

Toomians, Kristinae

From: betsy gong <betsytgong@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 19, 2018 10:14 AM
To: Toomians, Kristinae
Subject: Comments - Cannabis Cultivations- PRJ18-005

Dear Kristinae Toomians,

I am so against this said proposal of Cannabis Cultivation in my surrounding neighborhood. The quality of our lives will be in jeopardy. I can write more things against this proposal and submit signatures of names who live nearby.

It will do so much harm and violence not only to our children but to our entire "communities of quiet neighborhood."

As a property tax payer of this neighborhood - I am totally against this proposal.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Gong

Toomians, Kristinae

From: Megan Sweeley <msweeley@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2018 10:49 AM
To: Toomians, Kristinae
Subject: 444 Yolanda Ave #C

Dear Ms. Toomians:

We reside at 2419 Summercreek Drive and are vehemently opposed to the installation of this business behind our residence where we live with our youngb son and generally at all in our quiet child-filled neighborhood. While cannabis may now be legal in California it remains unsafe and criminal in nature especially given the fact that is still illegal in a majority of other states and criminals are flocking to Sonoma County to reap the ill-gotten-gains of marijuana to steal it and sell it back home where it is illegal.

We most recently had a terrifying experience at the ranch where we board our horses located on Todd Rd and Melcon Lane. As you may know a home invasion and murder was committed on Melcon Lane for the sole purpose of stealing cash and marijuana from the targeted residence. The criminals were from Virginia and known gang members. They cut the lock on the back gate of the barn and went over the barn's manure pile and through a hole in the back fence to break in and murder the nextdoor neighbor. IS THIS WHAT THE CITY WANTS FOR US? We live in a quiet neighborhood, filled with children. Our homes are easy targets for these criminals to come in through our backyards and rob, steal and harm anyone in their path. There are other areas in the City that are not near to residential homes where these businesses can go. We do not want them in our backyard. The City must set limits and this one is too close to our homes to be allowed. We understand another project at 800 Yolanda is also planned which is larger and more dangerous in scope and size. This project is a proposed cannabis manufacturing plant. KEEP THEM OUT OF OUR BACKYARDS!

Megan Saldana Sweeley
Gerardo Saldana

Toomians, Kristinae

From: Lisa Kelley <lisak@airportclub.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2018 8:55 AM
To: Toomians, Kristinae
Subject: RE: PRJ18-005

I just wanted to make sure, you never know with email.

From: Toomians, Kristinae [mailto:KToomians@srcity.org]
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2018 8:51 AM
To: Lisa Kelley <lisak@airportclub.com>
Subject: RE: PRJ18-005

Hi Ms. Kelley,

I also received your letter in my mailbox this morning. I will add it to the file record.

Kristinae Toomians | Senior Planner

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543-4692 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | KToomians@SRCity.org

From: Lisa Kelley [mailto:lisak@airportclub.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2018 8:32 AM
To: Toomians, Kristinae <KToomians@srcity.org>
Subject: RE: PRJ18-005

Thank you.

From: Toomians, Kristinae [mailto:KToomians@srcity.org]
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2018 8:27 AM
To: Lisa Kelley <lisak@airportclub.com>
Subject: RE: PRJ18-005

Hi Ms. Kelley,

Thank you for your comments. You will receive a notice for a neighborhood meeting on 3/14 at 6pm at 635 First St. The applicant will have a presentation and the neighborhood will have a chance to ask questions and voice concerns directly to the operator. I will be there to explain the permitting process and to take notes.

Kristinae Toomians | Senior Planner

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543-4692 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | KToomians@SRCity.org

From: Lisa Kelley [mailto:lisak@airportclub.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2018 2:11 PM
To: Toomians, Kristinae <KToomians@srcity.org>
Subject: PRJ18-005

February 21, 2018

Kristinae Toomians
Senior Planner
Planning & Economic Development
RE: Permit #PRJ18-005

We are writing to voice our concerns regarding the permit applied for by NT Ventures, Inc. for the grow operation of Cannabis located at 444 Yolanda Ave. #C.

This industrial park is not your normal industrial park. It backs up to a residential neighborhood with over 500 single family homes plus hundreds of families in condominiums and apartments.

We have attached pictures of the proposed location from our kitchen and bedroom windows. These are not enhanced by zooming in. They were taken while standing from inside the house.

Additionally, we have attached a drawing of the distance which measures 36 feet from their building to our home. The Cannabis operation will literally be in the residential back yards where families relax and children play.

