

Ramirez, Angelica

Public Comment - Group 1

#6

From: jstassinos@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, May 21, 2022 4:14 PM
To: sbcob; Supervisor Das Williams; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Nelson, Bob; Lavagnino, Steve
Subject: Item #6: Consider recommendations regarding the Singer and Concerned Carpenterians Appeal, Case No. 22APL-000000-00004, of the Planning Commission's approval of the 4701 Foothill Road Cannabis Cultivation Project, Case Nos. 19DVP-00000-00016 and 19CDP...

LATE
DIST

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 the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

I am writing in **Support** of the Singer and Concerned Carpenterians Appeal of the SB County Planning Commission's approval of the 4701 Foothill Road Cannabis Cultivation Project for the following reasons:

- 1) Carpinteria High School may be the only high school in Santa Barbara County that is surrounded by 5 cannabis grows. The bad odors emanating from these grows interfere with students ability to learn and teachers ability to teach. Having been a high school teacher for more than 20 years I realize the importance of a good learning environment. Trying to pay attention in class is made more difficult when distracted by the bad odors produced by cannabis. The inability to determine which of the 5 surrounding cannabis grow sites is the cause of the bad odors does not help the students and staff avoid a less than optimal learning/teaching environment and related health concerns.
- 2) Carpinteria High School students start their school day at 8am and while most are done at 3pm there will be many students who arrive before 8am and stay after 3pm. High school staff often start their work day between 6:30-7:30am and often leave after 3:30pm. These overlapping travel times with the 57 employees at 4701 Foothill Rd., who arrive at 6:30am and leave at 3:30pm, will cause traffic congestion on Foothill Rd. which is a narrow 2 lane road. Additionally, the potential for traffic accidents will be greatly increased.
- 3) 4701 Foothill Road's cannabis cultivation grows measured from the property line is approx. 350 feet from Carpinteria High School. This is too close to the high school and violates federal law which requires 1,000 feet measured from property line to property line and the Santa Barbara County Ordinance which requires 600 feet measured from the premise. Permitting 32,180 square feet of **unpermitted** greenhouses And reducing the 100 ft. setback from residentially zoned lots to 19.5 ft. not only sets a bad precedent but is just plain wrong! The message that will be sent to those in the community is that it is okay to violate federal and county laws.

Please listen to your constituents when they request that you **Support** this appeal!

Sincerely,
Jill Stassinos

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Anna Carrillo <annacarp@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, May 22, 2022 2:14 PM
To: sbcob; Hartmann, Joan; Supervisor Das Williams; Nelson, Bob; Hart, Gregg; Lavagnino, Steve
Subject: 22APL-00000-00004, 19DVP-00000-00016, 19CDP-00000-00017, 4701 Foothill Rd. Cannabis Cultivation Project

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: Board of Supervisors
From: Anna Carrillo
May 21, 2022

I would like to make some comments in urging your support of this appeal.

1. This project is **too close to Carpinteria High School**. Superintendent Rigby and your own planning commission had asked that the distance be 1000' measured from property line to property line. This project's property line is 400' from the high school property line.
2. It's too bad that the Board put the onus on the operator for allowing cannabis operations within 1000'. There is no protection offered for the operators from the Federal ban of cultivating and the operator "assumes any and all risk and any and all liability that may arise or results under State and Federal laws from the cultivation, sale, possession, distribution, use of cannabis, and/or any other cannabis activity." (Article II, Santa Barbara County coastal Zning Ordinance, Section 35-144U.A.2.e.)
3. It was reported in the June 2020 Grand Jury Report that a grower had asked for a change that ultimately passed - instead of measuring from property line to property line which is customary, it was requested that the measurement be 600' for nursery plants and 750' for mature plants, using the premise rather than the property line. Local Carpinterians now see the result of that decision.
4. As Carpinteria High School is probably the only high school affected by this decision, it behooves you to think of the consequences of that decision.
5. It has been noted for the last 4 years that the odors and health issues for staff and students can be quite bothersome for those on the campus. This has been discussed at least twice at the two Planning Commission meetings recently held on properties close to the high school.
6. It has been documented in 2 teacher surveys that staff will not report odor events.
7. Because of the staff's fear of retribution even if the odor ordinance put in place was effective, no one from the county or the Coalition is checking out the odors at the high school unless they receive a complaint and if no one is willing to complain, there is no remediation or tiered response. Therefore, it is incumbent for the health of the staff and the students that the 5 cannabis cultivation sites around the high school hire an **Independent Odor Monitor** that checks the campus at least once per day, or preferable twice a day. Schools and day care facilities (Boys and Girls Club) are not even considered as valid complainers because the rule really only applies to residential areas.

