

Dear Councilman Wu,

In regards to the proposed code change to Old East Hill Preservation District (OEHC-1), I would like to state my opposition to this change. I believe it an unnecessary and dangerous change that should be flatly denied.

Dr. Hall claims that there's never been a complaint against her business. **As a neighbor in very close proximity, I can attest that this is more a function of our desire to be accommodating to the needs of our neighborhood businesses, rather than a sign that Dr. Halls' business poses no issues for neighbors.** Please remember, this discussion culminated from neighbors having reached a breaking point with the noise emanating from Dr Halls business, and calling Code Enforcement, which resulted in a finding of violation by not just the enforcement officer, but of the presiding magistrate as well.

In order to avoid responsibility for having violated code, Dr. Hall is now attempting claim there is no actual violation by redefining terms: She is conflating "kennels" and "runs" with "outdoor exercise areas" and then further trying to confuse the issue by claiming "outdoor exercise areas" means something different to veterinarians than laypersons.

Ultimately, *Pensacola Pet Resort Too* was allowed into Old East Hill because it was supposedly similar to that of a pre-existing **pet store**. A pet store does not need to take animals outside. They use piddle pads, or indoor wet areas. Does the pet store at the mall require that animals be taken outside? Of course not. Does anyone think it inhumane that those animals are kept inside, and in some cases caged, at all times?

It was these limitations and conditions that Dr. Hall agreed to when she was originally given license to operate *Pensacola Pet Resort Too*. Further, she agreed to limitations, supposedly written by her, in 2008 when requesting a code change for *East Hill Animal Hospital*. **Dr. Hall is now seeking to expand the functions of *Pensacola Pet Resort Too* to include uses exceeding these limitations, and wholly inappropriate near a residential area.**

Please keep in mind, Dr. Hall has been given ample opportunity to bring her concerns and needs to the neighborhood, and to solicit feedback, however she has shown no interest in a solution to her problems other than an overly broad solution which gives her excessive license to operate unchecked in proximity to a residential area.

Even if you believe the current code needs clarification, please ask yourself: **What clarity exactly does this code change request add to the code?**

Dr. Hall still has plenty of time and means to resolve her code violation without resorting to such an overly broad change to city code which could have costly and unnecessary long-term effects.

Dr Hall seems to imply that her business and the livelihoods of her employees are somehow at risk if this code change does not go through. It may very well be that her Pet Resort business needs to move to a more appropriate location; businesses often outgrow their locations and it seems as if Dr. Hall may have reached that point. However, changing the code to allow a business to eke out a few more years at a location does a severe disservice to not only the business, but to the residents around the business and the city as a whole.

Being pro-business is great, but supporting a business' request simply because it's a business is nothing more than ideological extremism, and does nothing to improve the community in the long run, and can, in fact, be a detriment, not only to residents, but also to other businesses. How many other boarding facilities will appreciate the city giving one particular business a competitive advantage (a convenient downtown location) that would never be afforded to them?

This change sets a dangerous precedent that could result in the city being embroiled in an expensive and unnecessary lawsuit to defend the neighborhood from overreach by a business which already operates on the fringes of appropriateness near a residential area.

Please deny this requested code change.

Regards,

Joshua Gleaton
706 East Jackson St

Dear Councilman Wingate,

In regards to the proposed code change to Old East Hill Preservation District (OEHC-1), I would like to state my opposition to this change. I believe it an unnecessary and dangerous change that should be flatly denied.

Dr. Hall claims that there's never been a complaint against her business. **As a neighbor in very close proximity, I can attest that this is more a function of our desire to be accommodating to the needs of our neighborhood businesses, rather than a sign that Dr. Halls' business poses no issues for neighbors.** Please remember, this discussion culminated from neighbors having reached a breaking point with the noise emanating from Dr Halls business, and calling Code Enforcement, which resulted in a finding of violation by not just the enforcement officer, but of the presiding magistrate as well.

In order to avoid responsibility for having violated code, Dr. Hall is now attempting claim there is no actual violation by redefining terms: She is conflating "kennels" and "runs" with "outdoor exercise areas" and then further trying to confuse the issue by claiming "outdoor exercise areas" means something different to veterinarians than laypersons.

Ultimately, *Pensacola Pet Resort Too* was allowed into Old East Hill because it was supposedly similar to that of a pre-existing **pet store**. A pet store does not need to take animals outside. They use piddle pads, or indoor wet areas. Does the pet store at the mall require that animals be taken outside? Of course not. Does anyone think it inhumane that those animals are kept inside, and in some cases caged, at all times?

