

From: Alaina Neary [mailto:alaina1@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2010 8:06 AM
To: Planning
Subject: doggie daycare decision

To whom it may concern:

I am appalled at your decision to deny Arbor Dog Daycare the ability to expand. From the annarbor.com article, it seems as though you opposed this expansion due to 1 neighbor that complained, and a handful of letters- is this correct? How on earth is that fair for the rest of the citizens of Ann Arbor? The owners of the business have clearly done a massive amount of legwork to ensure that expansion would do nothing to increase noise, and it sounds like they have a large number of people in favor of their expansion. Why is it ever a good thing to stifle business growth in Ann Arbor, specifically in this economy?

Additionally, Dog daycare provides an invaluable service to both humans and canines. By having a place for people to bring their dogs to play and get tired, there are many more well behaved, well exercised dogs around. This means LESS barking over all, less behavioral problems, and everyone is happier.

Please, reconsider your decision to stifle business in this economy. It is so outrageously narrow-minded to let a handful of people's complaints ruin a perfect Ann Arbor business.

Best,
Alaina

From: bill bob [mailto:barnhelp@gmx.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2010 5:04 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Dog Daycare denied

I Have Been Living in Ann Arbor for the last 20 plus years

I can not even think YOU as a [Planning Commission](#)

Can think about killing AA jobs what ever they are
You are starting to look like Southfield Mich.

Pad you palms and it will go (prove me wrong)

But nope you kill Ann Arbor because you dont like a barking dog

Give me a break
Get a life

Bill Bobb

—Original Message—

From: David L Porter [mailto:dporter@umich.edu]

Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2010 4:41 PM

To: Planning

Subject: Dog day care expansion

Dear Commissioners:

I have read the news story about this decision along with the (very extensive) set of comments on the A2.com website at <http://www.annarbor.com/news/arbor-dog-daycare-needs-to-find-somewhere-else-to-expand-its-business-planning-commission-says/>

I must say that under the circumstances it would seem sensible to visit the site yourselves and then (re) visit your decision on this issue.

Sincerely,

David Porter
1465 King George Blvd
Ann Arbor

From: diane hayes [mailto:dianelongpoint@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2010 9:13 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Arbor Dog Daycare Permit

Arbor Dog Daycare has been a strong member of our community in its current location for 4 years now. Most neighbors were unaware of the Daycare's existence until the request to expand was sent out. Reading over the agreements that they came to with the neighboring residential communities, it is apparent that not increasing the outdoor area usage satisfied these housing communities. In referencing the original submission, it is apparent that the vast majority of resident concerns presented were based upon the potential impact of an increase in dogs on Odor and Sound. The agreements obtained by Arbor Dog Daycare from the neighboring communities addressed these concerns in a manner in and submitted to the Planning Commission should have answered these concerns. Out of the several hundred notified of this request, only two individuals remain with issues. This puts those remaining opposed at less than 1% of the surrounding residents. In support, the Owners have met with all of the neighboring facilities, obtained their buy-in along with several hundred signatures in support. It never crossed my mind that with all they have done to ensure that they comply with the Planning Commission's requests, that their request would have been rejected.

The fact that their request was rejected for something that wasn't included in the Special Exception Use request is quite concerning, as they committed to continue to hold the number of dogs outdoors in the "Dog Run" to 25 at any one time.

It is my request that the Planning Commission reverse their decision and allow Arbor Dog Daycare the Special Exception Use Permit as they requested.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter. Diane Hayes

From: Jim Beckstrom [mailto:jrbeckstrom@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2010 1:41 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Arbor Dog Daycare Expansion Request

Please reconsider your decision to deny the owners of Arbor Dog Daycare permission to expand their facility. As I understood the comments from the commissioners voting no, they were concerned about the level of noise from the expansion. The fact that the Svobodas are not requesting an increase in the number of dogs in the outside dog run would seem to me they are insuring the level of noticeable noise will not be increased. Also, their extensive consultation with the surrounding neighborhood demonstrated a real consideration for the people living nearby - they will not be increasing the nuisance factor.