8. It's all well and good to say that odor and air quality were a significant Class 1 impact, but does that mean the staff and students at the high school have to live with this ongoing problem in perpetuity.

9. There are 5 cultivation sites around the high school - this one at 4701 Foothill, 4505 Foothill Rd., 4555 Foothill Rd., 4994 Foothill Rd., and 4532 Foothill Rd. Three of these 5 projects have already received their CDPs, all still operating with state provisional cultivation, nursery, and a few with processing licenses.

10. This operation is using a part of a greenhouse that is within the 600' of the high school's property line for their nursery. It would be important to identify what is the definition of a "premise". I urge you not to accept part of a building as constituting a premise to allow cultivation. How do the odors in a building that has both nursery plants and mature plants not mix together that needs to be prevented in residential areas and schools?

11. Please add "schools and day care centers" to the requirement of not permitting odor to be experienced in residential areas.

12. Because of the closeness of the high school and the over 800 residents, your Board can not make the Development Plan Finding 2.2.5 - which required that the Proposed Project will **not be detrimental to the health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare of the neighborhood and will not be incompatible with the surrounding area.**

13. Enforcement is still an issue as the county still has not been able to identify the source of the odor., especially when there are so many greenhouses next to each other.

14. Besides Carpinteria High School, there are over 800 residents living within 1000' of this operation.

15. This operation has 2 unpermitted greenhouses totaling 32,180 sq.ft. which the operator is asking to now be approved.

16. This operation is also asking for a modification of the required 100' setback on the southern border and reducing it to 19.5 feet. That's a quite large reduction.

17. As this operation borders a residential area, the new landscaping that is being proposed will have 5 years to cover the greenhouses. That's too long!

18. This operation is one of the largest based on acreage and current state provisional licenses being held. It's interesting to note that 2 addresses are used on the state CDFA site: 4701 and 4587, with the same APN.

Thank you for your consideration,

Anna Carrillo

Ramirez, Angelica

From: merrily peebles <merpeebles@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2022 9:07 AM
To: sbcob; Supervisor Das Williams; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Nelson, Bob; Lavagnino, Steve
Subject: Everbloom Appeal to be heard 5/24

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 Supervisors,

The issue with pot odor around the high school is a five year shame on a governing board that is mandated to protect the community, and therefore the welfare of the students and their educational needs. Instead time and again the growers win.

Why? The teachers are afraid to speak up and the students, of which the majority are hispanic, rotate out after four years. No other school in this state would allow what is going on here.

We are asking you to regulate this grow so that odor does not escape into the surrounding environment. The 32,180 sq. feet of unpermitted greenhouses will now be permitted on a site that is one of the largest grows in Carpinteria if you deny this appeal. Please look long and hard at allowing greenhouses too close to homes and the school. There are rules you can call on to uphold this appeal.

In any case a school odor monitor is a good idea and one I hope you will implement. Thank you for your consideration.

