

Maloney, Mike

From: Streeter, Patrick
Sent: Wednesday, January 9, 2019 5:55 PM
To: Rose, William; Maloney, Mike
Cc: Hartman, Clare
Subject: FW: Permit for Cannabis Business Project #18-034
Attachments: Objection Letter to Permit for Cannabis Business Project #18-034.pdf

Late correspondence for 1/10 PC Item 10.2

From: Gigi McDonald <GMCDONAL@schsd.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2019 4:10 PM
To: Streeter, Patrick <pstreeter@srcity.org>
Subject: FW: Permit for Cannabis Business Project #18-034

Hello Patrick - I'm not sure if the attached requires immediate attention, but thought I'd forward it to you anyway as Aaron is out of the office for a bit.

Thx,

Gigi

Gigi McDonald
Executive Assistant
Human Services Dept
(707) 565-5802

From: Gigi McDonald **On Behalf Of** Karen Fies
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2019 4:05 PM
To: 'ahollister@srcity.org'
Subject: Permit for Cannabis Business Project #18-034

Dear Mr. Hollister: Please find attached an objection letter from the Sonoma County Human Services Department to the above-noted subject.

Sincerely,

Gigi

Gigi McDonald
Executive Assistant
Human Services Dept
(707) 565-5802



Human Services Department COUNTY OF SONOMA



County of Sonoma
Human Services Department
(707) 565-5800

Karen Fies, Director
kfies@schsd.org

Oscar Chavez, Asst. Director
Oochavez@schsd.org

Angela Struckmann, Asst. Director
astruckmann@schsd.org

Tina Rivera, Fiscal Director
Finance & Operations
trivera@schsd.org

Paul Dunaway, Division Director
Adult & Aging Division
(707) 565-5900
dunawp@schsd.org

Felisa Pinson, Division Director
Economic Assistance Division
(707) 565-3165
fpinson@schsd.org

Katie Greaves, Division Director
Employment & Training Division
(707) 565-8500
greavk@schsd.org

Nick Honey, Division Director
Family, Youth & Children Division
(707) 565-4300
honeyn@schsd.org

January 9, 2019

Aaron Hollister, Planning Consultant
Planning and Economic Development Department
100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 1
Santa Rosa CA 95404

VIA Email and U.S. Mail

Re: Permit for Cannabis Business Project # 18-034

Dear Mr. Hollister:

I have become aware of a pending application with the City of Santa Rosa by Seashore Enterprise, LLC (d.b.a. "365 Recreational") to establish a dispensary at 2750 Mendocino Avenue in Santa Rosa. I have reviewed the project narrative, and would like to object to the issuance of a permit.

My objection is based primarily on the proximity of the proposed location to the offices of the Sonoma County Human Services Department located in very close proximity at 2550 Paulin Drive. Our offices serve individuals and families daily who need public assistance in the form of Medi-Cal, CalFresh, and General Assistance. We also employ social workers at this location who assist the most vulnerable resident of Sonoma County. These clients include women and men in crisis, and quite frequently children. These people may be on site for hours at a time, and may leave and return as well. Having a dispensary nearby where customers can consume the product is very concerning and may challenge our clients to remain clean and sober.

Please feel free to contact me if I may provide any further information to assist you as you move forward on this application. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Karen Fies
Director

Cc: Tennis Wick, Permit Sonoma (by email)
Mayor Tom Schwedhelm (by email)

Sonia E. Taylor
306 Lomitas Lane
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
707-579-8875
Great6@sonic.net

10 January 2019

Casey Edmondson, Chair
Karen Weeks, Vice Chair
Patti Cisco
Vicki Duggan
Curt Groninga
Akash Kalia
Julian Peterson
Santa Rosa Planning Commission

Via email

Re: Planning Commission Agenda Item 10.2, 365 Recreation Club, 1/10/19 Agenda

Dear Chair Edmondson and Members of the Santa Rosa Planning Commission:

I am a neighbor of this proposed project, and attended the neighborhood meeting.

