

**Subject:** FW: June 2nd BOS meeting- Cannabis zoning proposed changes

**From:** Jennifer Fullerton <goletaspring@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 26, 2020 4:55 PM  
**To:** sbcob <sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>  
**Cc:** Williams, Das <DWilliams@countyofsb.org>; Hart, Gregg <gHart@countyofsb.org>; Hartmann, Joan <jHartmann@countyofsb.org>; Adam, Peter <peter.adam@countyofsb.org>; Lavagnino, Steve <steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org>  
**Subject:** June 2nd BOS meeting- Cannabis zoning proposed changes

**Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.**

Chair Hart and Supervisors,

My name is Jennifer Fullerton, and I live in Western Goleta, less than a mile from a pending cannabis application for an outdoor grow.

My neighborhood is directly adjacent to many AG2 parcels of various sizes, including the parcel for the open application. Although the current zoning mandates CUPs for AG2 properties adjacent to the urban limit line and neighborhoods, the applicant is able to get around this requirement because there is a very small parcel in between his property and our neighborhood. We all know that outdoor grows have odors, and the odors do not stop at property lines. Because of the way the parcels are allocated, his proposed farm is less than ¼ mile away from our homes, and the odors we would have to endure will create a public nuisance, which is not permitted in the current ordinance.

Our neighborhood is not the only one with these circumstances. Not all AG2 parcels are huge farms located away from neighborhoods. Most of the parcels along the Goleta foothills are all AG2, some of them very narrow, allowing growers to take advantage of bypassing the CUP process.

How can we solve this issue so that it's fair and equitable to everyone concerned?

It's pretty simple actually... require CUPs for all cannabis applications. That will ensure that neighborhood compatibility is taken into account, and thousands of residents will not be affected by these new businesses.

In addition, there should be buffers of at least 2 miles from the cannabis farms to neighborhoods, wineries, farms, and other non-cannabis properties if the application is for an outdoor grow. Even the cannabis industry admits that outdoor growing causes odor, why is the burden on us to deal with it? No one should be expected to have to keep their doors and windows closed for weeks at a time to stop a stench from coming into their homes or businesses.

Because there is no effective odor abatement control system existing for outdoor grows, we are asking that the County either **prohibit any outdoor cultivation within 2 miles of the urban limit line and neighborhoods, or at a minimum, require a CUP so that neighborhood compatibility can be reviewed as part of the application process.**

I want to be clear that I am not against cannabis in any way. But it's obvious from all of the hearings and appeals over the past year that **the overwhelming issue that people have is that it's too close to residential areas and to other businesses. And this is because the odors don't stop at parcel lines.**

Cannabis farms shouldn't have the right to take away our clean air and ability to enjoy the outdoors, not even for a few weeks or months out of the year, not even for a day. We hope that you will consider making this small but important change, and do what's right for the citizens of the County, both North and South.

Thank you so much for your consideration.  
Jennifer Fullerton

**de la Guerra, Sheila**

---

**Subject:** FW: Cannabis Ordinance CUP Requirement

**From:** Kelly Rangel <[cebadakelly@gmail.com](mailto:cebadakelly@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 26, 2020 5:23 PM  
**To:** sbcob <[sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us](mailto:sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us)>  
**Subject:** Cannabis Ordinance CUP Requirement

**Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.**

To Supervisor Adams,Hart, Hartman,Lavagnino, Williams:

Please update the Ordinance to require a Conditional Use Permit for all land use development project applications for Cannabis Cultivation, both Coastal and Inland. To require a CUP will allow closer scrutiny of each project, including CEQA. Environmental issues and the impacts of cannabis projects are extremely important. **Safeguarding** our beautiful County must be the highest priority!

The issue of Cannabis as a compatible agricultural crop is highly contested. Traditional agriculture such as row crops and the many world class vineyards Are in a struggle to remain viable. The Land Use Element Goals and Policies state that “Goal #1 is to assure and enhance the continuation of agriculture as a major viable production industry in Santa Barbara County. Agriculture shall be encouraged. where conditions allow, **(taking into account environmental impacts)**

Also relevant is Policy 1.A: **“The integrity of agricultural operations shall not be violated by recreational or other non compatible uses”**

A Conditional Use Permit level of Examination of a proposed project would bring to bear a closer examination to determine if a project is compliant with the necessary findings to approve, condition , or deny based on these goals.

Other important land use policy’s and goals, **such as Visual Resources Policy 2 that states the height, scale, design of structures, compatibility with the character of the surrounding natural environment shall be subordinate in appearance to natural landforms: shall be designed to follow the natural contours of the landscape; and shall be designed so as not to intrude into to skyline as seen from public viewing places”**. In short, All cannabis projects have features in common that make them detrimental to the land itself, hostile to traditional agriculture, deleterious to Visual resources,natural resourcessuch as water and wildlife, quality of life for neighboring property, air quality, architecture compatibility, traffic and safety demands. Requiring a CUP will address these issues, at least to a degree.

