

**Arturo & Maricela Panuco
1675 Adobe Drive
Pacifica, CA 94044**

September 1, 2026

Tet Maria Gonzalez
Zoning Hearing Officer

Bharat Singh
Zoning Hearing Officer

Sam Becker
Planner III

Planning & Building Dept.
County of San Mateo
County Government Center
455 County Center, 2nd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

Planning_zho@smcgov.org

Re: Public Comment on:
File No: PLN2026-00209
Location: 1620 Higgins Way, Pacifica
APN: 023-340-330

Dear Zoning Officer:

We are a retired couple living at 1675 Adobe Drive in Pacifica, just a block from 1620 Higgins Way, Pacifica. It has come to our attention that a request for a Kennel Permit for the above-named location has been filed with the County of San Mateo, and that a public hearing about the proposed Kennel Permit has been scheduled for 10:00 am on Thursday, September 3, 2026, to collect public comments about the proposed Kennel Permit.

Be advised that we did not receive the notice from San Mateo County regarding the proposed Kennel Permit and the public hearing. We received a copy of such notice from a neighbor.

Housing a commercial dog kennel for up to 15 dogs at the proposed location, which by the way is only 800 feet from our home is not acceptable or appropriate and the impact it will have to the neighborhood must be taken into consideration: our concerns are as follows:

Noise level – 15 dogs barking at all hours of the day/night is too much for the character of this neighborhood.

Shamrock Ranch Kennel at 100 Shamrock Road, Pacifica is located 1,500 feet away from our home and the noise generated from this kennel is very noticeable during all hours.

Parking – Higgins Way is a very narrow residential street and one that already has significant extra traffic and parking congestion due to its proximity to the old trailhead for the Ols San Pedro Mountain Road hiking and biking trail as well as a small Montessori School located at 1666 Higgins Way.

Impact of property values - We believe that adding a commercial dog kennel business into the mix will undermine property values and negatively impact the neighboring property owners.

We are concerned that not all residents in the neighborhood received proper notice about the proposed Kennel Permit or the public hearing. I urge you to take steps to ensure that you take the concerns, reservations, and questions of all the residents in this neighborhood into consideration as part of your decision-making process on this proposed Kennel Permit.

We wanted to submit our concerns in writing and plan to attend the meeting as well.

Regards,

s/s

Arturo & Maricela Panuco

From: [Bianca Ruzicka](#)
To: [PLANNING_ZHO](#)
Cc: [Bianca Ruzicka](#); charles@hymes.name
Subject: Comments Regarding Zoning Hearing Officer Agenda | File No. PLN2026-00209
Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2026 6:54:18 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

September 1, 2026

Re: Notice of Public Hearing
Zoning Hearing Officer Agenda
Regular Agenda Item 1
Owner: Sue Valteras (Property Manager), on behalf of Ali Nilchipour
Applicant: Jeffrey Aguilera
File No.: PLN2026-00209
Location: 1620 Higgins way, Pacifica
APN: 023-340-330

Dear Zoning Planning Officer:

We received the Notice of Public Hearing letter distributed by the county, and we are writing to express our concern about the possible issuance of a kennel permit for the property located at 1620 Higgins Way, Pacifica.

We live just around the corner, at 1655 Adobe Drive. We are very familiar with the noise that can be caused by having a dog kennel located in the vicinity, because we have lived here for almost 27 years, across from the Shamrock Ranch kennel that has been operational the entire time. To now have a second kennel business operating even more close-by in the neighborhood, adding to the noise pollution, would be simply excessive.

Notably, noise from a nearby dog kennel may reduce property values. According to CEDS (website access Sept 1, 2026), a dog kennel in a residential neighborhood can reduce nearby property values by 5% to 10%. Noise is the most significant quality-of-life impact, but persistent odors from animal waste can linger and reduce overall appeal of neighboring properties. Real estate agents and sellers will be legally required to disclose known noise complaints or other nuisance issues – we received such a disclosure about the Shamrock Ranch kennel when we first purchased our home here in 1999.

An additional consideration is that we have been dealing with a mismanaged land slide that has occurred on the western slope of the property in question. The broken retaining wall and landslide, which for the past 3+ years have ever incrementally progressed across the adjacent sidewalk and now also cover an approximately 3' wide swath of Adobe Drive itself for a distance of many feet, raise the concern about the stability of this property along its western edge. It would be reassuring if mechanical stability and integrity tests, along with the potential impact of the kennel operations on

them, had been completed, but we saw no reference to this in the planning documents uploaded to the website.