It was these limitations and conditions that Dr. Hall agreed to when she was originally given license to operate *Pensacola Pet Resort Too*. Further, she agreed to limitations, supposedly written by her, in 2008 when requesting a code change for *East Hill Animal Hospital*. **Dr. Hall is now seeking to expand the functions of *Pensacola Pet Resort Too* to include uses exceeding these limitations, and wholly inappropriate near a residential area.**

Please keep in mind, Dr. Hall has been given ample opportunity to bring her concerns and needs to the neighborhood, and to solicit feedback, however she has shown no interest in a solution to her problems other than an overly broad solution which gives her excessive license to operate unchecked in proximity to a residential area.

Even if you believe the current code needs clarification, please ask yourself: **What clarity exactly does this code change request add to the code?**

Dr. Hall still has plenty of time and means to resolve her code violation without resorting to such an overly broad change to city code which could have costly and unnecessary long-term effects.

Dr Hall seems to imply that her business and the livelihoods of her employees are somehow at risk if this code change does not go through. It may very well be that her Pet Resort business needs to move to a more appropriate location; businesses often outgrow their locations and it seems as if Dr. Hall may have reached that point. However, changing the code to allow a business to eke out a few more years at a location does a severe disservice to not only the business, but to the residents around the business and the city as a whole.

Being pro-business is great, but supporting a business' request simply because it's a business is nothing more than ideological extremism, and does nothing to improve the community in the long run, and can, in fact, be a detriment, not only to residents, but also to other businesses. How many other boarding facilities will appreciate the city giving one particular business a competitive advantage (a convenient downtown location) that would never be afforded to them?

This change sets a dangerous precedent that could result in the city being embroiled in an expensive and unnecessary lawsuit to defend the neighborhood from overreach by a business which already operates on the fringes of appropriateness near a residential area.

Please deny this requested code change.

Regards,

Joshua Gleaton
706 East Jackson St

Dear Councilman Terhaar,

In regards to the proposed code change to Old East Hill Preservation District (OEHC-1), I would like to state my opposition to this change. I believe it an unnecessary and dangerous change that should be flatly denied.

Dr. Hall claims that there's never been a complaint against her business. **As a neighbor in very close proximity, I can attest that this is more a function of our desire to be accommodating to the needs of our neighborhood businesses, rather than a sign that Dr. Halls' business poses no issues for neighbors.** Please remember, this discussion culminated from neighbors having reached a breaking point with the noise emanating from Dr Halls business, and calling Code Enforcement, which resulted in a finding of violation by not just the enforcement officer, but of the presiding magistrate as well.

In order to avoid responsibility for having violated code, Dr. Hall is now attempting claim there is no actual violation by redefining terms: She is conflating "kennels" and "runs" with "outdoor exercise areas" and then further trying to confuse the issue by claiming "outdoor exercise areas" means something different to veterinarians than laypersons.

Ultimately, *Pensacola Pet Resort Too* was allowed into Old East Hill because it was supposedly similar to that of a pre-existing **pet store**. A pet store does not need to take animals outside. They use piddle pads, or indoor wet areas. Does the pet store at the mall require that animals be taken outside? Of course not. Does anyone think it inhumane that those animals are kept inside, and in some cases caged, at all times?

It was these limitations and conditions that Dr. Hall agreed to when she was originally given license to operate *Pensacola Pet Resort Too*. Further, she agreed to limitations, supposedly written by her, in 2008 when requesting a code change for *East Hill Animal Hospital*. **Dr. Hall is now seeking to expand the functions of *Pensacola Pet Resort Too* to include uses exceeding these limitations, and wholly inappropriate near a residential area.**

Please keep in mind, Dr. Hall has been given ample opportunity to bring her concerns and needs to the neighborhood, and to solicit feedback, however she has shown no interest in a solution to her problems other than an overly broad solution which gives her excessive license to operate unchecked in proximity to a residential area.

Even if you believe the current code needs clarification, please ask yourself: **What clarity exactly does this code change request add to the code?**

Dr. Hall still has plenty of time and means to resolve her code violation without resorting to such an overly broad change to city code which could have costly and unnecessary long-term effects.

Dr Hall seems to imply that her business and the livelihoods of her employees are somehow at risk if this code change does not go through. It may very well be that her Pet Resort business needs to move to a more appropriate location; businesses often outgrow their locations and it seems as if Dr. Hall may have reached that point. However, changing the code to allow a business to eke out a few more years at a location does a severe disservice to not only the business, but to the residents around the business and the city as a whole.