Given the pressure to come up with revenue to fund the County's Budgetary Shortfall, Cannabis appears to many to be the answer to this problem. Some on the Board are eager to turn a blind eye to the horrible effect these projects ( with many more in the pipeline ) are having on our Communities being invaded. The lure of money to be made has made it difficult for some to say NO! (Thank you to Supervisors Hartman and Adams, for looking past the glitter of gold to the hard facts of what cannabis is turning our County into Cannabis Capitol in the Nation! Not something to be proud of, or responsible for letting happen on your watch! But we need a majority vote to stand up to the Cannabis Industry hired lawyers who write threatening letters, and biased companies for hire to put together slick binders of graphs, photos and untrue environmental data to sway the board in their favor. They put together empty promises (conditions) that they know are unenforceable and make neighbors responsible to report, and be ever vigilant.

(What is really needed is a commercial industrial area the county can lease in an unattractive area, and sell licenses to grow, monitor the amount produced and collect the taxes, all in the same geographic area, one giant security fence easily accessible by major road way, close to fire and police. Win-Win)!!!

In closing, thanks again to the supervisors for their consideration of this ordinance change to CUP for all Cannabis Projects. Some more suggestions: please limit average to a percent of parcel, zoning to be far away from homes, EDRNs, schools ; caps on total average allowed, and make the applicant part of the CUP process, not separate from the land . Preference should be given to local farmers before out of state corporations or LLCs.

This Cannabis Ordinance needs to be gotten right. Loopholes and the no proof Affidavits encouraged people willing to commit perjury and commit other felonious acts detrimental your constituents to go to the front of the line for permits. This needs to be corrected, along with illegal expansion of such offenders. The whole thing seems like it was dreamed up by and for the Cannabis wannabes. I regret having voted to legalize recreational pot. Little did I realize I was helping to open Pandora's Box!

Sincerely Kelly Rangel , Cebada Cyn Rd.

Sent from my iPh

**de la Guerra, Sheila**

---

**Subject:**

FW: Community input for Board of Supervisors meeting 6/2

**From:** William Vasquez <[willvasquezvmg@gmail.com](mailto:willvasquezvmg@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 26, 2020 5:24 PM

**To:** sbcob <[sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us](mailto:sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us)>

**Subject:** Community input for Board of Supervisors meeting 6/2

**Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.**

Dewar SB Board of Supervisors:

I live and own my home at 7880 Rio Vista Drive, the "San Miguel" tract in the Winchester Canyon neighborhood. I absolutely do not want any sort of larger-scale growing of Marijuana, or anything related, that would produce a strong or toxic odor, such as that pot plants emit. We used to live in Carpinteria, and when we visit the area we see how absolutely terrible it is to live anywhere near the growing businesses - we can't stand the smell - it permeates EVERYTHING, plus considering our safety and child-welfare concerns that are also well documented.

Please support the following items below, that our neighborhood has largely adopted:

- 1) Requiring CUPs for all cannabis applications, including those already in process.
- 2) Requiring buffers of no less than 2 miles from existing neighborhoods. (farther would be better!!)

We also want you (SBCBOS) to reserve the right to re-visit/review an approved application should there be unforeseen negative impacts for our neighborhood. We also want full transparency in terms of ownership, applications, approval process, decision process, proposed and approved scope of the business, and ownership details, insuring that individuals cannot hide behind LLC or Corporations - we want to know that bad actors are not setting up shop in our City or neighborhood.

Please continue to take a strong stance to protect our community from businesses that show no regard for our well being. Please know that I'm not against legal growing, I'm against bad policy that ignores the majority of people impacted. We don't need anything to lower our home values or create a reason for more violence, theft or burglaries - those business simply increase our risk. I am asking for the Board of Supervisors to find a way to come to terms in support of both the farmers, and the home-owners in the area.

Thank you,

Will Vasquez  
Rio Vista Drive, Goleta

**de la Guerra, Sheila**

---

**Subject:** FW: Conditional Use Permits For Cannabis Agriculture

-----Original Message-----

From: Frank Hudson <flhudson@icloud.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 6:48 AM

To: sbcob <sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>

Subject: Conditional Use Permits For Cannabis Agriculture

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

We strongly urge the following for the farming of cannabis:

1. Require conditional use permit for all cannabis applications, including those already in process;
2. Require buffers of no less than 2 miles from every existing neighborhood.

Linda and Frank Hudson

Sent from my iPad

**de la Guerra, Sheila**

---

**Subject:** FW: letter for June 2nd BOS meeting

**From:** Jackie Thiele <[jackiethielegj@yahoo.com](mailto:jackiethielegj@yahoo.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 27, 2020 9:07 AM

**To:** sbcob <[sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us](mailto:sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us)>

**Subject:** letter for June 2nd BOS meeting

**Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.**

Letter for BOS meeting Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and Licensing June 2nd

Dear Board of Supervisor's:

I am asking that you vote yes for CUP's for all cannabis applications and yes for requiring odor abatement plans for all cultivation and processing.

In applying more conditions to proposed projects the Planning Commission and BOS will be able to have more control over proposed cannabis projects. This will help the "free-for-all" cannabis projects in Santa Rita Hills AVA.