James Beckstrom
Ann Arbor

From: John Little [mailto:littleja@mac.com]
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2010 12:11 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Arbor Dog Daycare

Planning Commission,

Arbor Dog Daycare has been a strong member of our community in its current location for 4 years now. Most neighbors were unaware of the Daycare's existence until the request to expand was sent out. Reading over the agreements that they came to with the neighboring residential communities, it is apparent that not increasing the outdoor area usage satisfied these housing communities. In referencing the original submission, it is apparent that the vast majority of resident concerns presented were based upon the potential impact of an increase in dogs on Odor and Sound. The agreements obtained by Arbor Dog Daycare from the neighboring communities addressed these concerns in a manner in and submitted to the Planning Commission should have answered these concerns.

Out of the several hundred notified of this request, only two individuals remain with issues. This puts those remaining opposed at less than 1% of the surrounding residents. In support, the Owners have met with all of the neighboring facilities, obtained their buy-in along with several hundred signatures in support. It never crossed my mind that with all they have done to ensure that they comply with the Planning Commission's requests, that their request would have been rejected.

The fact that their request was rejected for something that wasn't included in the Special Exception Use request is quite concerning, as they committed to continue to hold the number of dogs outdoors in the "Dog Run" to 25 at any one time.

J. Little

—Original Message—

From: Minor J Coon [mailto:mjcoon@umich.edu]

Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2010 9:23 PM

To: Planning

Subject: Please support expansion of Arbor Dog Daycare

Dear Members of Planning Commission:

I sincerely hope that you will reconsider your decision on Margaret and Jon Svovoda's request to expand their Arbor Dog Daycare business. I strongly recommend voting in favor of expansion, which will strengthen a small but thriving business in Ann Arbor and be much appreciated by the city's many dog lovers.

Sincerely yours,

Jud Coon

1901 Austin Ave.

Ann Arbor, MI

From: linda coon [mailto:lindalarry@provide.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2010 9:11 PM
To: Planning
Subject: arbor dog day care

I am writing about my concern over the vote to not allow the expansion of Arbor Dog Daycare for the following reasons:

1. Personal issues got in the way of making a business decision.
2. The potential of another 8 employees being hired with the expansion during a time of economic distress.
3. A service that appears to be in demand is not being allowed to expand to meet the need.
4. All previous complaints/concerns brought up at the earlier Concil meeting were addressed - sound being the major factor.
5. Dogs would only be in the outdoor run between the hours of 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. which should not make any of the noise, which seems to be minimal, an issue.

The bottom line is that, as members of the Main Street Association, Jon and Margaret Svoboda are conscientious and committed small business owners trying to work through a difficult system to expand a service that is in demand, provide employment in a time of needed jobs and in a space that is conducive to their business. It was shown that the distance to the closest residence was in excess of 180 yards - almost 2 football fields. It was mentioned that there are dogs in the neighborhood that could be making noise that is offensive to the one person who came to the meeting to voice an objection.

I believe this decision needs to be reviewed and the issues be looked at with an objective frame of mind.

Sincerely,
Linda Coon

From: Mary Alampi [mailto:malampi@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2010 9:22 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Arbor Dog Daycare

With all due respect, this truly is a puzzling vote. Of all the noise-contributing elements that make Ann Arbor the great city it is, how can it be that a wholesome, positive business which has shown so much concern for its community, could be denied on the basis of noise? I have walked down the street a number of times and never heard anything but car radios, fatigued mufflers, and an occasional horn honking, NONE of which came from the dog care facility. More telling are the comments of bias. A commission member not liking yapping dogs? Has she been near a public school lately? Far more howling there! I expect more from a commission entrusted with serving the public. I expect the decisions of our public servants to reflect the good of the people in the community and NOT to allow a single member of opposition and a few letters to decide for everyone. The community members' rights are not in peril. Business have to obey noise ordinances, too. If the business expands and breaks the rules; they will pay then. Don't shut out business growth. Reconsider and make the right choice; allow the expansion.