Being pro-business is great, but supporting a business' request simply because it's a business is nothing more than ideological extremism, and does nothing to improve the community in the long run, and can, in fact, be a detriment, not only to residents, but also to other businesses. How many other boarding facilities will appreciate the city giving one particular business a competitive advantage (a convenient downtown location) that would never be afforded to them?

This change sets a dangerous precedent that could result in the city being embroiled in an expensive and unnecessary lawsuit to defend the neighborhood from overreach by a business which already operates on the fringes of appropriateness near a residential area.

Please deny this requested code change.

Regards,

Joshua Gleaton
706 East Jackson St

Dear Councilman Spencer,

In regards to the proposed code change to Old East Hill Preservation District (OEHC-1), I would like to state my opposition to this change. I believe it an unnecessary and dangerous change that should be flatly denied.

Dr. Hall claims that there's never been a complaint against her business. **As a neighbor in very close proximity, I can attest that this is more a function of our desire to be accommodating to the needs of our neighborhood businesses, rather than a sign that Dr. Halls' business poses no issues for neighbors.** Please remember, this discussion culminated from neighbors having reached a breaking point with the noise emanating from Dr Halls business, and calling Code Enforcement, which resulted in a finding of violation by not just the enforcement officer, but of the presiding magistrate as well.

In order to avoid responsibility for having violated code, Dr. Hall is now attempting claim there is no actual violation by redefining terms: She is conflating "kennels" and "runs" with "outdoor exercise areas" and then further trying to confuse the issue by claiming "outdoor exercise areas" means something different to veterinarians than laypersons.

Ultimately, *Pensacola Pet Resort Too* was allowed into Old East Hill because it was supposedly similar to that of a pre-existing **pet store**. A pet store does not need to take animals outside. They use piddle pads, or indoor wet areas. Does the pet store at the mall require that animals be taken outside? Of course not. Does anyone think it inhumane that those animals are kept inside, and in some cases caged, at all times?

It was these limitations and conditions that Dr. Hall agreed to when she was originally given license to operate *Pensacola Pet Resort Too*. Further, she agreed to limitations, supposedly written by her, in 2008 when requesting a code change for *East Hill Animal Hospital*. **Dr. Hall is now seeking to expand the functions of *Pensacola Pet Resort Too* to include uses exceeding these limitations, and wholly inappropriate near a residential area.**

Please keep in mind, Dr. Hall has been given ample opportunity to bring her concerns and needs to the neighborhood, and to solicit feedback, however she has shown no interest in a solution to her problems other than an overly broad solution which gives her excessive license to operate unchecked in proximity to a residential area.

Even if you believe the current code needs clarification, please ask yourself: **What clarity exactly does this code change request add to the code?**

Dr. Hall still has plenty of time and means to resolve her code violation without resorting to such an overly broad change to city code which could have costly and unnecessary long-term effects.

Dr Hall seems to imply that her business and the livelihoods of her employees are somehow at risk if this code change does not go through. It may very well be that her Pet Resort business needs to move to a more appropriate location; businesses often outgrow their locations and it seems as if Dr. Hall may have reached that point. However, changing the code to allow a business to eke out a few more years at a location does a severe disservice to not only the business, but to the residents around the business and the city as a whole.

Being pro-business is great, but supporting a business' request simply because it's a business is nothing more than ideological extremism, and does nothing to improve the community in the long run, and can, in fact, be a detriment, not only to residents, but also to other businesses. How many other boarding facilities will appreciate the city giving one particular business a competitive advantage (a convenient downtown location) that would never be afforded to them?

This change sets a dangerous precedent that could result in the city being embroiled in an expensive and unnecessary lawsuit to defend the neighborhood from overreach by a business which already operates on the fringes of appropriateness near a residential area.

Please deny this requested code change.

Regards,

Joshua Gleaton
706 East Jackson St

Dear Councilwoman Myers,

In regards to the proposed code change to Old East Hill Preservation District (OEHC-1), I would like to state my opposition to this change. I believe it an unnecessary and dangerous change that should be flatly denied.

Dr. Hall claims that there's never been a complaint against her business. **As a neighbor in very close proximity, I can attest that this is more a function of our desire to be accommodating to the needs of our neighborhood businesses, rather than a sign that Dr. Halls' business poses no issues for neighbors.** Please remember, this discussion culminated from neighbors having reached a breaking point with the noise emanating from Dr Halls business, and calling Code Enforcement, which resulted in a finding of violation by not just the enforcement officer, but of the presiding magistrate as well.

In order to avoid responsibility for having violated code, Dr. Hall is now attempting claim there is no actual violation by redefining terms: She is conflating "kennels" and "runs" with "outdoor exercise areas" and then further trying to confuse the issue by claiming "outdoor exercise areas" means something different to veterinarians than laypersons.