I am glad to see that there will be no on site consumption of either edibles or other sorts of cannabis projects. I would oppose any consumption of cannabis products at this location.

Further, I am glad to see that there will be a requirement that the applicant construct a 6' fence at the back of the property line, along Lomitas Avenue.

There is also an indication that the project has adequate parking and that employees and customers of the business will not be parking on Lomitas Avenue and walking down the small hill to the proposed project, but that agreement is not memorialized in any way.

With that said, by this letter I am requesting the following two specific amendments to the proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for this project:

1. Require that the 6' fence be made of chain link, or some other material that is not solid, and require that there be no gate in that fence.
2. Add as an explicit condition of the CUP, that parking is prohibited on Lomitas Avenue by any of the proposed project's employees, delivery vans, and/or customers.

I am requesting these two conditions because of long standing problems the neighbors have had in this area. We would appreciate this proposed project being an asset, instead of a liability to the neighborhood.

DISCUSSION OF CUP AMENDMENT REQUESTS:

Lomitas Avenue is a substandard narrow street, and has no sidewalks, curbs or gutters (all alleged drainage is accomplished by a dirt trench, and only works as well as the most recent clearing of that trench).

Additionally, Lomitas Avenue is a dead end street and is frequented by drug dealers and their “clients,” as well as homeless individuals who camp along Lomitas Avenue and have been problems in the neighborhood. A check of police records should show calls from neighbors about these issues over the years; the police certainly are aware of these ongoing problems.

At the neighborhood meeting my recollection is that the neighbors requested a 6’ chain link fence, and that one or more of the security cameras installed by this proposed project be focused on Lomitas Avenue to monitor activity along that street.

What is required by this application is a 6’ wood fence, which is much less desirable from the neighbors’ perspective, as it would make the area behind the proposed project along Lomitas Avenue even more “private,” and therefore more likely to be abused by drug dealers, their clients and homeless individuals.

I would therefore request that the 6’ fence be required to be chain link, or some other open type of fencing, so that the area of Lomitas Avenue behind the proposed project will not become more of a problem for the neighbors, and potentially for the proposed project.

Further, at this time there are professionally built steps leading from Lomitas Avenue down to the project property. This is very worrying, since it will make it quite easy for anyone to access the project property from Lomitas Avenue. I hereby request that the proposed project not be permitted to install a gate in the fence, or, if a gate is installed that it be locked and for emergency access only.

In that line, although the applicant claims that they won’t be parking along Lomitas Avenue, it’s an unenforceable promise. I would request that the Conditional Use Permit contain a condition explicitly prohibiting this proposed project’s employees and/or customers from parking along Lomitas Avenue, including the parking of their delivery vans, at any time, for any reason.

Those of us who live in this neighborhood have had multi-decade long problems with employees of the car wash adjacent to this proposed project not only parking on Lomitas Avenue, but holding parties and throwing trash around. The CUP for the car wash explicitly prohibits such parking, and we have occasionally been able to enforce that condition (although it is a continuous uphill battle). If the CUP for this proposed project does not contain this explicit parking prohibition, I guarantee you it will be a problem for the neighborhood.

Again, Lomitas Avenue is a substandard, narrow street, certainly should not have any additional traffic put on it, and parking should not be allowed on unimproved dirt areas behind this proposed project. The only way out of Lomitas Avenue is to turn either left or right at an uncontrolled intersection onto Chanate – I’ve seen a large number of accidents at this intersection over the years, and every additional vehicle attempting to use this intersection will make it that much worse.

Thank you for your consideration. As always, please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Sonia E. Taylor

Cc: Mayor Tom Schwedhelm
Vice Mayor Chris Rogers
Councilmember Julie Combs
Councilmember Victoria Fleming
Councilmember Ernesto Olivares
Councilmember John Sawyer
Councilmember Jack Tibbetts
David Guhin, Director of Planning and Economic Development
Clare Hartman, Deputy Director, Planning
Bill Rose, Supervising Planner
Aaron Holllister, Planning Consultant
Will Schmidt, Press Democrat
Jim Sweeney, Press Democrat