Respectfully,

Mary Alampi

From: Mike Farrell [mailto:mjfarrel@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2010 1:56 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Please Reconsider Arbor Dog Day Care Petition

Hello,

My name is Mike Farrell and I both a client at Arbor Dog Day Care and a resident at the Cambridge Condo Complex for the past 5 years. I am writing this email because I would like you to reconsider the expansion petition from Arbor Dog Day Care.

Here are the reasons why:

- 1) You can collect taxes on the expanded building space. If Arbor Dog Day Care doesn't use the space, who is going to use it? What kind of business would like to be located next to Arbor Dog Day Care?
- 2) Arbor Dog Day Care is a home grown small business, and is the kind of business that makes Ann Arbor special. This isn't another national burger chain going in.
- 3) Job creation.
- 4) It was proven that the noise level on the end of the lot was not significantly increase with more dogs. Yet, a council member said that she hates the sound of yapping dogs. Did the council member actually consider the facts or just go with her personal opinion?
- 5) In the Cambridge Condo as well as the Balmoral Condo complex, the vast majority of residents are gone from 7:30 AM until 6 PM. The typical resident is in the law, medical or business school at U of M or commutes into work. If you don't believe me check the parking lots at noon. Knock on some doors. You will realize that no one is home during the normal operation hours of Arbor Dog Day Care. Is noise level a huge factor if no one is at home to hear it?

Thank you for you consideration.

Mike Farrell
2940 Signature Blvd
AA MI 48103
734-945-2088

From: Mike Jeffries [mailto:mikej@proautotechs.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2010 4:46 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Expand Arbor Dog DayCare!

Arbor Dog Daycare has been a strong member of our community in its current location for 4 years now. Most neighbors were unaware of the Daycare's existence until the request to expand was sent out. Reading over the agreements that they came to with the neighboring residential communities, it is apparent that not increasing the outdoor area usage satisfied these housing communities. In referencing the original submission, it is apparent that the vast majority of resident concerns presented were based upon the potential impact of an increase in dogs on Odor and Sound. The agreements obtained by Arbor Dog Daycare from the neighboring communities addressed these concerns in a manner in and submitted to the Planning Commission should have answered these concerns.

Out of the several hundred notified of this request, only two individuals remain with issues. This puts those remaining opposed at less than 1% of the surrounding residents. In support, the Owners have met with all of the neighboring facilities, obtained their buy-in along with several hundred signatures in support. It never crossed my mind that with all they have done to ensure that they comply with the Planning Commission's requests, that their request would have been rejected.

The fact that their request was rejected for something that wasn't included in the Special Exception Use request is quite concerning, as they committed to continue to hold the number of dogs outdoors in the "Dog Run" to 25 at any one time.

It is my request that the Planning Commission reverse their decision and allow Arbor Dog Daycare the Special Exception Use Permit as they requested.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

From: Robert Davis [mailto:pbcompanies@inbox.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2010 3:07 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Jean Carlberg

I am sincerely disappointed with all of these members of this commission after reading the quote from annarbor.com's recent article.

"I love dogs, but yapping dogs make me crazy," Commissioner **Jean Carlberg** said before voting no with three other commissioners: **Diane Giannola, Kirk Westphal** and **Bonnie Bona.**"

With this kind of economy, and the stresses of running a business, you totally overlook the paperwork in this case and then on top of that you (Jean Carlberg) blatantly disrespect a local business owner? The worst part is that you hold a position where you make decisions that can help or hurt our local economy. I am very happy to see that you take your job seriously (sarcasm). I am a small business owner and employer and, if I EVER heard that kind of comment come from an employee, they would be terminated immediately. These small business owners are the people that are making money for your city. These people are paying your salary with the generous taxes they pay. I can not believe that you, as a commissioner, over looked the fact that ALL of the complaints, that you based your decision on, were no longer valid and that was reported to you in the case. That would make your decision NULL and VOID. Not that your decision had any merit being the fact that NOTHING on the exterior was being changed and the decision on the new facility was "shot down" due to previous (currently invalid) complaints. I would appreciate you looking into your decisions a bit further next time.

