

Date: July 18, 2017

To: John McCowen, Chair

Carre Brown

Georgeanne Croskey

Dan Gjerde

Dan Hamburg

Board of Supervisors

County of Mendocino

501 Low Gap Road

Ukiah, CA 95482



CC: Diane Curry, Agriculture Commissioner

County of Mendocino - Department of Agriculture

890 North Bush Street

Ukiah, CA 95482

Assemblymember Jim Wood, 2nd District

California State Assembly

200 South School Street

Ukiah, CA 95482

Carmel Angelo, Chief Executive Officer

County of Mendocino

501 Low Gap Road

Ukiah, CA 95482

Trent Taylor, Interim Code Enforcement
Manager

County of Mendocino – Planning & Building
Services

501 Low Gap Road

Ukiah, CA 95482

RE: REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO THE MENDOCINO COUNTY CANNABIS ORDINANCE – AS IT SPECIFICALLY RELATES TO THE NEW COMMERCIAL CANNABIS CULTIVATION AT 1181 BOONVILLE ROAD, UKIAH (APN 1851921200)

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

We, the undersigned property owners affected by, directly adjacent to, and surrounding the property at 1181 Boonville Road, are unanimously and vehemently opposed to this newly established commercial cannabis cultivation operation. We respectfully request that the Board consider the points to follow to revise the current ordinance and how it relates to the situation in our residential neighborhood.

Alex Anzilotti – My family history dates back to the 1930's in Mendocino County – I was born and raised here. I am a local small business owner; since 1991, running a family business that was started in 1962, and another that was started in 1982.

I do not believe it was the intention of the ordinance to disrupt a community. It is stated clearly in Section 10A.17.010 - Title, Purpose and Intent: "***...promotes the health, safety, and general welfare of the residents...the needs of neighbors and communities to be protected from public safety and nuisance impacts, and the need to limit harmful environmental impacts that are sometimes associated with cannabis cultivation.***" And in Section 20.242.010 - Intent: "***...to help ensure that its cultivation [medical cannabis] and related activities will not create adverse impacts to the public health, safety, and welfare, of the residents of the County of Mendocino.***"

The ordinance fails in its efforts to prevent these nuisances and is creating impacts in specific areas. What is basically happening is that an individual, or entity, with no history in the area or neighborhood, can come in and change the fabric of a small community whose long-term residents were once able to enjoy their rural residential setting.

Another over statement of the ordinance is that zoning and acreage of a parcel are the only factors to consider. Just because a property is zoned AG-40, and has 10+ acres, in reality, does NOT mean it fits into those particulars. Our County has many properties that are zoned AG-40, and while legal, are non-conforming – having less than 10 acres – and fail to meet the minimum requirements for Ag zoning; especially considering the fact that they have never had a history of farming. Rural residential subdivisions should have protections if a majority of property owners disagree with a commercial cannabis operation being allowed into what has historically been a quiet, non-growing community, and especially if the neighborhood has no prior history of cannabis growing.

Any new cannabis cultivation site should abide with the historical character of the neighborhood. **Please consider amending the ordinance to create an "opt-out" provision, or some type of overlay, for a neighborhood, and others like it, that have unanimous opposition to commercial operations and their negative impact to the quality of life and historical neighborhood mores?**

The problem is compounded when you take into consideration that in order to get to a new cannabis cultivation site, commercial traffic will travel across several private easements to get to a new commercial grow site. This is another issue that the ordinance does not take into account - **Crossing several residential property easements, to get to a NEW cannabis cultivation site, and conduct a NEW commercial cannabis grow operation, should not be permitted without a variance, or some type of easement owner approval.**

I understand that there is a huge balancing act that the Board of Supervisors has to make with this ordinance. Giving a new, commercial cannabis cultivation site carte blanche is definitely not the answer. Please take into consideration each situation – not as it only pertains to each applicant to grow – but, more importantly, the surrounding area, and the historical character of the neighborhood.

Thank you.

Alex and Sue Anzilotti
1551 Boonville Road

Dottie Bergmen
1671 Boonville Road

Mike and Nadine Boer
300 Stipp Lane

Michael Boer
775 Boonville Road

Naomi Engstrom
1201 Boonville Road

Thomas and Cia Fracchia
1155 Boonville Road

Jack and Bethene Griswold
951 Boonville Road

Thomas and Judy Jutzy
1153 Boonville Road

Emir Keye
1500 Boonville Road

John and Marcia Lazaro
1071 Boonville Road

Charles and Janet Morris
801 Boonville Road

Aaron Niderost
1187 Boonville Road

Steven Miller
1161 Boonville Road

Dave and Carolyn Redding
400 Stipp Lane

Michael and Kristi Ross
1300 Boonville Road

David and Jill Scheller
1601 Boonville Road

Dale Spring and Patricia Arnett
1121 Boonville Road

Robert and Emi Taylor
1401 Boonville Road

John Thomas
1282 King Ridge Road

Michael and Kathy Wilson
1171 Boonville Road