Ultimately, *Pensacola Pet Resort Too* was allowed into Old East Hill because it was supposedly similar to that of a pre-existing **pet store**. A pet store does not need to take animals outside. They use piddle pads, or indoor wet areas. Does the pet store at the mall require that animals be taken outside? Of course not. Does anyone think it inhumane that those animals are kept inside, and in some cases caged, at all times?

It was these limitations and conditions that Dr. Hall agreed to when she was originally given license to operate *Pensacola Pet Resort Too*. Further, she agreed to limitations, supposedly written by her, in 2008 when requesting a code change for *East Hill Animal Hospital*. **Dr. Hall is now seeking to expand the functions of *Pensacola Pet Resort Too* to include uses exceeding these limitations, and wholly inappropriate near a residential area.**

Please keep in mind, Dr. Hall has been given ample opportunity to bring her concerns and needs to the neighborhood, and to solicit feedback, however she has shown no interest in a solution to her problems other than an overly broad solution which gives her excessive license to operate unchecked in proximity to a residential area.

Even if you believe the current code needs clarification, please ask yourself: **What clarity exactly does this code change request add to the code?**

Dr. Hall still has plenty of time and means to resolve her code violation without resorting to such an overly broad change to city code which could have costly and unnecessary long-term effects.

Dr Hall seems to imply that her business and the livelihoods of her employees are somehow at risk if this code change does not go through. It may very well be that her Pet Resort business needs to move to a more appropriate location; businesses often outgrow their locations and it seems as if Dr. Hall may have reached that point. However, changing the code to allow a business to eke out a few more years at a location does a severe disservice to not only the business, but to the residents around the business and the city as a whole.

Being pro-business is great, but supporting a business' request simply because it's a business is nothing more than ideological extremism, and does nothing to improve the community in the long run, and can, in fact, be a detriment, not only to residents, but also to other businesses. How many other boarding facilities will appreciate the city giving one particular business a competitive advantage (a convenient downtown location) that would never be afforded to them?

This change sets a dangerous precedent that could result in the city being embroiled in an expensive and unnecessary lawsuit to defend the neighborhood from overreach by a business which already operates on the fringes of appropriateness near a residential area.

Please deny this requested code change.

Regards,

Joshua Gleaton
706 East Jackson St

Dear Councilman Johnson,

In regards to the proposed code change to Old East Hill Preservation District (OEHC-1), I would like to state my opposition to this change. I believe it an unnecessary and dangerous change that should be flatly denied.

Dr. Hall claims that there's never been a complaint against her business. **As a neighbor in very close proximity, I can attest that this is more a function of our desire to be accommodating to the needs of our neighborhood businesses, rather than a sign that Dr. Halls' business poses no issues for neighbors.** Please remember, this discussion culminated from neighbors having reached a breaking point with the noise emanating from Dr Halls business, and calling Code Enforcement, which resulted in a finding of violation by not just the enforcement officer, but of the presiding magistrate as well.

In order to avoid responsibility for having violated code, Dr. Hall is now attempting claim there is no actual violation by redefining terms: She is conflating "kennels" and "runs" with "outdoor exercise areas" and then further trying to confuse the issue by claiming "outdoor exercise areas" means something different to veterinarians than laypersons.

Ultimately, *Pensacola Pet Resort Too* was allowed into Old East Hill because it was supposedly similar to that of a pre-existing **pet store**. A pet store does not need to take animals outside. They use piddle pads, or indoor wet areas. Does the pet store at the mall require that animals be taken outside? Of course not. Does anyone think it inhumane that those animals are kept inside, and in some cases caged, at all times?

It was these limitations and conditions that Dr. Hall agreed to when she was originally given license to operate *Pensacola Pet Resort Too*. Further, she agreed to limitations, supposedly written by her, in 2008 when requesting a code change for *East Hill Animal Hospital*. **Dr. Hall is now seeking to expand the functions of *Pensacola Pet Resort Too* to include uses exceeding these limitations, and wholly inappropriate near a residential area.**

Please keep in mind, Dr. Hall has been given ample opportunity to bring her concerns and needs to the neighborhood, and to solicit feedback, however she has shown no interest in a solution to her problems other than an overly broad solution which gives her excessive license to operate unchecked in proximity to a residential area.

Even if you believe the current code needs clarification, please ask yourself: **What clarity exactly does this code change request add to the code?**

Dr. Hall still has plenty of time and means to resolve her code violation without resorting to such an overly broad change to city code which could have costly and unnecessary long-term effects.