I would really hate to see Ann Arbor fall to these poor decisions during economic crisis in our state. No reason to push another business out of our state or cities. That would be really bad advertising for Ann Arbor or our state for that matter.

I apologize if I come across rude.

R. Davis

—Original Message—

From: Sandra A. Graham-Bermann, Ph.D. [mailto:sandragb@umich.edu]

Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2010 7:10 PM

To: Planning

Subject: Ann Arbor Dog Daycare Vote

To the Commissioners

Arbor Dog Daycare has been a strong member of our community in its current location for 4 years now. Most neighbors were unaware of the Daycare's existence until the request to expand was sent out. Reading over the agreements that they came to with the neighboring residential communities, it is apparent that not increasing the outdoor area usage satisfied these housing communities. In referencing the original submission, it is apparent that the vast majority of resident concerns presented were based upon the potential impact of an increase in dogs on Odor and Sound. The agreements obtained by Arbor Dog Daycare from the neighboring communities addressed these concerns in a manner in and submitted to the Planning Commission should have answered these concerns.

Out of the several hundred notified of this request, only two individuals remain with issues. This puts those remaining opposed at less than 1% of the surrounding residents. In support, the Owners have met with all of the neighboring facilities, obtained their buy-in along with several hundred signatures in support. It never crossed my mind that with all they have done to ensure that they comply with the Planning Commission's requests, that their request would have been rejected.

The fact that their request was rejected for something that wasn't included in the Special Exception Use request is quite concerning, as they committed to continue to hold the number of dogs outdoors in the "Dog Run" to 25 at any one time.

It is my request that the Planning Commission reverse their decision and allow Arbor Dog Daycare the Special Exception Use Permit as they requested.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

—

Sandra A. Graham-Bermann

From: SUSAN.MAFFE@comcast.net [mailto:SUSAN.MAFFE@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 25, 2010 12:35 PM
To: Planning
Subject:

Arbor Dog Daycare has been a strong member of our community in its current location for 4 years now. Most neighbors were unaware of the Daycare's existence until the request to expand was sent out. Reading over the agreements that they came to with the neighboring residential communities, it is apparent that not increasing the outdoor area usage satisfied these housing communities. In referencing the original submission, it is apparent that the vast majority of resident concerns presented were based upon the potential impact of an increase in dogs on Odor and Sound. The agreements obtained by Arbor Dog Daycare from the neighboring communities addressed these concerns in a manner in and submitted to the Planning Commission should have answered these concerns.

Out of the several hundred notified of this request, only two individuals remain with issues. This puts those remaining opposed at less than 1% of the surrounding residents. In support, the Owners have met with all of the neighboring facilities, obtained their buy-in along with several hundred signatures in support. It never crossed my mind that with all they have done to ensure that they comply with the Planning Commission's requests, that their request would have been rejected.

The fact that their request was rejected for something that wasn't included in the Special Exception Use request is quite concerning, as they committed to continue to hold the number of dogs outdoors in the "Dog Run" to 25 at any one time.

It is my request that the Planning Commission reverse their decision and allow Arbor Dog Daycare the Special Exception Use Permit as they requested.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

From: Thomas [mailto:tpaluchniak@babutlaw.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2010 11:10 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Dog Day Care

I live in Ann Arbor. I think the vote on denying the expansion of the Dog Day care facility lacked reason. First, very few residences were complaining of noise. Further, you can always find somebody to complain about something. It is telling nobody showed up in person to complain at the public hearing. Second, the proposed expansion wouldn't have changed the level of dog noise as no more dogs would be let outside at a particular time. Third, in a troubled economy it is sad the City would deny local businesses owners from expanding and providing a valuable service. Instead we will have tons of dogs spread all over the City barking. Finally, Jean Carlberg's subjective opinion on how yapping dogs make her crazy showed a bias and was inappropriate.

Thomas Paluchniak

William Babut, P.C.

