicated to animals on a 3 acre lot
- My biggest concern regarding livestock on 3 acre parcels would be noise and smell.
- My concern is the manure, the safe disposal of the manure. Manure affecting water ways as 2020 lots of rain and lots of runoff from neighbours' property to wetlands area. The attraction of skunks- attracted to the feed, mice attracted to feed and feed storage area, coyotes attracted to small livestock for their meals, attraction of weasels to poultry to feast on. Diseases of livestock, chickens will have lice if not properly cared for, lice can be transferred to humans, and avian flu from small scale hobby farming can be transferred to large poultry farms. Are poultry only for only egg production? Poultry for meat production, ethical end of life for chickens, proper evisceration. How to dispose of poultry innards and feathers-not through garbage pick-up days. I would prefer small scale livestock owners to have some education prior to owning livestock. On line course through Strathcona County or an approved site by Strathcona County. Course should entail 1) building types for livestock housing 2) based on building option chosen- setbacks required, building permit requirements. 3) feed management, chickens for eggs or chickens for meat require different feed. 4) livestock pens, size of pens or runs. How to secure pens from predators 5) care of livestock, keeping your livestock healthy, keeping livestock safe, 6) manure management, how to collect, store and dispose of manure 7) livestock for meat, feed preparation of livestock prior to kill date, butcher site preparation, collection and disposal of eviscerated products. Livestock types that need to be taken off property site for kill, inspection, and preparation-butcher. 8) there are hunters in Strathcona County who butcher on their properties...they usually leave eviscerated products at the kill site. What is going to stop a neighbour with a steer from coming over to use the meat saw used on the deer to butcher the steer?
- My family and I currently live on an acreage of 3.76 acres, but are planning to move into Sherwood Park in the next few years as the yard

- work is getting to be too much for us. I would love it if Strathcona County would reconsider urban farming, specifically backyard chickens (no roosters, of course). It would make my family very happy to still be able to do what we love and have fresh eggs daily, on a smaller scale. If certain neighborhoods of Sherwood Park became open to having backyard poultry as a trial, that would be amazing. Thank you.
- Neighbour built their small horse paddock adjacent to our fence, so animals are 20 yards from our back deck.
 - No further comments, thanks
 - noise bylaws should be amended so that farmers are not penalized for having 'normal' farm noise on their acreage/farm. A small acreage can be greatly productive in food production if allowed, however current bylaws prohibit this.
 - Not sure why Roosters are singled out on this survey. The only reason someone raises roosters is as Broilers for the freezer or to have one around to fertilize eggs. Otherwise they are known to be mean and noisy. They have spurs and can cut with them. They love to chase people too. Hens are normally docile and don't crow in the AM. That will always be a rooster. They are nasty animals. Don't allow them in SP. Allow on Acreages - if they want the hassle. LOL. Also - Billy goats can be a pain in the butt. They climb on everything - tops of cars - not cool.
 - Online information says that 8 to 12 sheep per acre is acceptable how about assessing one's property as in feed availability vs just restricting all property's the same. As my property can produce way more grass than 7 sheep could consume. As I have only a few trees and lots of grass areas. This micromanaged law needs to have its strings loosened a bit within reason. Without having to apply for an over permit. As long as manure and feed situations are being met
 - Organized dog racing is taking place in my community of South Cooking Lake. It is very loud and the dogs sound like they are under severe stress. Please ban this atrocious activity with the County.
 - Our 5 acre parcel has had 1.5 -2 units per acre. We are very responsible and never a complaint. Good ownership of stock is the key. Bylaw needs to recognize good from bad NOT the letter of the bylaw. We are retired and have zero but would welcome animal owners like us in our subdivision.
 - Owners need to be inspected to ensure the animals are not in danger, neglected.
 - owners need to keep their property clean if they own livestock of any units.... clean the manure properly., buildings maintained and not be a nuisance to other neighbors who do not own livestock.... owners need to be responsible for the welfare and upkeep of their livestock