We read with empathy the letters of dog owners who favor the issuance of the kennel permit, and we do not question the skills of Mr. Aguilera as a dog trainer and handler. Nonetheless, we are compelled to point out that praise for Mr. Aguilera's services are offered by clients who do not reside in the immediate vicinity, and who have only their own 1 or 2 dogs to manage at any given time. We encourage the Zoning Planning Officer and any other decision makers to consider that the concerns and objections of the residents who actually live in the area should be given greater priority, as it is their lives that will be directly impacted day-to-day.

With thanks for the opportunity to comment,

Bianca Ruzicka, PhD and Charles Hymes
1655 Adobe Drive, Pacifica

Edwin Chow
1668 Adobe Drive
Pacifica, California 94044

September 2, 2026

Tet Maria Gonzalez
Zoning Hearing Officer Secretary

Bharat Singh
Zoning Hearing Officer

Sam Becker
Planner III

Planning and Building Department
County of San Mateo
County Government Center
455 County Center, 2nd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

Planning_zho@SMCgov.org

Re: Public Comment on:
File No.: PLN2026—00209
Location: 1620 Higgins Way, Pacifica
APN: 023-340-330

Dear Maria Gonzalez, Zoning Hearing Officer Secretary:

Thank you, for confirming your receipt of my 9/1/2026 public comment letter on this matter, and for forwarding to me a link to the SMCgov.org website with the staff report and other public comments on this matter.

Based upon my initial review of these materials, I wish to amend my 9/1/2026 public comment letter with the following additional points:

It appears to me that the staff report and recommendation focuses the “visibility” of the facility and the “health and welfare” of the dogs at the facility, and places less emphasis on the actual “noise” from the dogs and the real life nuisance of that noise to the residents who live in the immediate neighborhood.

The "Recommended Findings" in Attachment A of the planning staff report "That the keeping and maintenance of animals will not create a nuisance or endanger the public health, safety, or welfare" is clearly inconsistent with the written public comments and feedback to date from the neighbors of the subject property about their actual experiences to date. Such real-life experiences cannot be ignored or dismissed in the decision-making process on the proposed Kennel Permit.

The definition of "nuisance", according to the Oxford dictionary, is "a thing, person, or situation that is annoying or causes trouble or problems." In general use (and everyday meaning), a "nuisance" is a bothersome or irritating burden. Examples include a barking dog and loud traffic. The public comments to date on this proposed Kennel Permit include written statements from the actual neighbors of the subject property about the barking, noise, and associated nuisance from the subject property.

I also noted that most of the public comments submitted in support of the proposed Kennel Permit appear to be from satisfied customers of the kennel business. Of course, their comments and views should be considered. However, they do not appear to live in the immediate neighborhood and they do not have to live with the adverse consequences of having a commercial kennel business adjacent to or near their personal residence.

I believe that the concerns and objections of the actual residents who live in the immediate neighborhood should be given more weight and consideration by the Zoning Hearing Officer in the decision-making process on the proposed Kennel Permit.

Thank you for the opportunity to supplement my 9/1/2026 public comments on this matter.

Edwin Chow

EDWIN CHOW

From: [Julie Rose](#)
To: [PLANNING_ZHO](#)
Cc: [Lynda Brocchini](#); [Julie Rose](#)
Subject: Letter of Support for Custom K9 Bay Area Dog Training and Boarding
Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2026 8:44:08 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

To Whom It May Concern:

We are writing in support of the permit application for Custom K9 Bay Area Dog Training and Boarding and in advance of the September 3 hearing.

Our dog loves visiting Custom K9, and based on our firsthand experience, we have found the facility to be well organized, clean and filled with people who genuinely care about dogs. The staff have always treated the dogs with care and professionalism, and we have been very comfortable having our dog in their care. Our dog is a member of our family and it speaks to the exceptional care at Custom K9 that we trust them to give the best care possible.

We understand that some nearby residents have expressed concerns about the facility. While we respect the right of neighbors to voice their concerns, our experience has been quite different from some of the claims being made. We have never witnessed dogs being mistreated or in distress. Instead, we have consistently observed a clean, orderly, caring and professionally operated facility where the welfare of the dogs is a genuine priority. Our dog loves to go there and is excited to go every time we bring her.

We believe the decision regarding this permit should be based on the actual operation of Custom K9, the Planning Department's review and recommendation, and firsthand information from people who have actually used the facility.

