

Michael Lam

From: Sara Broadbent <sarab708@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 4, 2022 2:49 PM
To: Michael Lam
Cc: Thomas Moran; Paul G. Lego; vsheppard; Michael'; Jeff Williams
Subject: Letter regarding Planning Commission Agenda Item #7: Public hearing to review and provide a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors on proposed amendments to cannabis cultivation setbacks in the commercial agricultural zone districts, technical chan...

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

Santa Cruz County Planning Commission
c/o Michael Lam
Planning Department
701 Ocean Street, Suite 400
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Planning Commissioners,

We are writing today to help inform your review of the Non-Retail Cannabis Ordinance at the February 9th Planning Commission meeting. At their December 2021 meeting, the Board of Supervisors requested County staff to work with your commission to “study and address the conflicts presented by agricultural production near residential neighborhoods” (as reported in the Santa Cruz Sentinel, October 20).

We represent neighborhoods in Corralitos and La Selva Beach that will be impacted by your review and decisions. Our neighborhoods are a mix of commercial (CA) and residential (RA) ag zoning. We have peacefully coexisted with farms and farming for decades and don’t object to either cannabis or cannabis cultivation in appropriate locations.

It is well documented that commercial cannabis cultivation operations produce significant noise, odor, light pollution at night, traffic, and security issues, as well a negative impact on local wildlife and the environment. Reasonable setbacks from these operations are required to protect neighborhoods from these impacts. The current cannabis ordinance proposes setbacks of only 400 feet from outdoor grows to a neighboring residence and only 50 feet from indoor nursery greenhouses to a neighboring residence. To put this in context, a commercial greenhouse with dehumidifiers, heating, and lighting equipment could operate around the clock less than one semi-trailer truck length away from a child's window. We believe that setbacks at least equivalent to retail cannabis setbacks are required to adequately protect neighboring residences.

As an example in our community in La Selva Beach, an applicant has cleared the pre-application hurdle to grow 220,000 sq ft of cannabis canopy, 24 hours a day, in the middle of a neighborhood of 150 homes with families and children, a pre-school, a state park and an environmental preserve. The plans call for the existing 22 passive greenhouses to be converted to industrial agricultural buildings with estimated infrastructure equivalent to three Costco stores. To support the operation, there are proposed 40 large truck trips per week for delivery and distribution with 40 car trips per day for workers - all on one lane residential roads maintained by the neighbors, not the County. An operation of this size, as shown in the pre-application, includes vast amounts of grow lighting, electricity, air handling, security lighting and fencing and other equipment that will profoundly and negatively change the character of our neighborhood.

There are over 1400 parcels in the County that could apply for a cannabis licence and the County staff has projected that 40% of those parcels will become cannabis operations. Neighborhood apple farms and strawberry fields could convert to the energy and water intensive, non-food crop, cannabis. Anyone living next door to an ag zoned lot could potentially see their rural neighborhood farm become an industrial agricultural center. It has been documented by cannabis consultants that locating near residents can have negative impacts to their operations: <https://www.acentech.com/blog/legal-marijuana-theres-smoke-theres-sound/>. Additionally, this is an industry experiencing significant compliance issues as described in recent articles: (<https://www.politico.com/news/2021/10/23/california-legal-illicit-weed-market-516868> and <https://news.yahoo.com/california-pot-market-hazy-line-164536962.html>).

At this point, the County Planning Department and Commission are the only defense left to prevent these operations from destroying many County neighborhoods. We would welcome the opportunity to further discuss these issues with your Commission and, hopefully, find a compromise that protects our families and children. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Crest Drive and Corralitos Neighbors

Michael Bauch, Sara Broadbent, Paul Lego, Thomas Moran, Vicki Sheppard, Susan Williams

Michael Lam

From: Tim Folger <tim@folgerandburt.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 6, 2022 5:14 PM
To: Michael Lam
Subject: 110 Crest Drive

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

Hello Michael,

After attending many public hearings and meetings over the last 45 years I have never been more frustrated as I was last October and I was to blame for that.