- Owning livestock (pigs, chickens and bees primarily) is the entire reason my wife and I bought a rural acreage. We could not afford a quarter section or even 5+ acre lot, despite wanting more animals. Sherwood Park bylaw would not allow us to have livestock or backyard bees/chickens, and buying a 3 acre home in subdivision was our compromise. We consider the current livestock limits and related bylaws to be very fair and hope they are not lowered or removed. Thank you for reading this and please keep hobby homesteading alive!
- Owning livestock during unsure times is central to property owner's ability to feed their family. It contributes to a sense of well-being and safety. We always say if there are good shortages at least we will have the eggs.
- Parents have 5 acres in B.C. and they are considered a 'farm' when they can show they make \$2000.00 a year with their animals. (sheep/chickens) Their property tax is reduced substantially.
- Piles of manure.
- Please consider re-evaluating the county's stance on chickens in an urban setting. If Edmonton deems it possible to allow individuals to keep chickens, then it should also be possible for residents of Sherwood Park to do the same.
- please let people be
- Prefer to allow country dwellers the freedom to use their land as they see fit without undue regulation. Only limits need be on large-scale commercial operations in acreage areas.
- Request a total ban on fireworks in rural areas as these are extremely bad for livestock & wildlife. Horses should not be classed as livestock as the only advantage is for the slaughter industry. Horses are not bred for meat & there are no regulations (as per cattle) to protect them.
- Right now I believe people may need to increase their livestock to supplement income or food sources. I believe the decisions regarding livestock should be left up to the property owner since they own the land. I also believe beekeeping (and the crops/flowers required for them) should be encouraged.
- Right to shoot crows ravens magpies as these are all detrimental to livestock.
- Roosters and chickens should be classed in the same. You have to have roosters to have chickens. Also, they protect their flock of hens so unless you want to just feed the hawks with your hens, having chickens without roosters are pointless. We get harassing anonymous letters in our mailbox and repeated calls to bylaw because someone in our subdivision doesn't like hearing a rooster in the morning... but they tolerate dogs barking from every acreage, and coyotes on a

- nightly basis... Even the peace officer says it's just a waste of time for him to come out every time because we are allowed to have roosters and they are just being poor neighbors.
- Roosters and donkeys are too loud for 3-5 acre parcels
 - Roosters should not be allowed on 1 to 10 acres due to noise.
 - See above regarding minis/ponies- should allow two units per acre for them and keep the one full size horse per acre rule.
 - Seems to me that when animal per acre is discussed, it is not discerning GRAZING acres. The questions are not accurately reflecting the actual grazing area. Much of the parcel size is house/outbuildings/driveways...so I feel this is a misrepresentation. I would like to see the wording in the current Animal Control Bylaw 'allows one animal unit per acre', changed to read '...one animal unit per GRAZING acre...' I think the land is being abused in OVERGRAZING, hence animals potentially being underfed.
 - Should be better responses to deal with unreliable animal owners. Calling between bylaws, RCMP, SPCA, no one in rush to help citizens trying to help livestock that got lose.
 - Should people who own horses be treated the same as people who own dogs - pick up after their animals? It's not very appealing to see horse manure on the road where children and adults are walking or riding their bikes. They could ride their horses in the green area where the manure and hoof print holes would not be harmful or bother anyone.
 - Small holdings should consider miniatures horses or donkeys.
 - Small lot 2-3. and 3-5 acre are ok for the livestock but owner need more education to look' after animals
 - Smell , flies, health risk,
 - Some livestock have a very short period of life (i.e. Broiler chickens ~ 8 weeks). I believe this type of information should be considered in the calculation of how many livestock should be permitted per acre.
 - Some of the numbers of livestock allowed per acre are concerning e.g. 20 duck, chickens or rabbits. Feel this number should be lower, around 10.
 - Someone who owns a small acreage (under 5 acres) might be interested in also owning small breed livestock, be it cows or horses. Many small breeds are half the size of a large breed horse or cow and shouldn't be classified as a full animal unit taking away the ability to own three miniature cows and possibly some other form of unit like chickens.
 - Sometimes dogs barking are more a nuisance than livestock
 - Status quo works