700 Towner Street

Ypsilanti, MI 48198

Office: (734) 485-7000

Fax: (734) 485-6251

<http://www.babutlawoffice.com/>

Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2010 8:06 AM
To: Planning
Subject: doggie daycare decision

To whom it may concern:

I am appalled at your decision to deny Arbor Dog Daycare the ability to expand. From the annarbor.com article, it seems as though you opposed this expansion due to 1 neighbor that complained, and a handful of letters- is this correct? How on earth is that fair for the rest of the citizens of Ann Arbor? The owners of the business have clearly done a massive amount of legwork to ensure that expansion would do nothing to increase noise, and it sounds like they have a large number of people in favor of their expansion. Why is it ever a good thing to stifle business growth in Ann Arbor, specifically in this economy?

Additionally, Dog daycare provides an invaluable service to both humans and canines. By having a place for people to bring their dogs to play and get tired, there are many more well behaved, well exercised dogs around. This means LESS barking over all, less behavioral problems, and everyone is happier.

Please, reconsider your decision to stifle business in this economy. It is so outrageously narrow-minded to let a handful of people's complaints ruin a perfect Ann Arbor business.

Best,
Alaina

Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2010 3:07 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Jean Carlberg

I am sincerely disappointed with all of these members of this commission after reading the quote from annarbor.com's recent article.

"I love dogs, but yapping dogs make me crazy," Commissioner **Jean Carlberg** said before voting no with three other commissioners: **Diane Giannola, Kirk Westphal** and **Bonnie Bona**."

With this kind of economy, and the stresses of running a business, you totally overlook the paperwork in this case and then on top of that you (Jean Carlberg) blatantly disrespect a local business owner? The worst part is that you hold a position where you make decisions that can help or hurt our local economy. I am very happy to see that you take your job seriously (sarcasm). I am a small business owner and employer and, if I EVER heard that kind of comment come from an employee, they would be terminated immediately. These small business owners are the people that are making money for your city. These people are paying your salary with the generous taxes they pay. I can not believe that you, as a commissioner, over looked the fact that ALL of the complaints, that you based your decision on, were no longer valid and that was reported to you in the case. That would make your decision NULL and VOID. Not that your decision had any merit being the fact that NOTHING on the exterior was being changed and the decision on the new facility was "shot down" due to previous (currently invalid) complaints. I would appreciate you looking into your decisions a bit further next time.

I would really hate to see Ann Arbor fall to these poor decisions during economic crisis in our state. No reason to push another business out of our state or cities. That would be really bad advertising for Ann Arbor or our state for that matter.

I apologize if I come across rude.

R. Davis

Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2010 9:23 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Please support expansion of Arbor Dog Daycare

Dear Members of Planning Commission:

I sincerely hope that you will reconsider your decision on Margaret and Jon Svovoda's request to expand their Arbor Dog Daycare business. I strongly recommend voting in favor of expansion, which will strengthen a small but thriving business in Ann Arbor and be much appreciated by the city's many dog lovers.

Sincerely yours,

Jud Coon

1901 Austin Ave.

Ann Arbor, MI

Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2010 9:22 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Arbor Dog Daycare

With all due respect, this truly is a puzzling vote. Of all the noise-contributing elements that make Ann Arbor the great city it is, how can it be that a wholesome, positive business which has shown so much concern for its community, could be denied on the basis of noise? I have walked down the street a number of times and never heard anything but car radios, fatigued mufflers, and an occasional horn honking, NONE of which came from the dog care facility. More telling are the comments of bias. A commission member not liking yapping dogs? Has she been near a public school lately? Far more howling there! I expect more from a commission entrusted with serving the public. I expect the decisions of our public servants to reflect the good of the people in the community and NOT to allow a single member of opposition and a few letters to decide for everyone. The community members' rights are not in peril. Business have to obey noise ordinances, too. If the business expands and breaks the rules; they will pay then. Don't shut out business growth. Reconsider and make the right choice; allow the expansion.

