

## Manis, Dina

---

**From:** Gomez, Daisy  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 17, 2018 1:47 PM  
**To:** Manis, Dina  
**Subject:** FW: Approval of CUP 18-008

Please add to Legistar as an attachment with today's date. Please include all of the other attachments from last night's meeting that we did not capture because it was sent to us after the meeting had already started.

Thank you,

Daisy Gomez, CMC  
City Clerk  
City Clerk's Office  
100 Santa Rosa Avenue  
Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
Tel. (707) 543-3016  
Fax (707) 543-3030  
dgomez@srcity.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Earnshaw <msearnshaw@sbcglobal.net>  
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2018 10:03 AM  
To: \_CityCouncilListPublic <citycouncil@srcity.org>  
Subject: RE: Approval of CUP 18-008

Dear City Council,

I would like to include in this record, moving forward, the city council hearing regarding this "pilot project CUP 18-008" was less than satisfactory in regards to the constituents of Santa Rosa.

A simple 5 minutes from the appellant at the beginning and over the course of a 4 hour hearing, with no further questions or comments, was simply unfair.

The council failed to address many of our concerns, some of which were even left unstated from an insufficient amount of time to present our appeal. There was absolutely no evidence provided that this type of land use is already present in this IL zoning. We would maintain many of the same concerns were it an essential oil manufacturing business. We would like an example of a any related business (type 7/level2 manufacturing) with no setbacks to residents in the city of Santa Rosa. Further, we would like to see a cannabis manufacturing & distribution business, still federally unrecognized, anywhere in the united states with no setback requirements whatsoever.

With respect to your time, the time of your staff, and the cannabis subcommittee due diligence has not been met in regards to residents. The council has been rehearsed by the cannabis committee and un-researched in their own ability as a city council to follow the intent of the law in both the state and city. To vote yes of approval based on "hype of fear"

is an insult to the intelligence, research, and exhibits you were presented with. Your vote is as unfounded as our concerns.

Since this approval will move on to a state level, I would like my concern to go in the record. We will follow it up with the State of California with this statement : The City of Santa Rosa Cannabis Ordinance ORD-2017-025 does not follow the intent of California State Law in regards to manufacturing and distribution with no setbacks to residents, K-12 schools, parks, and other cannabis related business.

The facts will speak for themselves given the time.

I will remain vocal in our city about this matter because it has become evident the backbone of our cannabis city ordinance is founded in special interests and outside money while the residents and constituents of Santa Rosa largely remain clueless and unheard.

Thank you again for your time,

Shelly Earnshaw / appellant on behalf of Harvest Park Neighborhood.