

① TO PLANNING DEPT.
ATTN JOSHUA DORIS

Sept 21 2017

I am writing in response to the 'NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING' dated Sept. 7, 2017, regarding the proposed So. Hum. Royal Cannabis Co.

My objections to said business plan encompass its size, location, and diversity of proposed installations; and other issues such as ① ZONING ② NUISANCES ③ ENV. IMPACT ④ TOPOGRAPHY ⑤ AESTHETICS and ⑥ ~~NEIGHBORHOOD~~ LEGACY ISSUES NEIGHBORHOOD

Let's designate the following three site
A- ORIGINAL DWELLING EAST OF MAIN ROAD
B- 2ND DWELLING WEST OF MAIN ROAD
C- NEWEST COMPOUND NORTH ON TOP OF HILL ON ITS OWN SPUR ROAD.

PRELUDE: I object to the timetable of this process. The Sept. 7 notice arrived Sept. 12, leaving barely a week to summarize and formalize criticism that has been decades in the making. The deadline on admissible issues in later complaints further discourages healthy and considered criticisms. It is as if the planners are only giving "lip service" to a desire to hear neighbors' public input.

②

- 1) ZONING: For years I have been lead to believe that our 40 acre parcels were allowed 1 residence and a mother-in-law unit, perhaps a barn and/or garage. The parcel in question has residences A, B, and C, and many auxiliary structures. It is sounding like a new industrial park. Has zoning been totally thrown out the window. Approval of this proposal will surely codify and enshrine all these prior zoning transgressions
- 2) NUISANCES: The applicant's track record of artificial light, excessive generator noise at lengthy and random hours the presence of security cameras, and excessive traffic, parking, and human activity on the main road all contribute to a degradation of quality of life for neighbors.
- 3) ENV. IMPACT: Again, light and noise abuses, agriculture run-off, depleted and/or polluted water table, and most importantly, absent or inadequate septic facilities at all three sites A, B, and C.
- 4) TOPOGRAPHY: It is extreme, and such that any problems will be magnified and telegraphed along to other parcels ~~adjacent~~ adjoining at lower elevations.

(3)

5) AESTHETICS: Dozens of neighbors with deeded access to their own homes and woodlots will now be forced to drive thru this proposed light industrial park straddling the main road at A and B. Meanwhile, the applicant will already have turned off onto his spur road to his latest compound at C, a little to the North.

He will never have to experience this congestion regularly, since his employees will likely operate sites A and B (as well as site C.)

Sites A and B will likely become employee housing?

≡ THIS IS CLEARLY A CASE OF UNJUST ENRICHMENT

6) LEGACY ISSUES Along with the high dollar, high anxiety, high security, and high industrial waste and resource exploitation, the character of the neighborhood will suffer.

Thanks Robert S. Fishman 9239219