Merrily Peebles
Carpinteria

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Sarah Trigueiro <sarah.trigueiro@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2022 11:05 AM
To: Supervisor Das Williams; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Nelson, Bob; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: Note regarding Appeals of 4701 Foothill Rd and 3508 Via Real Cannabis Projects

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,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the appeals of the proposed cannabis projects at:
--4701 Foothill Rd
--3508 Via Real

As relates to 4701 Foothill Rd:

This is a cannabis development surrounding the high school, in violation of federal law setbacks. The density in the high school area is a significant and very troubling issue, as the odors and air quality issues create an environment that is not conducive to learning. I believe in equal access to a quality education (and an associated healthy, quality environment for learning) for all students in Santa Barbara County. This project stands in direct contravention to this, as does the surrounding density of grows. It is hard to imagine the Board approving developments of this nature around high schools in more affluent areas of the County - I would urge you to consider the needs of our students equally. Everyone deserves a quality educational environment, and Santa Barbara County has too much pot, too close to our schools, which is interfering with that. Please put children first.

As relates to 3508 Via Real:

The Arroyo Paredon is a critical coastal feeding stream in the Coastal Zone. Here, the applicant plans to modify and keep 41,000 sq ft of greenhouse within the 100' ESH setback of Arroyo Paredon. Please hold firm to protecting the ESH in not allowing this to occur - you have an opportunity here to review de novo and protect this vital watershed, which is home to several endangered species and a coastal feeding stream that already suffers from degradation. The extreme density of surrounding cannabis operations and associated impacts of this project and others have very real and negative impacts on surrounding residents, as well as the environmental habitat. I continue to be deeply troubled by the County's continuing inability to enforce on odor complaints for cannabis developments - and here we have yet another proposal to add to that density and enforcement challenge.

Kind regards,
Sarah Trigueiro
Carpinteria resident

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Anna Carrillo <annacarp@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2022 11:15 AM
To: sbcob; Hartmann, Joan; Supervisor Das Williams; Nelson, Bob; Hart, Gregg; Lavagnino, Steve
Subject: 22APL-00000-00006, 19DVP-00000-00020, 22CUP-00000-00005, 19CDP-00000-00027

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: Board of Supervisors
From: Anna Carrillo
May 22, 2022

I would like to make some comments and I urge you to support this appeal.

1. **Please don't allow any buildings to remain in the 100' ESH.** Almost an acre of buildings (41,000 sq.ft.) is in the 100' ESH setback. The ESH was established by the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay and the Toro Canyon Plan in 2004 to protect all creeks including the Arroyo Paredon Creek. This requirement needs to be upheld and maintained.
2. Since parts of 2 of the greenhouses are already being removed from the 50' ESH, the parts of the 2 greenhouses in the 100' ESH must also be removed.
3. Previously this operation received notices on 3/20/2019 and 3/27/2019 of violations due to unpermitted buildings and construction in the 50' ESH and elsewhere on the property. **Please don't permit just the removal of the unpermitted buildings as satisfactory.**
4. Arroyo Paredon Creek is designated by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service as a critical habitat for the tidewater goby and the Southern California Steelhead Trout. Both of these species are federally endangered. In fact, after the debris flow in 2018, Caltrans when installing their bridge at 192 also installed a fish run project. This was done for the future.
5. This project is requesting a modification of their nonconforming status so they can raise their roofs on 2 greenhouses about 5'. Please don't allow this modification until the 41,000 sq.ft. is removed from the 100' ESH.
6. This project shares a very long border with this creek so it is vital that your board does all it can to protect this creek for future generations.
7. Along this creek from Highway 192 to Via Real, the frontage road, there are 5 other cannabis projects, but this project is and will be the most impactful on the ESH having almost an acre of buildings in the 100' ESH.
8. For this project please increase the notification area to include the EDRN's of La Mirada and Ocean Oaks. They're more than 1000' distant. This project is one of six permitted operations (5 already cultivating) that are potentially causing the known odors in EDRNs of La Mirada and Ocean Oaks.
9. As there are so many projects next to each other, it is incumbent on your board to figure out a way of identifying the source of the odor for both residents and animals. You wrote the rule about no odors in residential areas as noted by the Director. In this area along this creek, there is one fully permitted project that smells driving by, but because the

county still doesn't have anyway of identifying the source the County can't enforce anything for the numerous complaints from the nearby residential areas.