It's appalling to me that this type of business would even be considered since it backs up so closely to this residential location. Not only will it bring substantial odor and noise to our once quiet neighborhood, it will attract violence and crime. I am sure you are aware of the recent increase of violent home invasions due to Cannabis. After reading the proposed site security paragraph which includes a professionally monitored robbery alarm system, it's evident they are anticipating trouble.

Do you honestly believe that having this type of business backing up to a residential neighborhood is a good idea? As a resident of this community, we don't want to live our life in fear and be concerned with our safety and well-being day and night.

Please respect the integrity of our neighborhood and families and do not allow this business to go in at this location. It belongs far away from homes and children.

Please take our concerns into consideration in the approval/denial process as this will be life changing for many of us.

Roman Hubalek
Lisa Kelley
2385 Summercreek Drive
707-235-2199

Toomians, Kristinae

From: Matthew Earnshaw <mearnshaw@ebagroup.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2018 12:24 PM
To: Guhin, David; Gallagher, Sue; CMOOffice; Gossner, Anthony; Hurtado, Gloria; Schreeder, Robert; _CityCouncilListPublic; Kevin McCallum; Maloney, Mike; Toomians, Kristinae
Subject: Concerned Resident - Incompatibility of IL with Volatile Solvent Extraction - 444 Yolanda
Attachments: mearnshaw.vcf

Dear City of Santa Rosa Officials, others,

It is my understanding that the City of Santa Rosa (City) is considering a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the manufacture of concentrated THC using volatile solvent extraction at the property located at 444 Yolanda in Santa Rosa, CA which is zoned Light Industrial (IL). Volatile solvent extraction includes the manufacturing of a hemp distillate using flammable/hazardous chemicals and is generally recognized as being historically dangerous as there is an increased risk of explosion and fire.

This property borders on multiple resident properties. My family (including 4 children under 14) occupy a residence (and play outside) less than 100 feet away from the property boundary in the Harvest Park Neighborhood.

I am concerned that the project is not being evaluated correctly given the threat to human health, agricultural processing and the storage and use of hazardous chemicals during volatile extraction which would suggest an IG zoning requirement rather than IL. This manufacturing technique appears to be altogether incompatible with the zoning designation for IL which should take into consideration residential uses or proximity to residential housing.

For example, it seems obvious that the City of Santa Rosa's Zoning District IG (not IL) appears to be altogether compatible with volatile extraction because of IG's allowance for agricultural manufacturing (bugs and bacteria), warehousing, traffic, chemical solvent usage (heat, noxious gases and industrial waste) and 24-hour operation (California Code requires 24 hour surveillance and has rather strict security policy's (See Subchapter 3, Article 1, 40200 - DPH - 17-004, April 17, 2017)).

Please see short definition of City of Santa Rosa Code of IL and IG below.

20-24.020 Purposes of **industrial** districts.

The purposes of the individual **industrial** zoning districts and the manner in which they are applied are as follows.

A. BP (Business Park) district. The BP zoning district is applied to areas appropriate for planned, visually attractive centers for business that do not generate nuisances (noise, clutter, noxious emissions, etc.). This zone accommodates campus-like environments for corporate headquarters, research and development facilities, offices, **light** manufacturing and assembly, **industrial** processing, general service, incubator-research facilities, testing, repairing, packaging, and printing and publishing. Warehousing and distribution, retail, hotels, and residential uses are permitted on an ancillary basis. Restaurants and other related services are permitted as accessory uses. Outdoor storage is not permitted. The BP zoning district is consistent with and implements the Business Park land use classification of the General Plan.

B. IL (**Light Industrial**) district. The IL zoning district is applied to areas appropriate for some **light industrial** uses, as well as commercial service uses and activities that may be incompatible with

residential, retail, and/or office uses. Residential uses may also be accommodated as part of work/live projects. The IL zoning district is consistent with the **Light** Industry land use classification of the General Plan.

C. IG (General **Industrial**) district. The IG zoning district is applied to areas appropriate for **industrial** and manufacturing activities, warehousing, wholesaling and distribution uses. Uses may generate truck traffic and operate 24 hours. Retail and business service uses that could be more appropriately in another zone are not permitted. Land uses allowed in the IG zoning district have the potential for creating objectionable noise, smoke, odor, dust, noxious gases, glare, heat, vibration, or **industrial** wastes. The IG zoning district is consistent with the General Industry land use classification of the General Plan.

