

Hayes, Kathy

From: Claire Trower <honeydew@asis.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 20, 2020 8:00 AM
To: Bohn, Rex; Madrone, Steve; Wilson, Mike; Fennell, Estelle; Bass, Virginia; COB
Subject: Re: The continuing RRR permit application appeal of Honeydew Ranch, LLC for 6 October 2020

I realize that I hit 'send' before adding the COB and my name. I apologize.

Claire Trower, Honeydew community member and landowner

On 9/19/2020 8:00 PM, Claire Trower wrote:

Appeal from Planning Commission's Approval of Honeydew Ranch, LLC, Conditional Use Permit and Special Use Permit Application Number 1256 Case Number CUP-18030 and Ap16-461 APN 107-272-005 665 Old Hindley Ranch Road, Honeydew

This is my second email sent in hopes that the permit for the RRR's at 665 Old Hindley Ranch Road be repealed.

After having first discounted (because who in their right mind would permit more greenhouses there), then alerted, researched, listened, reviewed, learned and was then astounded, I'm now more than ever opposed to relocating cannabis permits which allow abated parcel owners to move their grows down to an existing legal industrial cannabis property, with the strange requirement that they must be moved to agricultural land, when they don't even *use* the soil there to grow their crop. These same people ignored acquiring any kind of legal permits for wise use management of their abated land, and wreaked environmental havoc...only to be coaxed into the legal permit process by giving them a reward of MORE cannabis cultivation area, if they cleaned up their mess and relocated. Why reward bad farmers? If they don't *plant* in that ag land, then why can't they then get a permit to grow on their now cleaned-up original parcels?...and get the building/earth-moving/water permits needed to do so. Why invite the same people who broke the law to come to a small neighborhood and spoil *that* community's quality of life?

When listening to the September 1st meeting, I heard many of the callers claim they were the owners of those abated parcels, and were so happy to be able to relocate...but not one of them said that they were sorry for the messes they created. Some even claimed to be long-time growers, but many didn't even live on their old parcels...and they won't be living at this RRR either. They say they need to support their families, and need this RRR to do so. Well, they should have gone about getting a legal permit in the first place. The Doyles say they've found other sites for a few of the RRR's that were originally included in this permit, but are now diverted. Why can't they find all of them alternate sites?

If I owned a legal grow that was allowed a certain number of greenhouses, or square footage, and an RRR was allowed more, I'd be quite irritated- who made them special?. I'd done everything that the county required, and hadn't been abated, or if I was, I fixed it, and moved through the permit process with both the county and the state. This RRR ordinance needs to allow only what the legal grows are getting...and it shouldn't affect the quality of life of the neighborhood. In addition to these problems, monitoring by the county of all legal permits should be initiated, without warning, to make sure there aren't infractions...even at night, when there are many glowing hillsides where a few legal grows haven't covered their greenhouses. If the legal grows are being monitored, the illegal grows will probably be

discovered simultaneously in those areas as well. The rules can't be enforced if they aren't monitored. Part of the permit fees should be spent there.