For these reasons, we respectfully ask that you approve the permit for Custom K9 Bay Area Dog Training and Boarding as recommended by the Planning Department.

Thank you for considering our comments and our firsthand experience with this wonderful facility.

Sincerely,

Julie Rose and Lynda Brocchini

Residents of Pacifica and Custom K9 Customers

From: [Wharton-Basas, Brandon Basas](#)
To: [PLANNING_ZHO](#)
Subject: Support for Custom K9 Kennel Permit Application: File No. PLN2026-00209
Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2026 9:02:20 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Mr. Singh,

I am writing in support of the kennel permit application for Custom K9 at 1620 Higgins Way. I have been a client of Custom K9 since September 2024, and my dog, Emma, has attended both training and boarding with them. I am at the property regularly, typically on a weekly basis. I have no financial interest in Custom K9 and am writing solely in my personal capacity as a client. I understand that the decision on this application is based on the findings required under County Ordinance Code Section 6.20.060, rather than simply the number of comments submitted for or against the application. With that in mind, I have limited my comments to what I have personally observed and can speak to directly.

Facilities, Sanitation, and Animal Care: Sections 6.20.060(a)(2), (a)(3), (a)(5), and 6.20.140

Over the course of several dozen visits, I have consistently found Custom K9's facilities to be clean, dry, and free of noticeable odor or waste accumulation. I have been a customer since the business was located in South San Francisco, and that standard has remained consistent. The enclosures I have observed have been secure, properly latched, and in good repair. Outdoor areas have been free of standing water, and the interior spaces have had appropriate lighting, ventilation, and sufficient room for the dogs to move, stand, and rest. Fresh water has also been readily available. Importantly, I have observed these conditions consistently, including during routine pickups and visits when the staff had no reason to anticipate that I would be evaluating the condition of the property. From my experience, the cleanliness and upkeep appear to be part of the facility's normal daily operation.

Handling of Animals: Section 6.20.060(a)(4)

I have never personally observed rough handling, striking, prolonged isolation, or any conduct that I would characterize as neglect, cruelty, abuse, or causing unnecessary suffering. From what I have observed, dogs are managed appropriately based on size and temperament, and staff remain present and attentive. Emma has returned home calm and in good condition after every stay. She also continues to enter the property willingly and is comfortable with the staff who care for her. I love this dog; her wellbeing is important to me and has given me confidence in the care she receives.

Professional Perspective

I also manage facilities professionally. My work requires me to regularly evaluate buildings and

grounds for sanitation, drainage, ventilation, life-safety concerns, HVAC performance, enclosure integrity, preventive maintenance, and conditions that could develop into larger problems if they are not addressed. I hold professional credentials through both the Building Owners and Managers Institute (BOMI) and the International Facility Management Association (IFMA). I mention this not to suggest that I am an animal-welfare expert—I am not—but because my professional background causes me to pay particular attention to the physical condition and operation of a facility. Conditions such as standing water, drainage problems, inadequate ventilation, poor housekeeping, deteriorated enclosures, and deferred maintenance are things I am accustomed to identifying in my professional work. During my visits to Custom K9, I have not observed those types of deficiencies.

Nuisance – Section 6.20.060(a)(1)

During the times I have been at the property, I have not encountered sustained barking, objectionable odors, or traffic conditions that I would personally consider a nuisance. I recognize that I am not at the property continuously, so I can only speak to the conditions I have personally observed while there. Regarding Concerns About the Application I am aware that concerns have been raised regarding this application. I cannot speak to the experiences of others, nor would I want to speculate about their motivations. I would simply ask that the concerns raised, as well as the comments in support, be considered based on the available record and the specific criteria established by the ordinance. I also understand that the County has mechanisms available to address legitimate concerns while continuing to oversee the operation of the facility. The permit is issued for twelve months and is subject to annual inspection and renewal under Section 6.20.080. It may be revoked under Section 6.20.090, and Section 6.20.070(b)(3) provides authority to impose conditions determined to be reasonably necessary. If the County identifies legitimate concerns involving noise, operating hours, client traffic, dog count, or similar issues, it appears those concerns can be addressed through appropriate permit conditions and evaluated again during the renewal process.

