

## FINAL STEP IN LOS ANGELES ANIMAL REGULATIONS APPROACHING

by Jerry Jennings

The L.A. City Council Planning Committee approved, without dissent, a motion to accept the Planning Commission's recommendation to limit only the number of cows on RA city lots, and leave birds alone.

The history of the ordinance covers nearly two years of activity, when a proposal to ban birds and other animals from the city was introduced in June 1974. Strong opposition from A.F.A. and RURAL, a local animal owning, homeowner's association, led to several changes that free aviculturists and would-be gentlemen farmers from potential harrassment. The next and final step will be taken when the full council votes on the issue in the near future.

Existing L.A. animal-keeping and zoning regulations allow aviaries and unlimited numbers of birds on residential lots. A spokesman for the Department of Animal Regulations has advised A.F.A. that they have the same regulations as the state Dept. of Fish and Game, which requires that permits be obtained for birds of prey only and prohibits only a few species, which have been determined to be agricultural pests.

The liberal regulations now in existence make Los Angeles an urban paradise for aviculture, which local aviculturists can ill afford to lose. It would be prudent to anticipate problems that might contribute to future restrictions. Breeders would be wise to critically examine their operations to ensure they are clean, neat in appearance, free from odor and do not create a noise problem offensive to one's neighbor. Neighbor complaints arising from poor husbandry techniques can result in new proposed legislation banning aviculture, which is exactly the cause of the present long fought battle. Future efforts to counter negative legislation will be costly and time consuming. If we can prevent same through good maintenance of our birds, we will help guarantee the future of local aviculture.

NOTE: Since this article was written the Los Angeles City Council received the animal keeping ordinance on Thursday, March 18, 1976 for a final vote. When the ordinance was brought up, Councilmen Lorenzen and Wilkinson asked that the ordinance be returned to committee as they had received complaints that no one had been notified of the Council Planning Committee hearing, and that these same

people wanted an opportunity to speak for stronger restrictions. Oddly, A.F.A. learned of the Planning Committee hearing, so it is curious that others did not. Is there a mysterious effort afoot to make the ordinance more restrictive? Tune in next issue for the latest in this continuing drama

## RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERVISORS THROW OUT ANIMAL RESTRICTIONS

by Jerry Jennings

A second hearing of proposed County Ordinance No. 555 (Watchbird, Vol. III, No. 1) has resulted in that ordinance's defeat, thanks to the opposition of the A.F.A., the only group to oppose the restrictions.

Further study of the provisions of Ordinance 555 by the County Counsel indicated A.F.A. was correct in citing the ordinance's duplication of existing State Fish and Game regulations. On the advice of the County Counsel, the Supervisors voted down the measure. In so doing, Fish and Game would be given an opportunity to enforce their regulations, which only recently came into effect •

## Interested in Love Birds? Join the newly forming AFRICAN LOVE BIRD SOCIETY

dedicated to the study and breeding of lovebirds. For information write to Lee Horton 2376 Bella Vista, Vista, CA. 92083