Dr Hall seems to imply that her business and the livelihoods of her employees are somehow at risk if this code change does not go through. It may very well be that her Pet Resort business needs to move to a more appropriate location; businesses often outgrow their locations and it seems as if Dr. Hall may have reached that point. However, changing the code to allow a business to eke out a few more years at a location does a severe disservice to not only the business, but to the residents around the business and the city as a whole.

Being pro-business is great, but supporting a business' request simply because it's a business is nothing more than ideological extremism, and does nothing to improve the community in the long run, and can, in fact, be a detriment, not only to residents, but also to other businesses. How many other boarding facilities will appreciate the city giving one particular business a competitive advantage (a convenient downtown location) that would never be afforded to them?

This change sets a dangerous precedent that could result in the city being embroiled in an expensive and unnecessary lawsuit to defend the neighborhood from overreach by a business which already operates on the fringes of appropriateness near a residential area.

Please deny this requested code change.

Regards,

Joshua Gleaton
706 East Jackson St

Dear Councilwoman Cannada-Wynn,

In regards to the proposed code change to Old East Hill Preservation District (OEHC-1), I would like to state my opposition to this change. I believe it an unnecessary and dangerous change that should be flatly denied.

Dr. Hall claims that there's never been a complaint against her business. **As a neighbor in very close proximity, I can attest that this is more a function of our desire to be accommodating to the needs of our neighborhood businesses, rather than a sign that Dr. Halls' business poses no issues for neighbors.** Please remember, this discussion culminated from neighbors having reached a breaking point with the noise emanating from Dr Halls business, and calling Code Enforcement, which resulted in a finding of violation by not just the enforcement officer, but of the presiding magistrate as well.

In order to avoid responsibility for having violated code, Dr. Hall is now attempting claim there is no actual violation by redefining terms: She is conflating "kennels" and "runs" with "outdoor exercise areas" and then further trying to confuse the issue by claiming "outdoor exercise areas" means something different to veterinarians than laypersons.

Ultimately, *Pensacola Pet Resort Too* was allowed into Old East Hill because it was supposedly similar to that of a pre-existing **pet store**. A pet store does not need to take animals outside. They use piddle pads, or indoor wet areas. Does the pet store at the mall require that animals be taken outside? Of course not. Does anyone think it inhumane that those animals are kept inside, and in some cases caged, at all times?

It was these limitations and conditions that Dr. Hall agreed to when she was originally given license to operate *Pensacola Pet Resort Too*. Further, she agreed to limitations, supposedly written by her, in 2008 when requesting a code change for *East Hill Animal Hospital*. **Dr. Hall is now seeking to expand the functions of *Pensacola Pet Resort Too* to include uses exceeding these limitations, and wholly inappropriate near a residential area.**

Please keep in mind, Dr. Hall has been given ample opportunity to bring her concerns and needs to the neighborhood, and to solicit feedback, however she has shown no interest in a solution to her problems other than an overly broad solution which gives her excessive license to operate unchecked in proximity to a residential area.

Even if you believe the current code needs clarification, please ask yourself: **What clarity exactly does this code change request add to the code?**

Dr. Hall still has plenty of time and means to resolve her code violation without resorting to such an overly broad change to city code which could have costly and unnecessary long-term effects.

Dr Hall seems to imply that her business and the livelihoods of her employees are somehow at risk if this code change does not go through. It may very well be that her Pet Resort business needs to move to a more appropriate location; businesses often outgrow their locations and it seems as if Dr. Hall may have reached that point. However, changing the code to allow a business to eke out a few more years at a location does a severe disservice to not only the business, but to the residents around the business and the city as a whole.

Being pro-business is great, but supporting a business' request simply because it's a business is nothing more than ideological extremism, and does nothing to improve the community in the long run, and can, in fact, be a detriment, not only to residents, but also to other businesses. How many other boarding facilities will appreciate the city giving one particular business a competitive advantage (a convenient downtown location) that would never be afforded to them?

This change sets a dangerous precedent that could result in the city being embroiled in an expensive and unnecessary lawsuit to defend the neighborhood from overreach by a business which already operates on the fringes of appropriateness near a residential area.

Please deny this requested code change.

Regards,

Joshua Gleaton
706 East Jackson St

From: Joshua Gleaton [<mailto:joshua.gleaton@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2018 3:02 PM

To: Ericka Burnett <EBurnett@cityofpensacola.com>

Subject: OEH Proposed Code Change

Ms. Burnett,

Please let me know you have any questions or comments about the attached letters forwarded to Council regarding the proposed code change to Old East Hill.

Thank you,

Joshua Gleaton
706 E Jackson St