(Ord. 3677 § 1, 2004)

Zoning IG seems to be compatible to the proposed project (i.e., volatile extraction, agricultural processing and manufacturing) while IL is not. I would like to understand how it was decided that this proposed use is compatible with IL, how that decision was made, and based upon what study? My neighbors and I are struggling to see how this potentially hazardous agricultural manufacturing is compatible with IL zoning considering residential properties share a property boundary?

As a lifelong Santa Rosa resident, I would also appreciate some context to this decision including a list of other towns in which similar light industrial zoning for volatile extraction are allowed. It is concerning that apparently (if my facts are correct) there is a short list of cities that allow volatile extraction within City limits. I am curious what the other City's zoning requirements are and would appreciate a review of this item by the City. I would not be beneficial for Santa Rosa to become the "Mecca" for cheap and easy volatile extraction because of easier (or incorrect) zoning requirements. This item of the Cannabis policy should be reviewed. If, in fact, this is a purposeful attempt by the City of Santa Rosa to become a manufacturing hub for cannabis including volatile extraction by attracting businesses through its permitting process, I would hope the City Council would be aware of its impact on residential neighborhoods in the City. I believe the purpose of zoning is to consider and protect the people that live here, vote here, and support the community by keeping hazardous activities separated from residential neighborhoods.

It altogether seems obvious that residential neighborhoods should have a buffer from such activities because of the risk of explosion, fire, safety, noise, traffic, odor, agricultural processing, and 24-hour surveillance and security. I would propose to change the code to IG for volatile extraction and manufacturing activities unless there is a buffer to residential neighborhoods. That would seem prudent. I know all my neighbors are concerned also and just don't understand how the City can allow something like this.

Finally, it should be noted that similar projects and other zoning changes to IL are being proposed along Yolanda in the same area for the same purposes which is also of great concern to our neighborhood. At a minimum, the City should hold off on allowing these permits until a study is conducted regarding the issue of volatile extraction as it relates to human health and safety of nearby residents as well as assess the City's liability especially as it relates to the concentration of such projects in an IL zoning and adjacent to an existing and thriving residential development.

At the end of the day, we all just want a safe place to live. I believe every one of you on this list would share the same concern if this type of project (and other proposed projects) would be proximal to your neighborhood, given the information provided.

Thanks for reading this email and please let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

-Matt Earnshaw P.G., C.Hg, QSD

Toomians, Kristinae

From: Matthew Earnshaw <mearnshaw@ebagroup.com>
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2018 4:02 PM
To: Guhin, David; Gallagher, Sue; CMOOffice; Gossner, Anthony; Hurtado, Gloria; Schreeder, Robert; _CityCouncilListPublic; Kevin McCallum; Maloney, Mike; Toomians, Kristinae; Nelson Becerra; 'Alexander Rowland'
Subject: Re: Concerned Resident - Incompatibility of IL with Volatile Solvent Extraction - 444 Yolanda
Attachments: mearnshaw.vcf

Hi Mr. Becerra,

I received your *Italicized* message below. I just want to be perfectly clear. Speaking for myself, I don't have an issue with the type of business, the legality of cannabis, nor the professionalism of the business enterprise pursuing this project. That is not my main concern nor am I in a position to evaluate that.

My main concern is the proximity of a business that includes agricultural processing, chemical extraction using volatile compounds, manufacturing, and 24-hour surveillance to residential neighborhoods. In my opinion, this type of business should not be considered light industrial and be allowed next door to private residences in an existing subdivision. There has been no CEQA evaluation or corridor study for Yolanda Avenue with respect to multiple businesses next to each other, all able by CUP permit to perform the same cultivation, extraction, and manufacturing.

Thank you for your email and we are looking forward to some answers from the City in this regard.

-Matt

Hi Mr. Earnshaw,

I trust all is well. We wanted to take the time to introduce ourselves. We are the company that moved into the 444 Yolanda building. We understand you have some concerns and would like to schedule a call. I personally live in Santa Rosa and a Co-founder in NT Ventures. My business Partner, Alex Rowland and I would like to share our business model and experience in the industry. Please let us know when a good time would be to chat and will gladly address any questions you have. I want to have you rest assured that everything will be to codes and our SOPs around safety is A1. We look forward to your reply or we will see you on Wednesday. Thank you.