Finally, as a customer, I believe Custom K9 provides a valuable service that is difficult to find locally. I recognize that community need is not one of the required findings for the permit, so I offer that only as additional context regarding the value the business provides to its clients. Based on my personal experience with Custom K9 and the conditions I have consistently observed at the facility, I respectfully ask that you approve File No. PLN2026-00209, subject to any reasonable conditions you determine are appropriate. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,



Brandon Basas, FMP, FMC
Facility Manager, Engineering Facilities
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

O: 925-422-8773

C: 925-960-3641

whartonbasas1@llnl.gov

7000 East Avenue, Livermore, CA 94550

www.llnl.gov

FORMAL OPPOSITION TO KENNEL PERMIT PLN2026-00209 – 1620 Higgins Way, Pacifica

Dear Zoning Hearing Officer and Mr. Becker,

September 2, 2026

Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter. I yet again started my morning to the sound of a large number of dogs barking wildly in front of my home. This used to be a neighborhood where the mornings were punctuated with birdsong, that tranquility has been destroyed by the unpermitted and disruptive dog kennel business that has been operating for the past 4 months. I'm writing this letter to state my objection to the proposed Kennel Permit for 1620 Higgins Way, Pacifica. I've outlined my objections below.

1. Knowing disregard of code & continued non-compliance

The operators of this business knowingly opened this kennel without going through the proper permitting process. They have then continued to operate the business up to this date, despite seemingly being required to cease business operations until receiving a permit. I have witnessed customers dropping off dogs and spoken to some directly who have confirmed they're continuing to do business and "just figuring out the permit stuff" at the same time. Here's the timeline I'm aware of...

- April – started operating the business at 1620 Higgins Way (including a business sign on the street).
- June 2 – I contacted the property manager Sue Vaterlaus and also made a complaint to the Code Compliance Officer on that same date. Ms. Vaterlaus confirmed via text that she knew of the business, was aware of their needs for a permit, and knew they didn't have one. County Code Compliance Officer Eleonor Hilario stated via email that they had "inquire[d] last month about permit but did not follow through."
- June 4 – Code Compliance Officer Hilario stated via email that they were allowed to operate concurrently with going through the permitting process (which is an answer inconsistent with county code).
- June 21 - I escalated the June 2-4 email thread to Code Compliance Manager Tim Sullivan but never received a response.
- Aug 12 – County Planner Sam Becker confirmed via email that the business has an active code violation case (VIO2026-00121) and should not be operating as a business.
- August – September 2 – the business in question has continued to operate. Neighbors & myself have routinely observed customers dropping off dogs and I've spoken to two of those clients directly who confirmed they are using the services.

The operators of this business are seemingly experienced in the dog boarding & training services as evidenced by their website (www.custom-k9.com). It was also confirmed that the applicants (operators and property manager) were well aware of the legal requirements to open this business. This was no honest mistake, the business intentionally tried to circumvent the necessary procedure and only started the permit process when they were caught and investigated. This calls into question why the county would want to allow a business with these poor ethics to operate, and also calls into question the welfare of the animals being managed on this site. If they're trying to avoid these legal requirements, then what other animal welfare shortcuts are they willing to take?

2. Nuisance & Impact

According to Section 6.20.060, there needs to be a required finding that the animals will not create a public nuisance. There's nothing theoretical here, the neighborhood has been living with this illegal unpermitted operation for over 4 months now and it's generated multiple complaints from the neighbors due to the frequent barking noise pollution.

There are at least 15 residential buildings or residences within 300' of the location. It also sits in an elevated position that amplifies the noise from that location to the surrounding neighborhood well beyond that 300' range. Classifying this property as an isolated rural location is not consistent with the actual residential fabric.

Higgins Way is a small street that is already significantly overburdened with traffic due to an elementary school and its popularity as a hiking & biking location. This is not an appropriate location to open additional commercial businesses that will drive more traffic onto this small dead-end street that lacks proper safety elements like sidewalks.

3. Facility safety & code compliance

According to your code, The Zoning Hearing Officer must find, *"that any building, pen, run or other enclosure housing dogs is at least 300 feet from any residence on a neighboring property, unless an exception is granted pursuant to Section 6.20.130."*

Given the size and configuration of the property and the extent of surrounding residential development, it appears highly questionable whether the proposed dog-housing facilities can satisfy the ordinance's 300-foot separation requirement.

Importantly, the ordinance does not merely require separation from one particular residence. It requires that any building, pen, run, or other enclosure housing dogs be at least 300 feet from any residence on a neighboring property.

Before the County takes action on this application, I request that the applicant be required to provide a dimensioned site plan clearly depicting:

- Every building, pen, run, and other enclosure in which dogs will be housed;
- A 300-foot radius measured from each such facility;
- All residences on neighboring properties falling within those areas;
- The measured distance from each proposed dog-housing area to the nearest neighboring residences; and
- Any exception being requested pursuant to Section 6.20.130.