10. Please use this opportunity to make things better and protect the Arroyo Paredon Creek for the future and require the project to remove those parts of the buildings that are within the 100' ESH.

Thank you for your consideration,

Anna Carrillo

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Anna Carrillo <annacarp@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2022 11:25 AM
To: sbcob; Hartmann, Joan; Supervisor Das Williams; Nelson, Bob; Hart, Gregg; Lavagnino, Steve
Subject: Fwd: 22APL-00000-00006, 19DVP-00000-00020, 22CUP-00000-00005, 19CDP-00000-00027

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.

I added some more important information to #3 about a report from the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Anna Carrillo <annacarp@cox.net>
Subject: 22APL-00000-00006, 19DVP-00000-00020, 22CUP-00000-00005, 19CDP-00000-00027
Date: May 23, 2022 at 11:15:27 AM PDT
To: sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us, "Hartmann, Joan" <jhartmann@countyofsb.org>, Supervisor Das Williams <SupervisorWilliams@countyofsb.org>, bob.nelson@countyofsb.org, ghart@countyofsb.org, steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Anna Carrillo
May 22, 2022

I would like to make some comments and I urge you to support this appeal.

1. **Please don't allow any buildings to remain in the 100' ESH.** Almost an acre of buildings (41,000 sq.ft.) is in the 100' ESH setback. The ESH was established by the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay and the Toro Canyon Plan in 2004 to protect all creeks including the Arroyo Paredon Creek. This requirement needs to be upheld and maintained.
2. Since parts of 2 of the greenhouses are already being removed from the 50' ESH, the parts of the 2 greenhouses in the 100' ESH must also be removed.
3. Previously this operation received notices on 3/20/2019 and 3/27/2019 of violations due to unpermitted buildings and construction in the 50' ESH and elsewhere on the property. **Please don't permit just the removal of the unpermitted buildings as satisfactory.** There was also a report from the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board that on 1/22/2019 there was a waste water discharge of greater than 1 acre and some of that area is located within the setback requirements. "The cannabis cultivation activities are classified as Tier 2, high risk."
4. Arroyo Paredon Creek is designated by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service as a critical habitat for the tidewater goby and the Southern California Steelhead Trout. Both of these species are federally

endangered. In fact, after the debris flow in 2018, Caltrans when installing their bridge at 192 also installed a fish run project. This was done for the future.

5. This project is requesting a modification of their nonconforming status so they can raise their roofs on 2 greenhouses about 5'. Please don't allow this modification until the 41,000 sq.ft. is removed from the 100' ESH.

6. This project shares a very long border with this creek so it is vital that your board does all it can to protect this creek for future generations.

7. Along this creek from Highway 192 to Via Real, the frontage road, there are 5 other cannabis projects, but this project is and will be the most impactful on the ESH having almost an acre of buildings in the 100' ESH.

8. For this project please increase the notification area to include the EDRN's of La Mirada and Ocean Oaks. They're more than 1000' distant. This project is one of six permitted operations (5 already cultivating) that are potentially causing the known odors in EDRNs of La Mirada and Ocean Oaks.

9. As there are so many projects next to each other, it is incumbent on your board to figure out a way of identifying the source of the odor for both residents and animals. You wrote the rule about no odors in residential areas as noted by the Director. In this area along this creek, there is one fully permitted project that smells driving by, but because the county still doesn't have anyway of identifying the source the County can't enforce anything for the numerous complaints from the nearby residential areas.

10. Please use this opportunity to make things better and protect the Arroyo Paredon Creek for the future and require the project to remove those parts of the buildings that are within the 100' ESH.

Thank you for your consideration,

Anna Carrillo

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: kristo torgersen <kristotorgersen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2022 1:24 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: comment for May 24 Board of Supervisors public hearing

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.

Hello, please find below my comment for tomorrow's Board of Supervisors public hearing on the Planning and Development matter regarding the cannabis cultivation proposal at 4701 Foothill Rd, and the appeal Case No. 22APL-000000-00004.