The applicant himself positioned himself so as to be the last speaker at the Board of Supervisors hearing on the application for the greenhouses at 110 Crest Drive.

Only public hearing decorum prevented me from reacting immediately when he spoke these words: " I don't want to be where I'm not wanted".

I have kicked myself since that afternoon for not standing up from my chair and saying, "Well, then it's settled. You are surrounded by neighbors here in this room who are the very ones whose houses surround 110 Crest Drive and every one of us has made it quite clear that we don't want you."

Maybe in the old days things got settled that way - with direct one to one communication.

But when one party makes his feelings that clear, it speaks to the extreme likelihood that he is circling around the truth.

This is not an area where homeowners are pushing against agriculture.

I have been here for almost fifty years and watched the area live very peaceably with traditional small agricultural operations.

The inappropriateness of the cannabis proponents plan here is dramatically obvious.

For them it is an attempt to set a precedent for other approvals.

For us it is the raw knowledge that we are being used any way one looks at it.

It's a pretty lousy feeling to be treated as a guinea pig.

I thank you for your patience.

Sincerely,
Tim Folger

148 Crest Drive

Michael Lam

From: Sara Broadbent <sarab708@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 9:45 AM
To: Michael Lam
Cc: nlyellin@comcast.net; Ellen Pirie; Terry; Shelley Tushar; Henry Tushar; Jeff Williams; Thomas Moran; Jane Prough; Zach Friend; centralcoast@coastal.ca.gov
Subject: Additional signers and correction to Letter Regarding Planning Commission Agenda Item #7

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

Michael,

Additional people have requested to have their names added to this letter and there is a correction on one of the existing names. Thank you for your assistance in conveying this to the Planning Commission and please do not hesitate to let me know if you have any questions.

Best regards,

Sara Broadbent

Santa Cruz County Planning Commission
c/o Michael Lam
Planning Department
701 Ocean Street, Suite 400
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Planning Commissioners,

The Non-Retail Cannabis Ordinance is scheduled for your review at the February 9th Planning Commission meeting. You have an important obligation to the many rural neighbors in Santa Cruz County to evaluate this proposed ordinance carefully and to advise the Board of Supervisors as to what is protective for both neighborhoods and the cannabis industry. The staff report says that cannabis is like any other crop. However that is not correct especially in our Monterey Bay climate. Cannabis depends on more light, heat and less humidity than is available in our coastal areas requiring significant technology inputs to have sufficient harvests. This level of mechanical support has an unfortunate environmental footprint as noted in the study by Wartenberg and others (<https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00844>). Recent studies indicate that cannabis also has a significant water impact in that it can use up to double the amount of water as compared to conventional crops (<https://mjbizdaily.com/cannabis-requires-more-water-than-commodity-crops-researchers-say/>). The mechanization of cannabis operations also produces constant noise, light pollution, and air emissions as compared to traditional crops that do not require 24/7 climate controlled operations. The proposed changes to the cannabis ordinance do not have a means for public input except when an exception is being requested. The ordinance allows indoor greenhouse nurseries with all the inherent climate mechanisms to be within 50 feet of a neighbors window - creating the potential for around the clock noise, light and emissions without ever notifying the neighbor of the cannabis license application. We request that you examine the proposed changes to the ordinance in light of the protections provided to urban residents for

Retail Cannabis Operations. Shouldn't the neighborhood protections for cultivation operations be at least similar?

About 30 people spoke at the County Supervisors meeting in which this proposed ordinance was voted on. ALL of the comments were AGAINST decreasing setbacks, but the Board of Supervisors ignored the comments and clearly came in prepared to vote in support of the Cannabis growers. The objecting speakers were characterized as being simply against one project, however, there are over 1400 parcels in the County that could apply for a cannabis licence and the County staff has projected that 40% of those parcels will become cannabis operations. This would be a substantial change in the nature of agriculture in Santa Cruz County. Isn't it worthy of some due diligence before such a massive turnover occurs? Many residents of Santa Cruz County live on lots zoned Residential or Commercial Ag and they could see their community completely change as their neighboring apple farms become high tech cannabis factories.

