Lenzi, Chelsea

From: SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis <coalition4responsiblecannabis@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, December 16, 2019 12:25 PM

To: Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve

Cc: sbcob; Miyasato, Mona; Lenzi, Chelsea

Subject: D-3 CANNABIS RETAIL Licensing Ordinance Changes at BOS 12/17/19

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 Chair Lavagnino and Board members:

On 11/25/19 we sent you an email (when this matter was being set for hearing) raising some questions and concerns about proposed amendments to the retail licensing ordinance. Our hope was that some of these issues would have been addressed in the Board letter for today's Departmental item. It is now our hope that in your deliberations today, you will seek some responses or at least clarification.

It is unclear how removing possible sites in unincorporated areas of the County that are not covered by Community Plans is of benefit to the areas that spent years developing their Community Plans. Please note that when the underlying zoning recommendations were made and adopted during all of the Community Plan processes, *marijuana retail sales (or cultivation, manufacturing or distribution) were NOT contemplated*, so it is disingenuous to imply (as the comments in the Board letter do) that those policies were ever intended to accommodate commercial marijuana operations.

This is of particular significance when considering Mixed Use (MU) zoning, which was incorporated into the Orcutt, Eastern Goleta Valley, and Los Alamos Community Plans years prior to the County's adoption of the Cannabis Land Use and Licensing ordinances. In addition, the Montecito Community Plan area was inexplicably removed from possible retail sales during the ad hoc committee development of the Cannabis ordinance. As a result, the regional burden of accommodating commercial marijuana sales within the adjacent Summerland and Toro Canyon Community Plan areas is of concern, especially considering the high density of commercial marijuana cultivation in the unincorporated Carpinteria area. (As of 12/11/19, 398 State active provisional or annual licenses had been authorized for unincorporated Carpinteria area sites, and only 10 of those licenses are held by cultivators with valid local land use permits).

In our previous email, we requested that you direct staff to send notifications of the 12/17/19 hearing to all persons who are signed up on the Long Range Planning *Community Plan notification lists* in each identified area- Los Alamos, Santa Ynez, Orcutt, Eastern Goleta Valley, Isla Vista, Summerland and Toro Canyon. It does not appear that action was taken, so we again request that such noticing be implemented for all activities going forward on this issue.

Finally, we asked, and continue to request, that staff or your Board clarify how the process for selection will interface with the Zoning/Land Use process and intent for certain locations. As noted above, the Cannabis Land Use Ordinance requires applicants for cannabis retail in Mixed Use areas to obtain a **Conditional Use Permit (CUP)**. The intent of CUPs is to insure compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods and is (or should be) a rigorous process, culminating in a public hearing before the Planning Commission. Currently, over two-dozen CUP applications for cannabis cultivation are pending in P&D. *How will the Retail Licensing process interface with the CUP process and in what time frame*, if applicants apply for businesses in a mixed-use zone? Similarly, the remaining potential retail licensing locations require Land Use Permits- how will the new proposed process insure that sites are not "approved" without a thorough CEOA/Land use review and appeal processes?

Sincerely, and thank you in advance for addressing these issues during your deliberations tomorrow.

SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis