

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~
~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

4115 Bedford Drive,
San Diego 4, Calif.
July 28. 1947.

City Council,
San Diego, Calif.

Gentlemen:

I am for much stricter regulations for dogs.

There are eight homes on our section of Bedford Drive. One homemaker has four dogs, the rest have none. These dogs roam around during the entire day, and mess up all the lawns and gardens,

They should be restrained.

Very truly yours,
R. K. Gurney.



SAN DIEGO, CALIF. 92101
JUL 29 10 12 AM '47

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
JUL 29 1947

San Diego, Calif.
July 31st, 1947.

The Honorable, The Mayor,
and Common Council of
San Diego, California.

Dear Sirs:-

Re: DOGS.

I shall be glad if you will let me give you my ideas relative to regulation of dogs, something which is a crying need and getting more and more so steadily.

However, I hardly see how any further legislation can be effective unless enforced better than the present "leash law." There seems to be a curious idea in many families that some sort of a dog, (it doesn't seem to matter much what kind), is an appendage quite as necessary as the refrigerator or the car, regardless of how he affects others.

As a matter of fact little attention is paid to the beast, once the novelty is past. In the nature of the thing he can't even enter into the sort of activities the present generation of children indulge in. Ordinarily he is not at all "a friend of man;" in fact the generality of dogs around town are hostile to everybody except the owner and his immediate familiars. This neglect--lack of care and training-- is probably largely the cause of his senseless barking and suspicious officiousness.

I hear that many letters of protest have already been put on file, yet apparently there is nothing unreasonable proposed for the new law. Surely there should, within the "built-up" sections of the city, be some regulation. I have a notion that what the average "dog-lover" wants is no regulation at all, but ~~the~~ license to maintain a nuisance regardless of the rights and comfort of his neighbors. This sounds harsh, but I have lived (and paid taxes) for over forty years in San Diego, and in that time have resided in several widely separate neighborhoods, and in no one of them was there lacking a dog who was a plain, aggravated nuisance, admitted to be so by everybody but his owner.

If, after an evening of reading, I wish to stroll about a bit; if I have an errand to the drug store or to the branch library, after dark, -- is there any reason why I must avoid a certain stretch of sidewalk lest a dog rush out at me barking his fool-head off as if he had caught me trying to break in to his master's house? He may (has) follow me a block or more, snapping at my legs, and I have no means of knowing whether he will bite me or not. I have been so bitten twice. In neither case did the owner make any concessions or show any solicitude other than as to whether I might report the affair. If I start from the house and a big brute jumps up on me with his dirty paws, so that I have to go back and again make myself presentable, and

protest to the owner as to the dog running loose he merely declares sullenly, "He's got as good a right on the street as you have." If I (or any near-neighbor) having been "out" for the evening, returns home late, I cannot put my car in the garage without a fusillade of raucous barking that cannot but wake several people living nearby. There is one worthless pup who can be trusted to break out almost regularly somewhere around eleven, P.M., two A.M. and, very often, about five, A.M. Can any "dog-lover" justify that?

There are, in almost every neighborhood, elderly people and others who are unwell and need their rest. Often they would be only too glad to get away, but are unable. If they had their moral deserts, many dog-owners should be heavily penalized for the injury which they do, (through their dogs) inconsiderately, flagrantly and entirely unnecessarily. Why should one have to clean dog-droppings off his lawn, whether the dog was on a leash or loose? It happens either way.

Now, there is another phase of the situation. A dog's excreta is not like that of a horse-- it is as objectionable as that of a human being. In these days of pavement everywhere, the very casual, superficial gestures toward sanitation more or less instinctive with dogs ~~have~~ ^{have} been about bred out of them. Why should the brutes be allowed to run about committing nuisances at will--six or eight on an average, perhaps, in one city block, over a period of years? Imagine any small child doing the like, even for a day. Even the "dog-lover" would have a fit over that. If the board of health has no interest in such a matter, what do we have a health board for? And, with more and more dogs, that question becomes more pertinent. But it will hardly occur to a dog-owner, he seeming to be (as a class) from my observation, "not very particular."

The idea that complaints may be indicative of spite if made by one person only, I don't think should be taken too seriously. It is very hard to get people to back you up in a complaint, even though they freely admit the disturbance. They are willing to let somebody else pull their chestnuts out of the fire, but mostly are averse to "causing bad feeling" by taking a stand. It would take but a few minutes to an hour for a motor-cycle officer to investigate a complaint anyway, by inquiry, and probably his warning would be enough. The idea that people have to be put to the inconvenience (and possible expense) of going into court over a nuisance which is ~~xxxxxxxx~~ perfectly apparent, is certainly not right.

Very respectfully,

Charles Herbert

MAY 31 3 30 PM 1947

RECEIVED
MAY 31 1947



THIS SIDE OF CARD IS FOR ADDRESS

Fred Rohdes
Mgr
Civic Center
San Diego California

City Clerk
Dog File

Mr Rhodes, -
I think the street car
service is plenty bad
and thoir rattle traps
on #11 line is terrible
and the fare is high
enough now, dont
let them raise it again
and Mr Rhodes - can
you put a stop to
these barking dogs
and save of them are
plenty mean too.

A Tax Payer

Thank You.

3586 Univ. Ave., San Diego 4, Calif., July 31, 1947.

City Council,

Civic Center, San Diego.

Gentlemen:

I am bitterly opposed to dogs running loose in San Diego, and I do hope you will pass the ordinance requiring dogs always to be on leash when on the street or off their owners' premises.

And please add to what you already have, the stipulation that owners may be prosecuted for letting their dogs stop on other people's lawns or premises. The party next door makes a practice of turning his dog out on our lawn evenings, when his own lawn is next door on the other side. Why don't "dog lovers" let their dogs use their own lawns instead of their neighbors lawns and expect their neighbors to do the cleaning up. It is just things like this that make people disgusted with dogs. I used to love dogs but since I am run over by them, I dislike them, and truly dislike the way their owners let them do.

For all these reasons, a law protecting the people, is very much needed and I do hope you pass it and see that it is enforced.

Respectfully submitted,

Agnes J. Goodwine

4215 Durock St -
San Diego Calif
July 31 47

To City Councilmen of San Diego

Gentlemen
May I be allowed to say
a few words on the dog question,
and that is to hope you will do
something to curb this nuisance.
This part of San Diego is just over
run with loose dogs, both day &
night, I am fond of all animals, but
there should be some way to stop
the running loose all the time &
all over other peoples property.
The great trouble is these dog owners
do not care who their dogs are
a nuisance to, as long as they do
not bother them, please do
something to stop the nuisance.

Respectfully
F A West

DOCUMENT No. 376101

Filed... AUG. 1 1947

~~FRED W. SICK, City Clerk~~
By Clark M. Foote, Deputy
Deputy

COMMUNICATIONS

FROM

*Residents relative to
proposed ordinance
regulating the keeping
of dogs*

(For proposed ordinance)