

Jomsky, Mark

From: Laura Ellersieck [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2020 11:51 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Dec 14 Council Agenda item 26 re animal hospitals

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

It is not entirely clear to me from reading the staff report if the "additional provisions to minimize impacts" are intended to apply citywide, or only in the central district zones. The implication is citywide, which I find problematic.

If citywide:

- Do they apply to existing establishments, or are those grandfathered?
- Did anyone survey the existing animal hospitals to discover how the new regulations would practically affect existing operations and/or potential new facilities?
- Are these regulations addressing existing problems with current facilities? Are they truly solving problems, or just raising costs, making veterinary care even more expensive?
- I am particularly concerned that the proposed regulation "limiting hours open to the public to 8:00am to 6:00pm" would affect 24-hour emergency animal hospitals. They are few and far between, but very necessary. Pasadena is very fortunate to have one, located on Foothill Blvd. A few people coming and going at all hours could be troublesome in a residential area, but it really is no bother on a commercial corridor.
- I suspect that "requiring hospital staff to be present ... at all times that animals are present" will be a big problem for many veterinary practices. That raises costs considerably, or extremely limits the functionality. It is especially problematic for smaller facilities that would have to spread the cost of that extra coverage over a very few and varying number of animals.

12/14/2020
Item 26