

**From:** [Mischa Hedges](#)  
**To:** [Ross, Adam](#)  
**Cc:** [Lillian Dignan](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment | Green Pen Dispensary (353 College Avenue)  
**Date:** Thursday, March 7, 2019 7:25:51 AM

---

Hi Adam,

I'm writing with a public comment about the proposed Green Pen dispensary (file# CUP18-080), as I cannot attend the public hearing on March 14.

While I believe cannabis is important medicine for some, I have concern about a dispensary located on a known route to school.

I live in the Ridgway neighborhood, on Benton St (right around the corner from the proposed dispensary). Every day, hundreds of children walk down Glenn St, right by 353 College Ave, on their way to Santa Rosa High School.

I think that in one's formative years, increasing potential access/exposure and use of cannabis is not a good thing. Cannabis today is strong, and comes in many forms (candy, chocolate, drinks, vape cartridges) and these strong, often appealing substances will most definitely be more accessible if there is a public dispensary on their route to school.

The proposed dispensary is less than 4 blocks from a high school, and that is too close.

Thanks for considering public comment on this.

Best,  
Mischa

--

Mischa Hedges  
*mobile* 707.835.4874  
*skype* mischahedges  
[mischahedges.com](http://mischahedges.com)

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** **Ridgway Historic Neighborhood Association** <[ridgwayhistoricna@gmail.com](mailto:ridgwayhistoricna@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Thu, Mar 7, 2019 at 7:00 AM  
**Subject:** Public Hearing Notice | Green Pen Dispensary (353 College Avenue)  
**To:** <[mischahedges@gmail.com](mailto:mischahedges@gmail.com)>

**From:** [Sam E.](#)  
**To:** [Ross, Adam](#)  
**Subject:** Green Pen business application for College Avenue at Glenn Street  
**Date:** Monday, March 11, 2019 12:59:43 PM

---

I have previously written over my concerns about a dispensary at this location, so I hope that original letter is a part of the application file. Since I am unable to attend Thursday's meeting due to work, I am writing again to express my concerns.

Regardless of the close proximity to 2 high schools, the Junior College, and a second dispensary within ~0.5 miles (Sparc at N. Dutton and College), this location is not ideal for a high traffic business. I live on Benton Street and often turn down Glenn to get to my house. The road is narrow and packed with cars. It is not wide enough for 2 cars to drive by past each other. There is also very limited parking available as is and adding a business is only going to take that parking away from residents.

I love my neighborhood, but in recent years I am getting increasingly frustrated. I find garbage in my yard, abandoned shopping carts in the street, and cars speeding down the narrow streets barely avoiding parked cars. Don't even get me started about how people don't understand how to use a traffic circle! The neighborhood is cute and used to be quiet, but I am noticing it change. Adding a business like Green Pen isn't going to do anything to improve the neighborhood. It is going to increase traffic, increase parking difficulties, and continue to change the face of the neighborhood. Our neighborhood has a historic designation and adding this kind of business to the neighborhood just sucks the charm right out of it.

I do not know of any of my neighbors that wholeheartedly support this application. We all have our reasons for objecting to this business application, but I know that parking and traffic concerns are high up on the list for all of us. We already struggle with parking and traffic, and this is only going to make it so much worse. Please don't disregard our opinions since we will have to live with whatever business ends up in that location.

Again, please reject the application for Green Pen at the College Avenue location since I do not think that location in our neighborhood is a suitable site for such a high volume and high traffic business.

Sincerely,  
Samantha Evans

**From:** [Ken Pasek](#)  
**To:** [Ross, Adam](#)  
**Subject:** 353 College, Green Pen Dispensary CUP18-080  
**Date:** Saturday, March 9, 2019 5:53:47 PM

---

Dear Mr. Ross:

I am writing to voice my displeasure at the pending approval of this project specifically with the allocation of a reduction in parking spaces in order to accommodate this business. I am aware that Green Pen has offered up six off site garage parking spaces for its employees as a consolation. However, what follow-up will there be as to the actual usage of those spaces? We well know that there will be "sneak" parking in our neighborhood by the employees as its much more convenient to do that than to traverse back and forth late at night or during inhospitable weather. What will you have the nearby residents do? Call the Police and tell them that the employees are parking in the residential neighborhood instead of using the downtown parking garage?