Best,

Nelson Becerra

917.453.7007

On 3/6/2018 12:24 PM, Matthew Earnshaw wrote:

Dear City of Santa Rosa Officials, others,

It is my understanding that the City of Santa Rosa (City) is considering a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the manufacture of concentrated THC using volatile solvent extraction at the property located at 444 Yolanda in Santa Rosa, CA which is zoned Light Industrial (IL). Volatile solvent extraction includes the manufacturing of a hemp distillate using flammable/hazardous chemicals and is generally recognized as being historically dangerous as there is an increased risk of explosion and fire.

This property borders on multiple resident properties. My family (including 4 children under 14) occupy a residence (and play outside) less than 100 feet away from the property boundary in the Harvest Park Neighborhood.

I am concerned that the project is not being evaluated correctly given the threat to human health, agricultural processing and the storage and use of hazardous chemicals during volatile extraction which would suggest an IG zoning requirement rather than IL. This manufacturing technique appears to be altogether incompatible with the zoning designation for IL which should take into consideration residential uses or proximity to residential housing.

For example, it seems obvious that the City of Santa Rosa's Zoning District IG (not IL) appears to be altogether compatible with volatile extraction because of IG's allowance for agricultural manufacturing (bugs and bacteria), warehousing, traffic, chemical solvent usage (heat, noxious gases and industrial waste) and 24-hour operation (California Code requires 24 hour surveillance and has rather strict security policy's (See Subchapter 3, Article 1, 40200 - DPH - 17-004, April 17, 2017)).

Please see short definition of City of Santa Rosa Code of IL and IG below.

20-24.020 Purposes of **industrial** districts.

The purposes of the individual **industrial** zoning districts and the manner in which they are applied are as follows.

- A. BP (Business Park) district. The BP zoning district is applied to areas appropriate for planned, visually attractive centers for business that do not generate nuisances (noise, clutter, noxious emissions, etc.). This zone accommodates campus-like environments for corporate headquarters, research and development facilities, offices, **light** manufacturing and assembly, **industrial** processing, general service, incubator-research facilities, testing, repairing, packaging, and printing and publishing. Warehousing and distribution, retail, hotels, and residential uses are permitted on an ancillary basis. Restaurants and other related services are permitted as accessory uses. Outdoor storage is not permitted. The BP zoning district is consistent with and implements the Business Park land use classification of the General Plan.
- B. IL (**Light Industrial**) district. The IL zoning district is applied to areas appropriate for some **light industrial** uses, as well as commercial service uses and activities that may be incompatible with residential, retail, and/or office uses. Residential uses may also be accommodated as part of work/live projects. The IL zoning district is consistent with the **Light** Industry land use classification of the General Plan.
- C. IG (General **Industrial**) district. The IG zoning district is applied to areas appropriate for **industrial** and manufacturing activities, warehousing, wholesaling and distribution uses. Uses may generate truck traffic and operate 24 hours. Retail and business service uses that could be more appropriately in another zone are not permitted. Land uses allowed in the IG zoning district have the potential for creating objectionable noise, smoke, odor, dust, noxious gases, glare, heat, vibration, or **industrial** wastes. The IG zoning district is consistent with the General Industry land use classification of the General Plan.

(Ord. 3677 § 1, 2004)

Zoning IG seems to be compatible to the proposed project (i.e., volatile extraction, agricultural processing and manufacturing) while IL is not. I would like to understand how it was decided that this proposed use is compatible with IL, how that decision was made, and based upon what study? My neighbors and I are struggling to see how this potentially hazardous agricultural manufacturing is compatible with IL zoning considering residential properties share a property boundary?

As a lifelong Santa Rosa resident, I would also appreciate some context to this decision including a list of other towns in which similar light industrial zoning for volatile extraction are allowed. It is concerning that apparently (if my facts are correct) there is a short list of cities that allow volatile extraction within City limits. I am curious what the other City's zoning requirements are and would appreciate a review of this item by the City. I would not be beneficial for Santa Rosa to become the "Mecca" for cheap and easy volatile extraction because of easier (or incorrect) zoning requirements. This item of the Cannabis policy should be reviewed. If, in fact, this is a purposeful attempt by the City of Santa Rosa to become a manufacturing hub for cannabis including volatile extraction by attracting businesses through its permitting process, I would hope the City Council would be aware of its impact on residential neighborhoods in the City. I believe the purpose of zoning is to consider and protect the people that live here, vote here, and support the community by keeping hazardous activities separated from residential neighborhoods.