While cannabis has recently seen market fluctuations based on more product coming on market, it still has the potential for local tax revenue (<https://www.theunion.com/news/the-economics-of-pot-price-of-cannabis-flower-drops-50-from-last-year/>). However the tax benefit should be evaluated in balance with the environmental and community costs. We ask that you look at how this ordinance can be revised to better protect all interests. We hope you are interested in our concerns and if you would like to discuss them further please do not hesitate to reach out to us.

Sincerely,
Concerned Santa Cruz County Citizens

Lisa Barker, Robert Boettiger, Sara Broadbent, Paul Campbell, Susan Campbell, Chris Codiga, Sylvia Constantz, Sandra Degen, Mark De La Vega, Jean-Louise Excoffier, Katie Excoffier, Annie Folger, Tim Folger, David Gazek, Shani Ginsburg, Terry Hancock, Deeann Hartzell, Edward Hickey, Kathe Hickey, Carol Hobson, Kati Kattaneck, Jeff Logston, Jeanmarie Lucker, Diedra Lunn, Ali Moayedian, Thomas Moran, Ed Orre, Reena Philip, Ellen Pirie, Mary Jane Prough, Robert Wilits Prough, Deb Roisman, Jeff Roisman, Ricky C. Schmele, Traute Schmele, John Thomas, Lisa Thomas, Gloria Turner, Hugh Turner, Shelley Tusher, Henry Tusher, Ben Warren, Wendy Weil, Jeff Williams, Ricardo Wolf, and Nancy Yellin

Michael Lam

From: Daisy Allen
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 2:05 PM
To: Michael Lam
Subject: FW: Tiny Home options in Santa Cruz

Late correspondence for the tiny homes PC item.

From: Mark Buxbaum <markbuxbaum@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 6, 2022 1:16 PM
To: Daisy Allen <Daisy.Allen@santacruzcounty.us>
Subject: Re: Tiny Home options in Santa Cruz

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

P.S. The video clip is directly related to tiny homes.
Thanks again Daisy!
Mark

From: Mark Buxbaum <markbuxbaum@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 4, 2022 2:21 PM
To: Daisy Allen <Daisy.Allen@santacruzcounty.us>
Subject: Tiny Home options in Santa Cruz

Hi Daisy,

Thanks very much for your fine work on tiny and small home options here in Santa Cruz.

I am a CZU lightning fire survivor, considering all my options.

If you have just 5 minutes please watch this video clip:

<https://youtu.be/paf8zLA40c8?t=265>

Thank you!

Best!
Mark

From: Daisy Allen <Daisy.Allen@santacruzcounty.us>
Sent: Monday, November 1, 2021 9:57 AM

To: Mark Buxbaum <markbuxbaum@hotmail.com>
Subject: RE: Please add me to list to receive "Tiny Home" updates

Hi Mark,
I have added you to the list. I agree with your thought about "tiny homes" but we are stuck with that term as it has become popular in the industry 😊
~Daisy

Daisy Allen
County of Santa Cruz Planning Department
701 Ocean Street, 4th Floor
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
831-454-2801
daisy.allen@santacruzcounty.us

From: Mark Buxbaum <markbuxbaum@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 30, 2021 9:34 PM
To: Daisy Allen <Daisy.Allen@santacruzcounty.us>
Subject: Please add me to list to receive "Tiny Home" updates

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

Thanks!
By the way, I much prefer the term "Small Home"
as Tiny Home makes it sound like a doll house! 😊
Best!
Mark Buxbaum
Bonny Doon

Without deviation from the norm, progress is not possible.
Frank Zappa

Unthinking respect for authority is the greatest enemy of truth.
Albert Einstein

*The secret of happiness, you see, is not found in seeking more,
but in developing the capacity to enjoy less.*
Socrates

Never miss a good chance to shut up.
Will Rogers