

**From:** Sherry Emerson [mailto:sherry.petworldlawrence@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 18, 2015 4:37 PM  
**To:** Brandon McGuire  
**Subject:** Pet World's position

SO sorry for the delay. Here you go:

In regard to parts 1 and 3 of the proposed changes, Pet World supports everything except recommends dual-path alarm monitoring as opposed to landline only.

In regard to fire sprinkling, Pet World's recommendation is to require all animal housing facilities to install automatic fire sprinklers within less than one year from now, regardless of the facility's size.

This change, as proposed by city staff, will only affect Pet World with regard to sprinklers and no other animal facility. If the shelter builds a new facility, it will then affect them. But, as is, no other animal facilities in Lawrence will be affected. If fire sprinkling is important enough to use for a few large facilities full of unclaimed animals who are not pets, it is certainly important enough for all the many, smaller facilities housing cherished, family pets who would be terribly missed.

The 3000' size and "new or remodeled only" requirements exempt every animal facility in Lawrence from fire sprinklers except Pet World (who is installing sprinklers anyway). That part of the proposed change serves no purpose. If we are going to protect some animals, let's go ahead and protect all animals.

Thanks for all your work on this.

~Sherry

**Sherry Emerson**

Pet World Inc.  
711 W 23rd St #26  
Lawrence, KS 66046  
(785) 841-7476

PW WORK

[www.PetWorldLawrence.com](http://www.PetWorldLawrence.com)

[Pet World's Owners Blog](#)

PW Twitter @petworldkansas

*PERSONAL*

*My Blog*

*Personal Twitter @sherryemersonPW*

**Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.**

**From:** jerri@wagmoreinc.com [mailto:jerri@wagmoreinc.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 18, 2015 10:47 AM

**To:** Brandon McGuire

**Subject:** Re: Update on Revisions to City Fire Code for Animal Housing Facilities

Brandon,

I still have a great deal of concerns with the revisions. I am a major stakeholder and have not been kept in the loop and am in the process of expanding. I have made multiple calls to the city and fire dept. to get guidance. I have been told it doesn't seem to effect what I am planning. On that note I have spent a considerable amount of time, money and resources proceeding forward and now get this email. The potential new landlord said this is dead in the water if the sprinkler system is required. The new space would be 8,000 - 10,000 sq. ft. in a 16,000 sq. ft. building. From this email it looks like this would be a major deal.

These are my issues with the revisions that are being proposed:

1. If the issue is to protect the lives of animals in our care why would size matter, wouldn't a smaller facility burn faster???
2. This would drive business outside the city to the county or other cities that do not have these requirements. (cost prohibitive)
3. Discourage other similar businesses from coming to Lawrence. (cost prohibitive)
4. Discourage expansion of existing businesses. (cost prohibitive)
5. Landlord objections if leasing space. (Business may have to close or no spaces to lease)
6. Why would sprinklers be required in areas of facility not housing animals overnight. Would this effect the 3,000 sq. ft.?( Why not have someone stay on site 24/7)
7. Is the city willing to set up a fund that businesses could borrow from if this becomes mandatory?
8. More animals have died or been injured from unclean facilities (disease) or poorly monitored facilities (such as fights) are there any plans to regulate?
9. If a business wants to install a sprinkler and advertise and tout that benefit to increase their business, shouldn't this just be their competitive edge? Why not let consumers decide?
10. Our clients have not requested this added feature, nor have we lost any clients because we do not provide sprinklers, nor has this been a question asked by potential clients. In fact our entire business has grown, especially our boarding.
11. I am I this business because I love animals, but I am also a business person and there is a limit to how much I can spend on something that is in no way tied to revenue generation.
12. This is just too costly financially!!!!

Jeannene Loewenstein

Wagmore Canine Enrichment

1411 W 23rd. St., Suite B

Lawrence, KS 66046

[www.wagmoreinc.com](http://www.wagmoreinc.com)

785-550-1427