Hello Board of Supervisors:

I write today in support of Singer and Concerned Carpinterians appeal against the County Planning Commission's February 2, 2022 approval of the 4701 Foothill Road Development Plan and Coastal Development Permit (Case Nos. 19DVP-00000-00016 and 19CDP-00000-00017).

I live in the neighborhood on the north side of El Carro Lane, which abuts the properties under review for development and mixed-light cannabis cultivation. It's a quiet coastal community of cul de sacs, walkable to the nearby schools, perfect for young families, like my own. I do not want to see this Proposed Project gain approval as it will create a persistent and nauseating odor, degrade the character of the neighborhood, and erode the proximal residential property values.

This whole Proposed Project is egregious in its interest to flex and change current regulations, regulations originally set forth to keep cannabis operations out of locations such as this Proposed Project at 4701 Foothill Rd. This Proposed Project is attempting to contort itself between the High School and an established residential neighborhood. To accomplish this, it is ignoring the interests of the City of Carpinteria and many concerned citizens, merging properties for necessary square footage requirements, over-riding the 1000ft. drug-free zone set by the state with one set at 750ft, and holding that 750ft. line determination accountable not to the parcel, and not even to the structure, but to the actual use of the footprint inside the given structure. This whole plan is egregious. We're supposed to continually enforce their use of intended internal square footage? I'm disappointed to see the County Supervisors working so hard to accommodate these cannabis businesses over the interests and objections of the citizens they serve, especially given the fact that the taxable revenue has proven to be roughly 1/3 below the original expectation last year, a considerable portion of which goes directly to monitoring these operations and not back to the community, and also because upcoming state laws seek to reduce the cultivation tax even further. So what is the benefit? Somebody tell me, because given this, it doesn't appear the value of the tax revenue is worth the degradation to the housing property values (and related property taxes), let alone the detrimental impacts to the community.

So far, the local cannabis producers have failed to manage the odor from their operations. Why should I believe all the claims that this next operation will be any different? I live on Theresa St, and from dusk til dawn, most days of the week, I can smell cannabis outside my home. Last week it was warm and so I left the window in my infant child's nursery open to cool it down, only to come into the room at midnight and have it reek of cannabis. I experience this odor now, with grow houses miles away, and you want to approve a cannabis grow operation several hundred feet from my house! This is not an environment I wish to raise my family in. Local growers have yet to show that they can manage the odor, and not surprising when local enforcement has largely failed to hold any growers accountable for the smell. The nauseating odor is the root cause of all the major objections to the cannabis industry in Santa Barbara County, and so you'd think it'd be in their best interest to eliminate the smell. Given this, it's alarming that the industry has yet to find a solution, and points to the fact that they can't fully manage the smell, and the County can't adequately enforce it.

A cannabis operation does not belong in the ~800ft. corridor between our community's homes and community's High School. It just doesn't. The grand jury report cites with examples the convivial relationship between the Board of Supervisors and the Cannabis businesses, and we're seeing it play out before our very eyes with the Proposed Project at 4701 Foothill Rd. Before I bought my home here in Fall 2018 I checked the zoning maps at the county office to ensure that cannabis could not be grown in that agricultural corridor between the High School and my house. At that time, the restriction line extended from the High School through to my neighbor's yard. Great, no cannabis. Now, in the Project Proposal that line somehow exists several hundred feet short, permitting cannabis in a portion of the agricultural zone. How has this line moved in just 3 years time? This is what happens when Big Cannabis seeks to influence local elected officials for favor, and those elected officials choose the money over their community.

It feels like our quiet coastal town has become a frontline community to the detrimental impacts of Big Cannabis. Our community is being destroyed by a persistent and nauseating odor from these operations. To people who ask where I live, Carpinteria is no longer a quiet little beach town, but rather, "that place along the highway that smells like marijuana". I understand how this May 24th appeal feels like just another hurdle in the interests of the cannabis business and the Board of Supervisors, but know the decisions you make here will have lasting consequences in the nature and value of our community, and lasting consequences to your reputation in the community that elected you to represent their interests.

Sincerely,
Kristo Torgersen