

From: [Jacob Patterson](#)
To: [Lemos, June](#)
Cc: [Peters, Sarah](#); [O'Neal, Chantell](#); [Gurewitz, Heather](#); marie@mariejonesconsulting.com
Subject: 3/28/22 CC Mtg, Item 8E concerning public comments listed in the IS/ND for the cannabis ordinances project
Date: Saturday, March 26, 2022 11:22:28 AM

City Clerk & City Council,

This email is primarily informational since no final action is actually contemplated for this agenda item but I still think it is important to consider as this project progresses through the City's review process. I am not providing any opinion or my personal recommendation concerning the cannabis regulations policy decisions, which I will likely reserve for oral or future public comments but I want to point out what appears to be a fairly significant error if it is carried through to the actual adoption process for the relevant ordinances within this overall project updating the City's cannabis regulations.

The IS/ND that is included in the agenda materials for Monday's meeting purports to be published with the public comments on the draft IS/ND received by the City during the formal review and comment period but the comments that are included in that attachment appear to be incorrect and should be revised. First, there are duplicates of several public comments. Second, there are comments about the ordinances themselves or the policy decisions and not about the IS/ND (some are combined on both topics so those are appropriately included). Third, there are several very significant comments about the alleged inadequacy of the IS/ND that were submitted about the IS/ND during the formal public and responsible agency review and comment period as part of the public hearing process before the Planning Commission that are omitted in their entirety (see, e.g., February 23, 2022 Planning Commission meeting, Item No. 6A).

These omitted comments include comments submitted from me about the City's water model questioning the water supply analysis as it applies to this project. There are also comments incorporating the City's meeting materials and meeting video for the January 25, 2021 City Council meeting to demonstrate that the baseline conditions and even the scope/details of the project description in the draft IS/ND is inaccurate and therefore the resulting analysis in the draft IS/ND is flawed. I understand this is just a preliminary discussion and not the required noticed public hearing where you will potentially take action on this proposed ordinance that is recommended for approval by the Planning Commission but these apparent errors concerning the public comments on the draft IS/ND are very significant and should be corrected prior and a revised (accurate) draft IS/ND incorporating the actual public comments received on the draft IS/ND should be included as this item moves forward.

In general, it is a standard and best practice to actually log submitted comments in the order they are received during the formal review and comment period for a draft CEQA document. Based on the inaccuracies and disorganization of the comments in the attachment for Monday's meeting, this probably wasn't followed for this particular project. I think you should consider following those best practices in the future.

Regards,

--Jacob

Dear City Council,

When the discussion of cannabis coming into town first started, it was interesting to hear the different perspectives. Now that a couple of retail cannabis stores have opened, they are a part of our local business. The council voted on it, passed it and set ordinances in place for the retail cannabis to enter the city and be a part of the CBD.

Recently there has been discussion of the planning commission to propose that the retail cannabis only be allowed on the west side of Franklin St. I was shocked to hear that there was even a suggestion as the city already had ordinances in place for the retail cannabis. Our Central Business District is called that because that is where business in downtown happens. It is not Central Business district, excluding certain businesses that were welcomed into the city.

My parents own the property located at 144 N Franklin St and have a contract with MS Moulton for Sunshine Holistic. This was researched and well thought out asking the city if there were any reasons why they should not have them as tenants. The city assured them that their space was acceptable and so they moved forward.

I worked full time in the alley located between McPherson St and Franklin St for more than 20 years. When I worked there, on the South end was Mendo Litho, receiving deliveries, The Credit Union, with customers using the alley, they even added a parking lot that exited into the alley, LaBamba grocery and restaurant receiving deliveries in the alley, The Men's Room and also the Fratis house that had parking in the back by the alley. The Floor Store which received deliveries for various flooring products. The point is that this has always been a commercially used alley and is no surprise to the people on McPherson St that they live one block up from a commercial street in the central business district, or to new property owners that they would be buying one block up from Franklin St, a busy part of town.

It would be unfair to discriminate against property owners that own on the East side of the street, when their property is zoned commercial and they are in the CBD. It could cause problems in the CBD as the east side has the bulk of the empty buildings. This is unfair to the property owners on the east side!

After going to the planning commission meeting last week, my Mom asked the commission to exclude her property from this ridiculous idea of drawing a line down the center of Franklin Street and dividing the businesses. Jeremy said he was fine with the proposal of the line down the middle of Franklin, MS Roberts said she was fine with it and Nancy had no comment. Jay Andreis was open for discussing it in a sensible way to make it work, but it was disregarded and they moved on with this outrageous suggestion to exclude the east side of Franklin St. How disappointing that they didn't even talk about the request of excluding her building as she explained the natural buffer around the entire building.

I mentioned to them that I could walk across Franklin St in 5 seconds. How is this a better location a few seconds away? I didn't hear any facts that support allowing a retail cannabis across the street would be beneficial in any way. We're not talking about across a four lane highway, we are talking about a downtown street that people walk from side to side as they shop. They even have a special crosswalk by the Tip Top for pedestrian crossing.

I am asking that you do not draw a line down the middle of Franklin St.

Thank you, Anson Pyeatt

Dear Mayor Norvell and City Council Members,

My husband and I have owned the property at 144 N Franklin St for 22 years.

I have not phoned in or spoke at the meetings until last week at the planning commission. After hearing the idea to divide Franklin St. down the middle, I felt compelled to show up and address the unfairness of this proposal. This could cause problems with neighboring property owners on Franklin St, causing rent issues, devaluing one property and increasing rents on others as well as not being able to rent the space due to a line drawn down Franklin St.

The planning commission has allowed Jacob Patterson to speak on behalf of the appellants, while his mother MS Roberts would be voting on issues pertaining to the subject he was against. How is everyone OK with this? He praises them when they please him and he sternly disciplines them with his rhetoric when they are in opposition. This can influence votes! It is not disclosed to the public when they put in an application for a permit, as I had no idea for quite some time that they were Mother and Son. When I heard this, I was in disbelief.

Jay Koski on the other hand tries to strong arm the commission with his good ole boy attitude, gathering a few neighbors and attempting to convince people that having a retail cannabis business is an unsafe and egregious. If this is true, then we should have the facts supporting it. Has the Bakery on Main Street or the retail cannabis store in Mendocino been a problem? If so, then we should hear about it so that we can address the issues. I am interested in hearing the facts, if it is indeed not safe then we should be addressing the issues. I phoned Willits, they have 3 retail cannabis stores, Ukiah has 3, and Mendocino has 1. If there are problems I want to know about them. We all want safety!

We have a tenant for our building, Brandi Moulton and she has been waiting for over a year and a half for her permit for a retail cannabis business. For those of you that have any experience with owning and operating a small business, you will understand the impact this would have.

I am located on McPherson St as well as some of the appellants and I am not impacted by the businesses that are located on Franklin Street. Everyone knows that Franklin St is just one block away from McPherson St.

I have a buffer around my building at 144 N Franklin St on all four sides, Alder St to the North, Franklin St to the West, a 50 X150 parking lot to the South and a commercially used alley to the East. This location is not touching any of the appellant's property and has been a fully operating business for more than 20 years with no complaints from neighbors.

I asked the planning commission to exclude my property for this proposal and it was ignored in the following discussion. Jay Andreis was the only one on that was willing to discuss having a reasonable way to approach this proposal other than dividing Franklin Street and it was quickly rejected.

This proposal will affect me directly and I am hopeful that you will not go along with this preposterous idea of dividing Franklin St. down the middle to appease a few that resist change.

Thank you for your time,

Lyndia Pyeatt