It altogether seems obvious that residential neighborhoods should have a buffer from such activities because of the risk of explosion, fire, safety, noise, traffic, odor, agricultural processing, and 24-hour surveillance and security. I would propose to change the code to IG for volatile extraction and manufacturing activities unless there is a buffer to residential neighborhoods. That would seem prudent. I know all my neighbors are concerned also and just don't understand how the City can allow something like this.

Finally, it should be noted that similar projects and other zoning changes to IL are being proposed along Yolanda in the same area for the same purposes which is also of great concern to our neighborhood. At a minimum, the City should hold off on allowing these permits until a study is conducted regarding the issue of volatile extraction as it relates to human health and safety of nearby residents as well as assess the City's liability especially as it relates to the concentration of such projects in an IL zoning and adjacent to an existing and thriving residential development.

At the end of the day, we all just want a safe place to live. I believe every one of you on this list would share the same concern if this type of project (and other proposed projects) would be proximal to your neighborhood, given the information provided.

Thanks for reading this email and please let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

-Matt Earnshaw P.G., C.Hg, QSD

Toomians, Kristinae

From: Megan Sweeley <msweeley@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 23, 2018 3:31 PM
To: Toomians, Kristinae
Subject: 444 Yolanda Avenue, Santa Rosa - Proposed Project

Dear Ms. Toomians and City Planning Dept:

I write in opposition to the proposed project at 444 Yolanda Avenue. This project has ABSOLUTELY no place near a neighborhood full of homes and families. This projects seeks to produce a volatile extract of hash oil which is highly flammable and toxic to the air and surrounding persons. Our children live in the Harvest Park subdivision. They play outside in our backyards and our front yards on a daily basis. This proposed project threatens the safety of all of the residents of our subdivision, especially those who live on the other side of the fence and most importantly it threatens our most vulnerable segment of the population, our children.

Would you live next door to this? The risk of harm from a chemical explosion is so significant that the City should think long and hard about the criminal and civil liability it opens itself up to should the unthinkable happen if they put their stamp of approval on this project. Why is this even being considered in an area that is so close to homes? There are plenty of other industrial areas in the City that are not near homes that seem far more appropriate for this type of manufacturing business. The very threat of crime from all cannabis related business is present on a daily basis. We intend to fight the City all the way if they go forward with approval of this project. Enough is enough and having such establishments so close to a residential development of single family homes with 100's of small children is and should be of grave concern to the planners and the council when considering approval. I just can't even believe ANYONE WOULD THINK THIS WAS A GOOD IDEA, there are simply no safeguards to insure that we are kept safe.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that there are 7 current permit requests in process for cannabis related business in this one industrial complex on Yolanda. How can this be? Did you forget that our neighborhood exists? Do we not matter to the City that we pay our taxes to faithfully? We deserve to be heard and thought of, no cannabis business need to be so close to a family neighborhood. Our home values are at least \$500,000 and we don't matter? Enough is enough and we shouldn't be forced to come to City Hall every time a cannabis business wants to build a project behind us. As I said there are plenty of other places that have no neighborhoods near them. A ban on all business in the Yolanda strip and at the corner of Yolanda and Petaluma Hill Road needs to be made for the sake of our neighborhood.

Our children should grow up in a neighborhood free from the threat of volatile chemicals and possible explosions, armed robbery, armed guards and security 24/7 ... we purchased our home to prove our child with the American dream and a neighborhood to make memories in... not a drug infested operation full of crime ... while cannabis may be legal in California it isn't elsewhere in the country and criminals are coming to California and killing and maiming people to get their hands on it.

I implore the planning commission and the City to shut this proposal down and tell this project to relocate his business to an area away from homes and families because they are a threatened nuisance to our quiet neighborhood.. Shame on you.

We don't want this in our backyard.

Megan Sweeley
Gerardo Saldana
Owners of 2419 Summercreek Drive
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
707-495-3695
msweeley@gmail.com

Toomians, Kristinae

From: Melissa Gilpin <traininggal@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 23, 2018 12:12 PM
To: Toomians, Kristinae
Subject: Volatile Extraction Permit

Good afternoon,

I hope your day is going well so far. I cannot attend the hearing in Thursday regarding the Volatile Extraction Permit on Yolanda Ave. but wanted to write and ask that the permit not be granted at that particular location as it is in very close proximity to many homes. It is important to me that we keep our neighborhoods and families safe.

Respectfully,
Melissa Gilpin
Santa Rosa resident