If the proposed facilities are within 300 feet of neighboring residences, then the application does not satisfy Section 6.20.060(b)(1) as written, and the required finding cannot be made absent an exception under Section 6.20.130.

The fact that a particular property may simply be too small, too constrained, or too close to neighboring residences to accommodate a commercial kennel while satisfying the ordinance's residential separation requirement should not, standing alone, constitute an extraordinary hardship justifying an exception. Rather, those circumstances may demonstrate that this particular property is not an appropriate location for the proposed kennel use.

In addition to these concerns, this same property suffered a landslide on its western side onto Adobe Dr in the Spring of 2023. To this day, it remains an unrepaired and significantly dangerous situation for residents. The only solution has been to place a large tarp over it. This is further evidence of a pattern of disregard to the surrounding community by the property owner/manager. It also points to how significant sections of the 0.6 acre site are not just unusable, but geologically unsafe for use. Thorough assessment of this parcel in a holistic manner should be part of the scope before any further commercial use is even considered.

Requested Actions

Based upon the foregoing, I request that the Zoning Hearing Officer deny PLN2026-00209 because the present record does not demonstrate that all findings required by Section 6.20.060 can be made.

At minimum, the matter should be continued until the County...

- Investigates the existing barking and noise conditions.
- Requires documentation of residences located within 300 feet of the proposed dog-housing facilities.
- Requires a dimensioned site plan demonstrating compliance with Section 6.20.060(b)(1).

- Identifies and evaluates any requested Section 6.20.130 exception.
- Evaluates the actual usable area of this approximately 0.6-acre, substantially sloped
- Parcel.
- Investigates the existing tarp-covered slope condition and determines whether a geotechnical investigation and corrective stabilization work are required.
- Evaluates the proposed location and operation of all outdoor dog areas.
- Evaluates hours, customer activity, parking, drop-off/pickup, and other operational impacts associated with the commercial daycare, training, and boarding use.
- Identifies the RM zoning provisions authorizing the proposed use.
- Addresses consistency with the Open Space General Plan designation.
- Addresses the existing nuisance evidence in connection with the mandatory Section 6.20.060(a)(1) finding.
- Provides neighboring property owners an opportunity to review and respond to this information before a decision is made.

If the County nevertheless considers approval, I request stringent, objective, and enforceable conditions addressing hours of operation, outdoor activity, the maximum number of dogs outdoors simultaneously, overnight boarding, barking and noise, customer drop-off and pickup, and an effective mechanism for permit review or revocation in response to substantiated nuisance complaints.

Reservation of Rights

I respectfully request that the County address these concerns before taking final action on the application. The existing nuisance conditions, apparent conflict with the 300-foot residential separation requirement, substantial surrounding residential development, physical limitations of the property, and apparent unresolved slope stability condition raise serious questions regarding the County's ability to make the findings required for approval.

If the County approves the permit notwithstanding these concerns, I intend to pursue all available administrative remedies, including appeal of the decision to the Planning Commission, and I expressly reserve all rights and remedies available under applicable law, including the right to seek judicial review of any final County action.

This correspondence and subsequent written submissions, is intended to be included in the administrative record for PLN2026-00209.

Please include this correspondence in its entirety in the administrative record and provide it to the Zoning Hearing Officer prior to consideration of PLN2026-00209.

Thank you for your time and consideration to this matter.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nick Lusson', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

Nick Lusson

1623 Higgins Way, Pacifica

NLusson@gmail.com

From: [Karen Clark](#)
To: [PLANNING_ZHO](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 1 Permit Request PLN2026-00209
Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2026 2:02:49 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Hello,

I am writing to urge you not approve a permit for a boarding facility at 1620 Higgins Way. I do not believe a facility such as this should exist on a small one lane residential street. We already have Shamrock Ranch within a few blocks of this and there is no need for one here.

I live at the other end of the street from this residence and every day, all throughout the day, I can hear many dogs barking because the sound echoes up through the eucalyptus forest and off the buildings on the street. I understand that not only was this business operating without a permit, but has continued to after he was told to stop and while waiting for permit approval.

This is not the location for such a business. It is a residential area. Please do not approve this permit.

Sincerely,

Karen Clark
1677 Higgins Way
Pacifica, CA

From: [Gregg Maher](#)
To: [PLANNING_ZHO](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 1 file number PLN2026-00209
Date: Thursday, September 3, 2026 12:00:49 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Zoning Hearing Office Singh,

I would like to share my experience with Jeff, Becky, and Custom K-9. From the very first time we brought our dog, Agatha, to Custom K-9, we have had nothing but a positive experience.