I live just 3 houses from this business at the corner of Carrillo St. I happen to have a nice wide driveway for their customers to turn around in when looking for a space to park. I will be adversely affected as well as my tenant who shares my driveway.

When a business cannot contain its own business to its property, why is it permissible to negatively impact residential neighborhoods? Many of our historic homes, have limited driveways or none at all and rely on street parking. If I have guests over at my home and they need parking, will I be permitted to use their parking lot if a space is available? Of course not.

Glenn St. at 3pm is already impassable going north because of the narrow street with parking on both sides and a heavy amount of school traffic passing through. The amount of customers expected at this business 7 days a week, 12 hours a day of course will negatively affect what little quiet enjoyment of our homes we have.

As a homeowner and a landlord I pay my share of taxes to the city, but commercial enterprises seem to have greater rights than private property homeowners.

I oppose this project because of the seven days a week, 12 hours a day operations and the lack of parking that it brings.

Respectfully,

Ken Pasek  
1125 Glenn St.  
Santa Rosa, CA. 95401

**From:** [Lillie Dignan](#)  
**To:** [Ross, Adam](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Public Hearing Notice | Green Pen Dispensary (353 College Avenue)  
**Date:** Friday, March 8, 2019 4:21:06 PM

---

Dear Mr. Ross,

I am not able to attend the city council meeting regarding on Monday, but I would like to submit my public comment.

I live on Benton Street, and I also walk and drive by this location every weekday on my way to work.

I am concerned about this dispensary being opened within close proximity to Santa Rosa High School and specifically on a walking route that so many students take on a daily basis to school. In the few minutes of my morning commute, I see dozens of high school students who are commuting to school past this suggested dispensary location.

This is similar to opening a liquor store or a tobacco shop on this corner. I'm generally unopposed to this business -- but this specific location, on a highly trafficked corner within 1/2 mile of a high school, does not seem to be sensible for supporting the young people in our community.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Lillian Dignan  
422 Benton St, Santa Rosa, CA 95401

On Thu, Mar 7, 2019 at 7:00 AM Ridgway Historic Neighborhood Association  
<[ridgwayhistoricna@gmail.com](mailto:ridgwayhistoricna@gmail.com)> wrote:

---

**From:** [Dustin Maxam](#)  
**To:** [Ross, Adam](#)  
**Cc:** [Guhin, David](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment for 353 College Ave, Ridgway Historic Neighborhood - CUP 18-080  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 12, 2019 1:09:15 PM  
**Attachments:** [Public Comment - CUP 18-080.pdf](#)

---

Hi Adam,

I have sent this letter a couple of different times, to both you and Amy Nicholson. I am not sure why it is not included in the Public Correspondence Attachment 10 for CUP18-080. This makes us fearful that not all public comment has been provided. Please supply to the Commissioners as soon as possible.

Thanks,

Dustin Maxam  
325 Carrillo Street

---

**From:** Dustin Maxam  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 5, 2018 11:48 PM  
**To:** 'ARoss@srcity.com' <ARoss@srcity.com>; 'planningcommission@srcity.org' <planningcommission@srcity.org>  
**Cc:** 'Che Casul' <Che.Casul@cfes.org>  
**Subject:** Public Comment for 353 College Ave, Ridgway Historic Neighborhood - CUP 18-080

Hi Adam,

I oppose the proposed Cannabis Retail project at 353 College Ave; please find my attached letter detailing a multitude of concerns.

Sincerely,

**Dustin Maxam, RLA**  
*Sr. Planner/ Landscape Architect*  
**Oakmont Senior Living**  
9240 Old Redwood Hwy, Suite 200  
Windsor CA 95492  
P: 707-535-3296



Dustin Maxam  
325 Carrillo Street  
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

August 5, 2018

Adam Ross, City Planner  
City of Santa Rosa Planning and Economic Development  
100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3, Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
aross@srcity.org

Re: Proposed Retail Cannabis at 353 College Ave, CUP 18-080

Dear Mr. Ross,

It is unfathomable to me that within a few short months Cannabis can transition from being an illicit drug relegated to the outskirts of our City to being sold at a boutique retail store only 300' from where my 3 and 5 year old kids play in our front yard. I oppose the proposed Cannabis Retail at 353 College Avenue and the associated use permit required. In the scramble to address marijuana legalization, the City has neglected to fully consider the health, safety, economic, cultural, and environmental impacts on its Residential Neighborhoods.