Respectfully,

Mary Alampi

Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2010 9:11 PM
To: Planning
Subject: arbor dog day care

I am writing about my concern over the vote to not allow the expansion of Arbor Dog Daycare for the following reasons:

1. Personal issues got in the way of making a business decision.
2. The potential of another 8 employees being hired with the expansion during a time of economic distress.
3. A service that appears to be in demand is not being allowed to expand to meet the need.
4. All previous complaints/concerns brought up at the earlier Concil meeting were addressed - sound being the major factor.
5. Dogs would only be in the outdoor run between the hours of 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. which should not make any of the noise, which seems to be minimal, an issue.

The bottom line is that, as members of the Main Street Association, Jon and Margaret Svoboda are conscientious and committed small business owners trying to work through a difficult system to expand a service that is in demand, provide employment in a time of needed jobs and in a space that is conducive to their business. It was shown that the distance to the closest residence was in excess of 180 yards - almost 2 football fields. It was mentioned that there are dogs in the neighborhood that could be making noise that is offensive to the one person who came to the meeting to voice an objection.

I believe this decision needs to be reviewed and the issues be looked at with an objective frame of mind.

Sincerely,
Linda Coon

Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2010 5:04 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Dog Daycare denied

I Have Been Living in Ann Arbor for the last 20 plus years

I can not even think YOU as a [Planning Commission](#)

Can think about killing AA jobs what ever they are
You are starting to look like Southfield Mich.

Pad you palms and it will go (prove me wrong)

But nope you kill Ann Arbor because you dont like a barking dog

Give me a break
Get a life

Bill Bobb

Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2010 11:10 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Dog Day Care

I live in Ann Arbor. I think the vote on denying the expansion of the Dog Day care facility lacked reason. First, very few residences were complaining of noise. Further, you can always find somebody to complain about something. It is telling nobody showed up in person to complain at the public hearing. Second, the proposed expansion wouldn't have changed the level of dog noise as no more dogs would be let outside at a particular time. Third, in a troubled economy it is sad the City would deny local businesses owners from expanding and providing a valuable service. Instead we will have tons of dogs spread all over the City barking. Finally, Jean Carlberg's subjective opinion on how yapping dogs make her crazy showed a bias and was inappropriate.

Thomas Paluchniak

William Babut, P.C.
700 Towner Street
Ypsilanti, MI 48198
Office: (734) 485-7000
Fax: (734) 485-6251

Sent: Friday, September 24, 2010 9:13 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Arbor Dog Daycare Permit

Arbor Dog Daycare has been a strong member of our community in its current location for 4 years now. Most neighbors were unaware of the Daycare's existence until the request to expand was sent out. Reading over the agreements that they came to with the neighboring residential communities, it is apparent that not increasing the outdoor area usage satisfied these housing communities. In referencing the original submission, it is apparent that the vast majority of resident concerns presented were based upon the potential impact of an increase in dogs on Odor and Sound. The agreements obtained by Arbor Dog Daycare from the neighboring communities addressed these concerns in a manner in and submitted to the Planning Commission should have answered these concerns.

Out of the several hundred notified of this request, only two individuals remain with issues. This puts those remaining opposed at less than 1% of the surrounding residents. In support, the Owners have met with all of the neighboring facilities, obtained their buy-in along with several hundred signatures in support. It never crossed my mind that with all they have done to ensure that they comply with the Planning Commission's requests, that their request would have been rejected.

The fact that their request was rejected for something that wasn't included in the Special Exception Use request is quite concerning, as they committed to continue to hold the number of dogs outdoors in the "Dog Run" to 25 at any one time.

It is my request that the Planning Commission reverse their decision and allow Arbor Dog Daycare the Special Exception Use Permit as they requested.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter. Diane Hayes

Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2010 7:10 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Ann Arbor Dog Daycare Vote

To the Commissioners

Arbor Dog Daycare has been a strong member of our community in its current location for 4 years now. Most neighbors were unaware of the Daycare's existence until the request to expand was sent out. Reading over the agreements that they came to with the neighboring residential communities, it is apparent that not increasing the outdoor area usage satisfied these housing communities. In referencing the original submission, it is apparent that the vast majority of resident concerns presented were based upon the potential impact of an increase in dogs on Odor and Sound. The agreements obtained by Arbor Dog Daycare from the neighboring communities addressed these concerns in a manner in and submitted to the Planning Commission should have answered these concerns.