It will be an additional expense upfront for the applicant but will save money for the county, cannabis growers and the appellant if less appeals are filed.

The cannabis industry constantly complains about the cost of doing business in Santa Barbara County quickly forgetting the large revenue return they receive in the end. Other businesses have to jump thru hoops and navigate the financial cost of doing business here. Why have the cannabis industry been given a "walk"?

CUP's and odor control are not an unreasonable request.

This should have been done from the beginning.

Thank you, Jackie Thiele,

## de la Guerra, Sheila

---

**Subject:** FW: Cannabis growing

-----Original Message-----

From: Becky Davis <becky.davis@mac.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 10:43 AM  
To: sbcob <sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>  
Subject: Cannabis growing

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

May 27, 2020

Dear Santa Barbara County Supervisors,

I understand you are discussing amendments to the county's zoning and regulations regarding cannabis growing. I'm weighing in, as a citizen who has lived in SB County for almost 5 decades.

I live at the base of Winchester Canyon, in western Goleta, and have lived there for decades. I'm used to the occasional sulfur smell from the spring watering of vegetables, and tolerate it without problem for a few weeks, because it's related to growing healthy vegetables, for sale to everyone.

I was disappointed when you permitted "Mountain View Estates" (aka, the roof-to-roof run, due to the miniscule set-backs), and "Winchester Commons" (aka, Orange County North, due to big houses on small lots with big fences), just as the county finally made Cathedral Oaks a through street, because those short-sighted decisions (with inadequate parking in MVE) led to the departure of the turkey vultures who used to roost in the Eucalyptus grove adjacent to Cathedral Oaks. I wrote a letter about both those projects, warning about exactly that result, but the turkey vultures and related wildlife lost out to more houses and more people, as always seems to be the case. Those developments also plagued our existing neighborhood with the ground squirrels and gophers who used to be in the former horse and cow pastures that these two developments replaced. Another unfortunate side-effect.

We chose to live on the very edge of suburbia, as our budget won't allow the rural living that we'd prefer, but by getting as close to "rural" as possible, we can still enjoy the quail, bunnies, wild turkeys, turkey vultures, and birds of prey that are abundant at the suburban/ rural boundary. Indeed, for years, we had a red shouldered hawk who nested each spring in one of our back yard trees.

I easily accept normal agriculture - vegetable grows, fruit orchards - as my neighbors. They are desirable and appropriate businesses at the rural/ urban boundary. I do have a problem with cannabis grows within 2 miles of my home.



I don't want to smell that persistent, invasive, unpleasant skunky smell. I don't want the increased traffic that cannabis growing brings, as compared to more traditional agricultural uses. I sure don't want the increased crime that seems to accompany most of these legal and illegal grows. Without increased security, which means increased staffing and traffic, cannabis grows attract those who want to steal this cash crop.

Please carefully consider the existing neighborhoods and uses, and do not permit any cannabis growing within two miles of already established neighborhoods. If you permit cannabis growing at all, please require Conditional Use Permits with mitigation of odors, traffic, and crime, as a pre-requisite. If their water use is as, or more intensive than other agricultural uses, don't permit these grows at all. I'm truly weary of being asked to use less and less water, while you and the local cities allow more and more developments that are taking our already scarce water from the existing residents.

We accept zoning and regulations only insofar as they improve our quality of life. The way the cannabis permits have been handled so far, they have done exactly the opposite. Please remedy this.

Thank you for your consideration.

Becky Davis  
7865 Rio Vista Drive  
Goleta, CA 93117

becky.davis@silcom.com ; 805-968-4600

**de la Guerra, Sheila**

---

**Subject:** FW: Conditional Use Permits for Cannabis

**From:** Chuck DalPozzo <[cdalpozzo@yahoo.com](mailto:cdalpozzo@yahoo.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 27, 2020 11:59 AM

**To:** sbcob <[sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us](mailto:sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us)>

**Subject:** Conditional Use Permits for Cannabis

**Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.**

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We urge you to stand with thousands of aggrieved Santa Barbara County residence and require Conditional Use Permits for all cannabis cultivation. The current one size fits all permitting system fails to account for the externalities unique to every cannabis operation. For example, growers that were previously shut down by Cannabis Enforcement, now have permits working their way through Planning and Development with no provisions to mitigate their previous and potential future transgressions. This is simply unacceptable. Two years ago, a neighboring cannabis grower had a series of frightening robberies, which we now know were the result of the people the owner brought into the business. Why should applicants that have a track record of total disregard for their neighbors, the environment, and the rule of law have an equal footing in the regulatory process, with those that have played by the rules?

We agree with Supervisor Williams when he said, "We want to permit the best and shut down the worst, and that is precisely what we are doing." By requiring Conditional Use Permits you can go a long ways in accomplishing this by holding "the worst" to account for their impact on the environment, the community, and the rule of law.

Chuck Dal Pozzo  
Pete Dal Pozzo

Dal Pozzo Ranch Carpinteria