I oppose any Cannabis business located abutting or in close proximity to a residential neighborhood for many reasons, but chiefly because the City's newly adopted Cannabis Ordinance, ORD-2017-025, is not consistent with Santa Rosa's General Plan and directly contradicts many of its goals and policies. This appears to be a violation of California Government Code, 65860 (a)(2). The following are a few of the General Plan's Goals and Policies that appear to be in conflict with the proposed land use abutting residential:

**LUL-C-9 Preserve and protect the character of older established residential neighborhoods within and adjacent to downtown.**

The proposed location is sandwiched between two historic neighborhoods and in close proximity to a third. The commercial parcels directly across College Avenue from the project are zoned Downtown Commercial (CD) a district that doesn't allow Cannabis Retail in the St. Rose historic neighborhood. Given that our neighborhood is clearly adjacent to downtown, has significant character, and an established historical value to the greater community the proposed cannabis retail use is not compatible with our neighborhood.



Partial Map of the City of Santa Rosa Historical Districts

Walkability is a core characteristic of our neighborhood and it is reflected in the design of our historic homes (closer to the street, porches, rear garages). Given this core value, allowing an auto-oriented commercial Cannabis business does not 'preserve and protect' the character of the neighborhood.

**LUL-I-3 Allow neighborhood centers that include small grocery stores, cleaners, and similar establishments, where they can be supported, within walking distance of residential uses. Ensure that neighborhood centers do not create unacceptable traffic or nuisances for residents due to the hours and nature of their operation, and are designed to facilitate walking and bicycling.**

The intent of this policy is clearly to provide services that benefit walkable residential neighborhoods and prevent negative impacts and nuisances. The residents of our neighborhood are clearly demonstrating to the City that the proposed Cannabis Retail will be detrimental to our quality of life. Why was the determination made that this type of use may be compatible with zoning districts CN, CG, CO, and CSC? If the general plan guides the placement of shopping centers, neighborhood commercial, drive-through establishments, and helipads then shouldn't it guide the location of Cannabis Retail? Perhaps the General Plan

should have been amended to consider effects of Cannabis legalization on land uses prior to adopting the ordinance?

**T-B-1 Require site design to focus through-traffic on regional/arterial streets. Employ the following design techniques to increase driver safety and traffic efficiency**  
**-Avoid residential access**

The existing parking lot is connected to a residential street and its configuration does not meet the current design standards of 20-36.070 or comply with Accessibility requirements. Per 20-36.040, Table 3- 4, the number of parking spaces required for retail is 1 space per 250 sf. The existing building is 2,943 sf, but it appears that the Applicant's architect has designed the interior with only 1,200 sf dedicated to retail in order to comply with the limited available parking (1,200 sf /250 sf = 4.8 parking). Given that 1 space will remain handicap and the operation will include a delivery service, 4 standard stalls are not enough to accommodate the retail delivery vehicle, employees, security personnel, and customers.

Given the small size of the parking lot and lack of backup space, cars and delivery vehicles (fedex, ups, usps, etc.), and armored trucks will have issues turning around and navigating the parking lot thus creating an unsafe exit onto the residential street. The building and fences appear to conflict with vision/ sight triangles required per 20-30.060 these vehicles will not be able to safely exit the parking lot and view pedestrians. Given that Glenn Street is a route for students traveling to Santa Rosa and Ridgway High Schools this of even greater concern.

The nearest comparable business, SPARC, has many hundreds of customers per day, an increase in parking is justifiable per 20-36.050. Cannabis Retail brings special circumstances associated with its operation including security vehicles, the proposed use will generate a parking demand greater than the standards specified in Table 3-4.

Also, due to the historic nature of our neighborhood parking is extremely limited. Many homes do not have adequate parking and residents commonly are unable to park near their homes. Each day the employees of existing local businesses utilize the parking in front of our homes. The proposed Cannabis retail will be unable to prevent its customers from using what limited parking is available to residents.