Out of the several hundred notified of this request, only two individuals remain with issues. This puts those remaining opposed at less than 1% of the surrounding residents. In support, the Owners have met with all of the neighboring facilities, obtained their buy-in along with several hundred signatures in support. It never crossed my mind that with all they have done to ensure that they comply with the Planning Commission's requests, that their request would have been rejected.

The fact that their request was rejected for something that wasn't included in the Special Exception Use request is quite concerning, as they committed to continue to hold the number of dogs outdoors in the "Dog Run" to 25 at any one time.

It is my request that the Planning Commission reverse their decision and allow Arbor Dog Daycare the Special Exception Use Permit as they requested.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

--

Sandra A. Graham-Bermann

Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2010 4:46 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Expand Arbor Dog DayCare!

Arbor Dog Daycare has been a strong member of our community in its current location for 4 years now. Most neighbors were unaware of the Daycare's existence until the request to expand was sent out. Reading over the agreements that they came to with the neighboring residential communities, it is apparent that not increasing the outdoor area usage satisfied these housing communities. In referencing the original submission, it is apparent that the vast majority of resident concerns presented were based upon the potential impact of an increase in dogs on Odor and Sound. The agreements obtained by Arbor

Dog Daycare from the neighboring communities addressed these concerns in a manner in and submitted to the Planning Commission should have answered these concerns.

Out of the several hundred notified of this request, only two individuals remain with issues. This puts those remaining opposed at less than 1% of the surrounding residents. In support, the Owners have met with all of the neighboring facilities, obtained their buy-in along with several hundred signatures in support. It never crossed my mind that with all they have done to ensure that they comply with the Planning Commission's requests, that their request would have been rejected.

The fact that their request was rejected for something that wasn't included in the Special Exception Use request is quite concerning, as they committed to continue to hold the number of dogs outdoors in the "Dog Run" to 25 at any one time.

It is my request that the Planning Commission reverse their decision and allow Arbor Dog Daycare the Special Exception Use Permit as they requested.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2010 4:41 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Dog day care expansion

Dear Commissioners:

I have read the news story about this decision along with the (very extensive) set of comments on the A2.com website at <http://www.annarbor.com/news/arbor-dog-daycare-needs-to-find-somewhere-else-to-expand-its-business-planning-commission-says/>

I must say that under the circumstances it would seem sensible to visit the site yourselves and then (re) visit your decision on this issue.

Sincerely,

David Porter
1465 King George Blvd
Ann Arbor

Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2010 1:41 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Arbor Dog Daycare Expansion Request

Please reconsider your decision to deny the owners of Arbor Dog Daycare permission to expand their facility. As I understood the comments from the commissioners voting no, they were concerned about the level of noise from the expansion. The fact that the Svobodas are not requesting an increase in the number of dogs in the outside dog run would seem to me they are insuring the level of noticeable noise will not be increased. Also, their extensive consultation with the surrounding neighborhood demonstrated a real consideration for the people living nearby - they will not be increasing the nuisance factor.

James Beckstrom
Ann Arbor

Sent: Saturday, September 25, 2010 12:35 PM

To: Planning

Subject:

Arbor Dog Daycare has been a strong member of our community in its current location for 4 years now. Most neighbors were unaware of the Daycare's existence until the request to expand was sent out. Reading over the agreements that they came to with the neighboring residential communities, it is apparent that not increasing the outdoor area usage satisfied these housing communities. In referencing the original submission, it is apparent that the vast majority of resident concerns presented were based upon the potential impact of an increase in dogs on Odor and Sound. The agreements obtained by Arbor Dog Daycare from the neighboring communities addressed these concerns in a manner in and submitted to the Planning Commission should have answered these concerns.