- Subdivisions should require bun bags for horses being ridden around. Horseback riders riding on roadways should have some oversight. Inexperienced riders and horses are dangerous to themselves and others
- Substance farming should be promoted
- Survey doesn't mention dogs. We rescued several orphan dogs over the years, but were disappointed when told we needed a kennel licence for 3+dogs. We had 4 and live on 4+ acres.
- The ability for rural property owners to produce their own meat and vegetables is the key to helping to decentralize our food supply. We also need to encourage the business development for year round locally grown produce for people who cannot grow their own.
- The amount of land that can contain a specified number of livestock in summer months should be based on the formula used to calculate animal units that is used for government grazing reserves. Many small parcel holdings cannot adequately support an over population of livestock during the summer. Every livestock owner should have a livestock premise id. Farmers / Ranchers of large parcels are forced to have these by law. Why is the small parcel landowner exempt /not enforced from a premise id? If you tallied up all the livestock of small parcel land owners, I am quite sure that total is far beyond the livestock numbers of all the Ag zoned registered farms. All land that is not used by a registered farm or ranch should be taxed at residential rates, not agricultural rates. These people are not registered farmers / ranchers, they are hobby / residential.
- The animal unit definition needs to be redefined. One horse (draft/light/mini) does not equal one cow (beef cow, Holstein cow, Jersey cow, miniature cow). If you are aware of livestock there wide variations in species and spatial needs vary between species and within species. Provincial legislation may give direction. Animal welfare must be taken into consideration.
- the animals were here and it was suitable until the small acreages were crowded in
- The county needs to stop interfering with property owners, and maybe fix the roads or something useful.
- The current animal units are not appropriate, 20 chickens do not equal 1 cow in terms of space required and any potential nuisance to neighbours. 20 chickens can occupy a space of 12 ft x 12 ft, whereas a cow requires much more space. I think the limits should be adjusted to better reflect special requirements and potential nuisance to neighbours
- The current by-law seems reasonable.

- The draw for most people to Strathcona County is the friendly acreage setting. Part of this setting is the ability to have livestock. It gives our children a chance to learn about caring, nurturing and tending to live animals. These are qualities that they will carry for the rest of their lives and will help them become strong individuals in society. Today it seems more and more people forget about their grassroots and ties to the land. We would have fewer issues in society if kids were at home caring for livestock instead of learning bad habits in malls and parkades. Let's not take our children's future away from them by listening to a select few with complaints
- The idea behind buying an acreage is the right to own livestock. If you don't want livestock buy in the city.
- The idea that limiting livestock in rural areas will increase responsible animal ownership is vague and does not carry an objective or end-goal that is shown to increase responsibility in any areas of livestock handling. Having read the proposal and being a resident of rural Strathcona County I would love to see an increase if not totally getting rid of 'limits' entirely on the amount of livestock allowed on acreages in Strathcona County. The problem I see with increasing limits on livestock is that many people may have been following the bylaws correctly, but if a livestock limitation occurs then many innocent citizens and or farmers will be forced to either get rid of the newly defined 'extra' animals, or keep them, and then risk being criminalized for not getting rid of their previously, lawfully owned livestock. Livestock is a farmer's property and to own and keep it lawfully should not be infringed on. As long as the animals remain on their property there should be an obligation to protect the farmer, and if not, simply leave the farmers alone. The county should not get to in-force what a real farm is. If I have only three acres and want a couple hundred chickens if they are on my property then they are not the governments business. If the law changes to up the limits or get rid of them entirely, then I am all for it and welcome a long needed change to our increasingly more complex and useless laws designed by people who probably never even so much as touched a live chicken in their life. Allowing rural farmers more freedom will create a healthy local market for locally grown and raised goods while increasing competition to large scale industry in a fair and competitive free market manner. Thank you for considering the above.
- The only concern is that the animals have enough food.
- The only issue that I've had with livestock is horseback riders riding on subdivision roads. The horses poop all over the road and the riders do not clean up after. Subdivision residents including children use these roads for walking, biking and other activity. People with dogs pick up after their dogs pick up after their animals, why not horse riders?
- The rules on keeping honey bees are too restrictive in Strathcona county

- The rules should encourage self-sufficiency among residents. It should be reasonably easy for people to own a couple of chickens or bees. Residents in Sherwood Park should be allowed a couple of chickens or bees or a pet pot-bellied pig without much hassle.
- the type of animals (chickens etc.) tend bring more coyotes into the area which leads to them getting into garbage and endangering household pets
- There is a lot of over grazing here in the county.
- There should be containment regulations as well.
- There should more follow up on the care of these animals - ensure that they are looked after sufficiently. There will be lack of space and waste issues.
- There's no point in having a bylaw that stipulates how many animals on smaller acreage is if you're not willing to enforce it! There are too many small acreages that have over their limit and continue to have over their limit despite neighbour relations breaking down and regardless of what the bylaw currently allows. Too many animals on smaller acreages can also mean toxins leaking into Wells and manure overflow into surface water drainage
- Think that 2 large animals per acre would be reasonable.
- This survey doesn't seem to concern people living on land between 10 & 20 acres.
- This survey has been set up to get a pre-ordained outcome. It is bogus, phoney, sinister and corrupt and whoever set it up should be fired.
- this year I have seen many animals in a foot of water , people need to make sure there is proper place to home the animals before deciding on bring them home
- too many dogs, too little bylaw enforcement, too much noise
- Typically large animals require more than 1 acre per animal for grazing needs. It is hard to feed large animals on anything less than 1 acre per horse. Especially during times of drought. Animal Feed needs should be considered during this survey. Many people rely on pasture grass for feed during the summer months.
- We are wondering if this will apply to acreage owners exclusively or will it also be pointed towards farms.
- We feel it is essential to keep with the current regulations. They are fair for surrounding neighbors. If these are clearly enforced there should be no problem with people having animals. Thank you for this survey.
- We have lived in the County for over 40 years and have had livestock, horses, cattle, pigs, chickens, rabbits, goats and because of our