**T-C Reduce traffic volumes and speeds in neighborhoods.**

In 2016 the City's Traffic and Engineering Division conducted a study of a Carrillo Street near the intersection of Glenn. The study concluded the street is subject to 863 cars per day. Given that this volume doesn't even account for the peak loads encountered during the first few weeks of SRJC and SRH semesters, allowing a Cannabis Retail adjacent to our residential neighborhood will not reduce traffic volumes or vehicle speeds.



**T-D-3 Require traffic studies for development projects that may have a substantial impact on the circulation system.**

Our neighborhood is daily inundated with traffic heading to and from Santa Rosa Junior College, Santa Rosa High, Ridgeway High, The SR City School Dist. Office, CalFire, and the Armory. At peak times traffic backs up on Glenn Street and College Avenue as well as Morgan and Carrillo Streets. Given the proximity to local schools and that neighborhood traffic is already severe, a traffic study will be unable to demonstrate that our circulation system won't be further impacted.

According to a study from the Highway Loss Data Institute, States that have recently legalized recreational cannabis (Colorado, Washington and Oregon) saw a 2.7 percent increase in collision claims. The Applicant or City will be unable to prevent patrons, of the proposed store, from purchasing drugs, using them, and then drive through our neighborhood. How can the City maintain the safety of our streets when we are already inundated with traffic and drunk driving related issues?

**T-K-5 Ensure provision of safe pedestrian access for students of new and existing school sites throughout the city.**

The crosswalk at the intersection of Glenn Street and College Avenue is heavily utilized by students each morning and afternoon. In addition, a number of pedestrians have been hit at that location which has resulted in at least one fatality. Given this is the only non-signalized crossing of College Avenue and the project will utilize a legal non-conforming parking lot, the safety of students cannot be guaranteed when the very nature of the product being sold at the store puts them at risk.

Marijuana still remains an illegal substance under Federal Law, it is classified as a 'Schedule I Drug' due to its high potential for abuse. Given the prevalence of vaping devices among youth and their use on school grounds and even in the classrooms, how will the City prevent youth access to the products sold at this store when requiring IDs for tobacco, alcohol, and e-cigarette products currently isn't adequate?

Will the art gallery shown on the floor plan be visible through the windows? If so, will the art be appropriate for viewing by youth utilizing this route to school? It is not appropriate for students to view Cannabis related artwork on their way to school.

**YF-A Create an environment where children can grow and develop in secure and supportive families and neighborhoods.**

Our neighborhood is home to many young families, including my own. The children utilize our front yards and streets for play and socialization. They walk and bike to school, the Ridgeway Swim Center, and the neighbor sports field. Families stroll in the evenings and walk to nearby restaurants, coffee shops, and downtown. Our neighborhood is a safe place that experiences

regular 'spill-over' problems including from nearby bars, the homeless, and crime. I have lived in my home on Carrillo Street, 300 ft away from this project location, for 15 years and have experienced it all - including having my home vandalized and burglarized. Allowing Cannabis Retail in our neighborhood will not improve the "health, safety, welfare and development of youth and families" as expressed in the General Plan.

Located directly across Glenn Street from the proposed Cannabis Retail is The Center for Social and Environmental Stewardship. This organization serves at risk youth in different capacities, including counseling, workforce development, and alternatives to juvenile detention. Also, located in our neighborhood is the Social Advocates for Youth (S.A.Y.) Teen Shelter. The proposed project does not help facilitate their missions or support these teens, especially when considering that drug use is their primary root problem.

It has been suggested that allowing prominent Cannabis Retail will 'normalize' drug use, Cannabis Retail at prominent locations frequented by children is not appropriate or compatible with the General Plan.

Many sources have suggested that teen drug use has been on the rise; has the potential effects of Cannabis Retail on the City's Youth been examined and how are these land uses compatible with the General Plan?

#### **HP-B Preserve Santa Rosa's historic structures and neighborhoods.**

The existing building at 353 College Avenue where the project is proposed was built in 1962. Being that this structure is over 50 years old and zoned CG-H, the project will be subject to historical review for building modifications. Will the windows be blacked out or views to the interior be obstructed? The visibility needs of law enforcement cannot be accommodated without allowing children walking by to see product displays and advertising. The security measures and lighting required (per the ordinance) are not compatible with the historic building and neighborhood.