Out of the several hundred notified of this request, only two individuals remain with issues. This puts those remaining opposed at less than 1% of the surrounding residents. In support, the Owners have met with all of the neighboring facilities, obtained their buy-in along with several hundred signatures in support. It never crossed my mind that with all they have done to ensure that they comply with the Planning Commission's requests, that their request would have been rejected.

The fact that their request was rejected for something that wasn't included in the Special Exception Use request is quite concerning, as they committed to continue to hold the number of dogs outdoors in the "Dog Run" to 25 at any one time.

It is my request that the Planning Commission reverse their decision and allow Arbor Dog Daycare the Special Exception Use Permit as they requested.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sent: Friday, September 24, 2010 1:56 PM

To: Planning

Subject: Please Reconsider Arbor Dog Day Care Petition

Hello,

My name is Mike Farrell and I both a client at Arbor Dog Day Care and a resident at the Cambridge Condo Complex for the past 5 years. I am writing this email because I would like you to reconsider the expansion petition from Arbor Dog Day Care.

Here are the reasons why:

- 1) You can collect taxes on the expanded building space. If Arbor Dog Day Care doesn't use the space, who is going to use it? What kind of business would like to be located next to Arbor Dog Day Care?

2) Arbor Dog Day Care is a home grown small business, and is the kind of business that makes Ann Arbor special. This isn't another national burger chain going in.

3) Job creation.

4) It was proven that the noise level on the end of the lot was not significantly increase with more dogs. Yet, a council member said that she hates the sound of yapping dogs. Did the council member actually consider the facts or just go with her personal opinion?

5) In the Cambridge Condo as well as the Balmoral Condo complex, the vast majority of residents are gone from 7:30 AM until 6 PM. The typical resident is in the law, medical or business school at U of M or commutes into work. If you don't believe me check the parking lots at noon. Knock on some doors. You will realize that no one is home during the normal operation hours of Arbor Dog Day Care. Is noise level a huge factor if no one is at home to hear it?

Thank you for you consideration.

Mike Farrell
2940 Signature Blvd
AA MI 48103
734-945-2088

Sent: Friday, September 24, 2010 12:11 PM

To: Planning

Subject: Arbor Dog Daycare

Plannig Commition,

Arbor Dog Daycare has been a strong member of our community in its current location for 4 years now. Most neighbors were unaware of the Daycare's existence until the request to expand was sent out.

Reading over the agreements that they came to with the neighboring residential communities, it is apparent that not increasing the outdoor area usage satisfied these housing communities. In referencing the original submission, it is apparent that the vast majority of resident concerns presented were based upon the potential impact of an increase in dogs on Odor and Sound. The agreements obtained by Arbor Dog Daycare from the neighboring communities addressed these concerns in a manner in and submitted to the Planning Commission should have answered these concerns.

Out of the several hundred notified of this request, only two individuals remain with issues This puts those remaining opposed at less than 1% of the surrounding residents. In support, the Owners have met with all of the neighboring facilities, obtained their buy-in along with several hundred signatures in support. It never crossed my mind that with all they have done to ensure that they comply with the Planning Commission's requests, that their request would have been rejected.

The fact that their request was rejected for something that wasn't included in the Special Exception Use request is quite concerning, as they committed to continue to hold the number of dogs outdoors in the "Dog Run" to 25 at any one time.

J. Little

—Original Message—

From: Powers, Judith [mailto:jpowers@umich.edu]

Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 2:14 PM

To: Planning

Subject: Arbor Dog Daycare

Hello,

I would like to express the importance of reconsidering your decision regarding the expansion for Arbor Dog Daycare. The owners have obviously considered the needs of and have had contact with the residents living near their facility and have addressed expressed concerns. From reading the meeting minutes and comments on Ann Arbor.com, it seems that the concerns of the few individuals worried about a possible increase in noise outweighed any other considerations. During our current economic downturn, small businesses requesting expansion should be encouraged. Suggesting that they move their business out of the City to a more rural location does not benefit the City or provide jobs to local residents.

I hope you will revisit your decision.

Sincerely,

Judy Powers
1540 Northwood St.
Ann Arbor, MI 48103