climate feed always has to be brought in. With the financial climate it would be good to be able to raise a person own meat. There was nothing better than sitting down to a meal where everything had been home grown or made. Even in the Hamlet if the property owner has the land they should be able to own the allowable livestock for the amount of land they have, with no special permit

- We have several neighbours with livestock and I enjoy walking and seeing them and hearing the roosters. Everyone seems very responsible with their livestock and I'm glad they have them. I have considered having ducks or chickens but have never pursued it.
- We live in RURAL Strathcona County. Livestock should be allowed and anyone living in RURAL Strathcona County should accept that there may be livestock in their area.
- We live in the area of south cooking lake and very much enjoy our little community . Sometimes the donkey is around the store area or mowing the grass nearby and we don't mind at all . We prefer to see livestock , cows , horses, donkeys , and chickens in the area and don't care to what extent . As long as the animal have sufficient care and means to eat . We hope this survey will not affect anyone in our community negatively and we will continue to see livestock around the area . Changing regulations that would affect those would probably make the area less desirable to live and out property taxes are high enough already . Especially with paying for a water line that the golf course uses without paying into . Hopefully this will be brought to attention as it is a more important issue
- We live in the hamlet of Antler Lake. We would like to be able to own a couple of chickens. Please address this in your upcoming bylaws.
- We moved to an acreage to be free to have animals and want to see fewer rules and regulations rather than more. You can save yourself a lot of time if you just stay within the rules you have instead of adding more. I realize common sense is getting scarcer and some people will be irresponsible but for the rest of us - fewer rules are better than more.
- We need an indoor facility for livestock in Strathcona County!!!!!!
- We should be allowed to have small livestock in hamlets, like chickens, ducks, and rabbits. Also, quail are a great option the county could promote as they are quiet and provide meat and eggs
- We should be encouraging the ability of residents to responsibly have livestock even on smaller properties.
- What to do when neighbours livestock escapes and comes into yard given that it has happened to us multiple times The guidelines for amount of animals per acre should be worded a little more clear - we struggle with understanding it and establishing whether or not some people are over or within the limit

- Where can you get a hay analysis done, also, does the county provide someone to look at pastures and provide feedback
- Where properties are zoned agriculture and have commercial livestock business, the bylaw would have provisions to protect the property from livestock disease. Example - no small flocks of birds (ducks, chickens turkeys) within 1 mile of a commercial bird operation. This is to minimise the risk of the small flock infecting the commercial flock with disease (ILT) where both the small flock and commercial flock would need to be destroyed. If allowed, the small flock owner would need to have a permit and insurance to compensate the mass destruction of the commercial flock. Also, large animals including cattle, horses and bison must have specific fencing and subject to inspection. Small acreages must have an emergency plan for large animals in event of wildfire including ability to transport livestock to safe zones identified by the County (grazing lease space)
- Why should other people dictate what their neighbor has for animals in their yard? That's like me having a problem with what hand soap my neighbor uses, or what trees my neighbor puts in their yard. My point is, it's their yard that they own; why should it be anyone else's issue in regard to what they have in THEIR PROPERTY?
- Why was there not an option for horses with regards to the number of animals for 3-5 acre parcels?
- Would like to see being able to raise chickens on 1/4 acre and 1/2 acre plots of land in the rural hamlets.
- Would like to see hay testing and an Ag department that's involved with livestock and livestock management. A resource for livestock owners (new and experienced) to be able to go to. I feel like there are few resources right now besides finding another producer and that can be difficult for a new livestock owner or someone looking into it.
- Would like to see more support of agriculture in the county. Programs, Fairs, etc. Currently traveling to all other neighboring communities/ counties for use of agricultural facilities.