

**TO:** Board of Supervisors  
[browncj@mendocinocounty.org](mailto:browncj@mendocinocounty.org)  
[mccowen@mendocinocounty.org](mailto:mccowen@mendocinocounty.org)  
[croskeyg@mendocinocounty.org](mailto:croskeyg@mendocinocounty.org)  
[gjerde@mendocinocounty.org](mailto:gjerde@mendocinocounty.org)  
[hamburgd@mendocinocounty.org](mailto:hamburgd@mendocinocounty.org)  
[bos@mendocinocounty.org](mailto:bos@mendocinocounty.org)

**FROM:** Carol A. Feen (Property Owner)  
 15710 Shane Drive  
 Fort Bragg, CA 95437  
 Parcel Number: 019-590-08-00  
[friedaf@mcn.org](mailto:friedaf@mcn.org)  
 707-962-9246

**SUBJECT:** OA\_2018-0008 /R\_2018-0005: AMENDMENTS TO MENDOCINO COUNTY CODE CHAPTER 10A.17 – MENDOCINO CANNABIS CULTIVATION ORDINANCE AND CHAPTER 20.242 - CANNABIS CULTIVATION SITES; PROPOSED ADDITION OF CHAPTER 20.118 – CANNABIS ACCOMODATION (CA) COMBINING DISTRICT AND CHAPTER 20.119 – CANNABIS PROHIBITION (CP) COMBINING DISTRICT TO THE MENDOCINO COUNTY CODE, AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES TO THE CA AND CP DISTRICTS.

November 15, 2018

Dear Supervisor,

I am a property owner within the proposed Mitchell Creek Combining District.

I am pleased that County Staff recommended and County Commissioners' voted to support their recommendation to remove Mitchell Creek North and South from the proposed Cannabis Accommodation Combining Districts. **I strongly encourage the Supervisors to join county Staffs recommendation, and the County Commissioners' vote of support of staff's recommendation, and vote to remove Mitchell Creek North and South from the proposed Cannabis Accommodation Combining Districts.**

However, as a property owner, I am deeply disturbed that the county would even consider imposing these zoning changes upon Rural Residential (RR) zoned neighborhoods.

Rural Residential zones are, by definition, free from the impacts that commercial and/or agricultural zoned parcels allow. As a Rural Residential Property owner, I entered into a legal contract with the county: what I am allowed to build, where I am allowed to build, the square footage of any structure I am allowed: the set backs I must honor from my neighbors front/back/side boundaries - for my septic/ from my neighbors' septic - my current and potential future leach fields - my well/my neighbors' wells - existing buildings - existing waterways -

protecting environmentally sensitive areas on my property - easements - water usage - lighting - noise, on and on — zoning determines what I am legally allowed to do on my property.

Neither the county, nor property owner's (or their tenants) who engage in activities not allowed by current RR zoning regulations, who never-the-less choose to engage in those activities, should not be rewarded with zoning changes that support their unregulated activities, while presuming neighboring property owners — who have complied with zoning regulations — will assume the impacts that changing land usage from RR to Commercial/Agricultural will impose upon them. The county and property owners are bound by that property's existing zoning regulations. Everyone who purchases property in Mendocino County enters into zoning contracts with the county. Everyone. The county needs to uphold their side of these contracts.

These proposed Cannabis Accommodating Combining Districts contain so many negative impacts and profound affects for those of us who have conscientiously purchased permits, complied with well tests, soil tests, set-backs; protected our investments, created our homes, and settled into a RR neighborhood.

I have met the many county RR zoning regulations. I feel blindsided by the county, I need the county to uphold your side of the legal Zoning contracts you've made with me.

This is a land use issue, not a pro-vs.-con cannabis issue. Such a change in zoning should certainly involve the courts and demand the consent, by vote, of the people of the county. I view the changing of designated Rural Residential Zoning to Commercial/Agricultural Zoning a sort of an unstated eminent domain. I find it distasteful that neighbor is being pitted against neighbor. What the county might have to gain commercially here, the county would lose in broken zoning contracts.

Adding insult to injury, not all property owners were included in the planning of these proposed changes. The county hired Michael Baker who assembled growers, organized exclusive planning meetings without notifying other property owners or disclosing to them that this overlay/combining district plan was in the works. Important considerations including set backs; water usage; lighting; noise, zoning; agricultural usage; and commercial usage; among others that would have changed major aspects of the plan, were all written into the plan without the input of the majority of property owners. Permits — that are not compliant with existing zoning regulations, but suit future the proposed overlay/combining plan — have been granted prior to the approval of the “plan,” without noticing neighboring property owners. Non-grower property owners were left out of the planning process. This was intentional, resulting in diminished trust among property owner's toward the county.

**Please vote to remove Mitchell Creek North and South from the proposed Cannabis Accommodation Combining Districts.**

Thank you for your consideration,  
Carol A. Feen