#### **HP-B-1 Ensure that alterations to historic buildings and their surrounding settings are compatible with the character of the structure and the neighborhood...**

Our Historic Neighborhood and the Project's Parcel is a locally designated historical resource and allowing Cannabis Retail at this location would cause a substantial adverse change in the character and cultural significance of our neighborhood. This is a potential environmental impact under CEQA (impact of a historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5).

In addition to the above concerns there has been a recent increase in the occurrences of home invasion robberies locally. Due to Federal banking regulations (despite recent allowances for credit unions), the perception exists that Cannabis businesses have large amounts of cash on-hand and no bank account. The proposed floor plan, for 353 College, features a large vault room. Given this this will create a target for burglaries and robberies, how will the project address the additional security needs? How will the City increase police resources to our neighborhood to counter this threat and the increase of unsavory persons our the neighborhood? How will the City address the potential for increased criminal activity in the nearby alleyways behind our residences?

Given that the business will be dealing in large quantities of cash and that criminal investigations can be hampered when there is no paper trail to determine cash flow, how will the Proposed Retail provide transparency to law enforcement and prevent money laundering activities by customers and employees?

Thank you very much for your time on this matter. Answers to these questions, and many more, are necessary before the City can allow the proposed Cannabis Retail at 353 College Avenue and adequately ensure the Public's health, safety, and welfare. I also ask that Planning Staff review in greater detail the disparities between the General Plan and the recently adopted Ordinance. In the meantime we will continue to organize the neighborhood into a cohesive force and educate the local politicians, businesses, schools, parent-teacher groups, non-profits, and law enforcement about the proposed Project and its potential effects on the community.

Sincerely,

**Dustin Maxam**  
325 Carrillo Street  
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

**From:** [Che Casul](#)  
**To:** [Ross, Adam](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Letter regarding Cannabis Dispensary  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 12, 2019 2:28:16 PM  
**Attachments:** [20190312123604438.pdf](#)

---

Hello Adam,

It was suggested to me that I forward you the attached.

Thank you,

Che

---

**From:** Kristi Toprakci  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 12, 2019 12:42 PM  
**To:** 'Gigi McDonald' <GMCDONAL@schsd.org>  
**Cc:** Karen Fies <KFIES@schsd.org>; Kathy Halloran <halloka@schsd.org>; Che Casul <Che.Casul@cfes.org>  
**Subject:** RE: Letter regarding Cannabis Dispensary

Hi Gigi,

Thank you! We appreciate the support!

Regards,

**Kristi Toprakci, MA, LMFT #50108**

**Stewardship Manager**

Phone: (707) 838-6641 x217

### **The Center for Social and Environmental Stewardship**

Santa Rosa Office: 401 College Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Windsor Office: 9619 Old Redwood Highway, Windsor, CA 95492

***Our Mission: To support community members to become stewards of their own lives, the lives of others, and the environment we share.***

**Support The Center when you shop online with Amazon! [Click here!](#)**

The information in this e-mail and in any attachments is confidential, privileged, and the property of The Center for Social and Environmental Stewardship. If you received this message in error, please destroy this message, delete any copies and attachments stored on your systems and notify the sender immediately. Any further distribution or copying of this message is strictly prohibited under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA).

---

**From:** Gigi McDonald <[GMCDONAL@schsd.org](mailto:GMCDONAL@schsd.org)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 12, 2019 12:43 PM

**To:** Kristi Toprakci <[Kristi.Toprakci@cfses.org](mailto:Kristi.Toprakci@cfses.org)>

**Cc:** Karen Fies <[KFIES@schsd.org](mailto:KFIES@schsd.org)>; Kathy Halloran <[halloka@schsd.org](mailto:halloka@schsd.org)>

**Subject:** Letter regarding Cannabis Dispensary

Hi Kristi - Pls find attached a scanned copy of the letter we sent to the City of Santa Rosa today regarding the above-noted subject.

Thx, ☺

*Gigi*

Gigi McDonald

Executive Assistant

Human Services Dept

(707) 565-5802

**From:** [shuddec](#)  
**To:** [Ross, Adam](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose the proposed Cannabis store - 353 College Ave - Green Pen Dispensary  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 13, 2019 2:33:47 PM

---

Mr. Adam Ross,

I am writing to oppose the proposed cannabis store at 353 College Ave, the Green Pen Dispensary.