Jeff and Becky have consistently been welcoming, caring, understanding, and, most importantly, kind and professional with Agatha. It is very clear to us how comfortable and happy she is in their care. Agatha genuinely looks forward to going to Custom K-9 every day. She gets incredibly excited whenever we mention words such as "school," "Jeff," "Becky," or even the names of her dog friends.

When we arrive to drop her off, Agatha can hardly wait to get through the door and greet everyone. In fact, as we approach the entrance, she becomes so excited that it is almost as if we cease to exist! Her enthusiasm and eagerness to get inside have always been very reassuring to us as her owners.

I understand that there are sometimes dogs barking when we drop Agatha off or pick her up. However, dogs bark, especially in an environment where there are multiple dogs, people arriving and leaving, and the excitement of seeing their friends. From what I have personally observed and heard, the barking has sounded like normal, excited barking rather than distressed or fearful barking.

Most importantly, Agatha's behavior around Jeff and Becky speaks volumes to me. She becomes incredibly excited, happy, and rambunctious when she sees them. She clearly has a strong bond with both of them and genuinely loves being around them. As her owner, I cannot imagine that she would consistently display this level of excitement, affection, and eagerness if she felt unsafe, frightened, or mistreated in their presence.

Agatha's behavior has always given us confidence that she feels safe, comfortable, and cared for at Custom K-9. Her excitement to attend, her eagerness to see Jeff, Becky, and her dog friends, and the affection she shows toward them are, in my opinion, powerful indications of the positive relationship she has with them.

We have been very happy with our experience at Custom K-9, and I sincerely appreciate the care, kindness, and professionalism that Jeff, Becky and team have shown toward Agatha since day one.

Sincerely,

Gregg Maher

From: [Mia Blank](#)
To: [PLANNING_ZHO](#)
Subject: Applicant: Jeffrey Aguilera File No.: PLN2026-00209
Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2026 11:58:57 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Regarding

Owner: Sue Valteras (Property Manager), on behalf of Ali Nilchipour

Applicant: Jeffrey Aguilera

File No.: PLN2026-00209

Location: 1620 Higgins Way, Pacifica

APN: 023-340-330

Dear Zoning Hearing Office Secretary, Tet Maria Gonzalez:

Please forgive the tardiness of this email and allow it to be considered for the hearing regarding Jeffrey Aguilera and approving his property for a Kennel Permit. I am currently out of the country and that is why this note has been delayed.

The service Jeff and his team provide is invaluable. I met Jeff about six years ago. I had adopted a dog from the SFSPCA. Shortly after I adopted my dog, I realized my dog had several triggers that caused him to react. As an example, when my dog would see a crow/raven, he would instinctively takeoff. One time when he did that, the leash got caught wrapped around my hand as I was dropping it and broke one of my fingers. I realized at that point I needed to train my dog.

After a significant amount of research and multiple interviews with individuals and entities that provide dog training, I found Jeff. I chose Jeff because of his professionalism, depth of knowledge with dogs, expertise in training dogs — including training police dogs and other professional service animals — plus his obvious passion about the care and training of dogs.

At that time, his business was located in South San Francisco. The facility offered both day drop off/care and more formalized individualized training packages. One of the options Jeff offered was a board and train option where my dog would stay with him for several weeks and he would do behavioral training. That option included several sessions with me on how to handle and direct my dog. It literally was the best thing I have done for my dog, Mylo.

Since then, Mylo has participated in both drop day drop off and care/board and train when I have had to travel for work. In 2025, I did multiple work trips and every time Mylo stayed with Jeff. Each time, I had such peace of mind knowing that my dog was well taken care of. Mylo would come back happy and healthy.

If you are a pet person, then you know what I mean that it is very difficult to drop your pet off anywhere for an extended period of time. Your pet is part of your family.

In addition to the above, Jeff and his team historically have provided creative and impactful activities for pets and their owners including weekend dog socialization sessions, biweekly group training reinforcement sessions and celebrating fun events like International Dog day.

The service that Jeff and his staff provide is incredibly important. Jeff knows and understands dogs. It truly is a gift.

Without hesitation, I strongly ask that you approve a Kennel Permit for Jeff and his team on Higgins in Pacifica.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Mia

Mia DiMucci Blank
415-994-7625 (m)