I live at 326 Carrillo St, right around the corner from the location in question. My family has lived here since February 2003. During this time I have walked and driven by this corner countless times, any hour of the day and night. For many years I rode public transportation to and from work and would often catch the bus across the street from the location in question, or walk by there on my way downtown for various reasons.

I have witnessed drug use and drug deals in the alley way across Glenn from the corner of the proposed dispensary, which over the years I have communicated with the police about. High school students get off the city bus or walk from the nearby neighborhoods, crossing the street at this location to walk to the high school. We do not need to have this type of business in such close proximity to the high school. I realize the use of marijuana has various levels of approval legally and culturally, and at the same time it's also been proven that use of marijuana has negative effects on the developing brain. At high school age and young adult, the human brain is still developing.

In addition, the close proximity to the SAY Center on Mendocino Ave, and to the Armory Homeless Shelter (when it's operational), plus the general homeless population residing in the area are all reasons to deny this request for the dispensary.

I also have the perspective of having our property affront to the alley that runs near by to the proposed dispensary. There is already questionable activity in the alley way and I do not want to encourage more crime, drug use, loitering etc in the alley. We have had burglaries, people tag our property & buildings, park illegally on our property, gather in the alley to use drugs and party. We don't need to create an environment that will draw more of this type of behavior.

The location on the corner of Glenn and College is a neighborhood, sits between two residential neighborhoods on each side of College. Families live here. There is no room for additional parking at this location of the proposed dispensary, and we don't need the added traffic in an already very busy auto traffic area. Safety for the residents in the immediate neighborhood should be a paramount concern when reviewing this request for a business or any activity in this location. Why would the safety of the residents be of less value than the potential commerce?

I strongly urge and request that the Commission deny this request for the dispensary.

Sincerely,

Cathi Cari

326 Carrillo St

Santa Rosa,

707-799-4702



## Human Services Department COUNTY OF SONOMA



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

March 12, 2019

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

Adam Ross, City Planner  
Planning & Economic Development  
City of Santa Rosa  
100 Santa Rosa Ave – Room 3  
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Dear Mr. Ross,

I am writing to state my objection to the application for a cannabis dispensary (Green Pen Dispensary) to be located at 353 College Ave, Santa Rosa, CA 95401.

This is directly across the street from The Center for Social and Environmental Stewardship, located at 401 College Avenue, which provides programs for vulnerable youth, including at-risk youth with substance abuse issues. Having a cannabis dispensary in such close range to where minor youth come on a daily basis for social services programming would be highly inappropriate.

I urge the City to reject this application.

Sincerely,

Karen Fies  
Director

**From:** [Crystal Mangahas](#)  
**To:** [Ross, Adam](#)  
**Subject:** Objection to Green Pen in Ridgway Neighborhood  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 13, 2019 4:03:24 PM

---

Dear Mr. Ross,

I'm writing in opposition to the proposed retail cannabis store at 353 College Avenue for a number of reasons.

My husband and I bought our home on Benton Street 15 years ago. We delight in the neighborliness of the Ridgway community - the friendly families with their kids, the annual potluck for residents, the way people pulled together after the fire.

Unfortunately, we have seen a great deal of turnover at 353 College Avenue - if memory serves, it was once a cafe and since then a golfing supply store, a hydroponics store and so on. It is a tiny retail space with a tiny amount of parking. Indeed, at school drop off and pick up times the intersection of Glenn and College is already difficult to navigate if not downright dangerous. (Glenn street is a major thoroughfare to SRHS, ArtQuest, the alternative high school, the SRJC, and the Ridgway pool.)

If this retail site will be tailored to customers who walk, instead of park, it should be noted that the vast amount of foot traffic in this area are youth, **18 years old and younger**, walking to high school. They are not legally able to purchase cannabis and thus it makes the application to situate store a very strange (poor) locale. It seems to me "a certain distance from a school" kind of rule would be appropriate here.

In addition, I have concerns about safety and our quality of life in this sweet little neighborhood. We already wave down speeding cars, as businesses and commercial cars encroach on this residential space. More and more residents will be pushed from the city center if some lines are not drawn.

I appreciate your consideration in what I can only imagine is a contentious topic. My hope is that this business finds a retail location designed with true parking in mind and out of the zone of a school.

Kind Regards,  
Crystal Mangahas  
427 Benton Street  
Santa Rosa, 95401