From: Hayes, Kathy

To: Ford, John; Lippre, Suzanne

Subject: FW: Re:DanyAvi-David Lot Line Adjustment; Honeydew area; PLY-2021-17465-APPEAL

Date: Friday, March 25, 2022 3:59:50 PM

Attachments: <u>image001.png</u>

FYI

Kathy Hayes, Clerk of the Board County of Humboldt (707) 476-2396 khayes@co.humboldt.ca.us



From: Roxy Kennedy <hnydew@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, March 25, 2022 3:57 PM

To: COB <COB@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Bohn, Rex <RBohn@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Bushnell, Michelle <mbushnell@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Wilson, Mike <Mike.Wilson@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Bass, Virginia <VBass@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Madrone, Steve <smadrone@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: Re:DanyAvi-David Lot Line Adjustment;Honeydew area;PLY-2021-17465-APPEAL

Caution: This email was sent from an EXTERNAL source. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

March 23, 2022

Dear Supervisors and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

Today we received a notice in the mail saying that our neighbor, Dany Avi-David is appealing a planning commission decision that denied them a lot line adjustment with the property on their western border. This is the first we've heard of this. We are grateful to know it was denied last time, and hope you will stick to that decision.

Dany's Ranch is **48.36 acres (APN 107-272-005**). The property to the east of the Ranch is **8.76 acres (APN 107-272-006)**. This "006" property is a recreational easement we all have on our deeds, and was not to be developed. As far as we know this piece has passed from the Michelons and the Shinns, and now to Dany Avi David's group. Even though your Notice says they are held in "different ownerships", the two pieces are both part of the same cannabis group trying to increase industrial levels on Old Hindley Ranch Road.

We are the neighbors that appealed the last plan of "Dany's" Honeydew Ranch, to increase his 9 giant greenhouses to 40. They were not allowed to build those, in part, because the "Old Hindley Ranch Road Neighbors" group objected already to the amount of traffic, noise, smell, crime, litter, road damage, fire dangers, water use etc. that the current operations caused to our neighborhood. As well as other Mattole Valley neighbors objecting to such high level industrial operations so close to family homes.

At the time of that appeal, that the "Old Hindley Ranch Road Neighbors" put before you there were several options the planning department had posed to the Supervisors to decide upon. The option chosen included allowing a nursery, a pond, and a building that could be built. (on APN 107-272-

005). No new cultivation greenhouses were to be built. They were supposed to set up a road association and invite all the neighbors to participate. Road repairs and maintenance were to happen. A culvert was to be replaced, and various other things. Well the update is that the pond was put in; no road association or road repair/maintenance has happened. And the "nursery" greenhouses are in full swing.

So our question now is why would they be allowed to expand their operations when they have not even complied with what they were asked to do last time? And why would they be allowed to build on the neighborhood's recreation easement that was not to be developed? And even if they had complied with all the previous requirements, why would they be allowed to expand operations, when the neighbors and Mattole Community went to so much troubles, stress, and expense to appeal their expansion before, and you responded by setting a limit to their growth.

Our neighborhood has continued to fill in with cannabis farm expansions and it is not pleasant to say the very least. Where does this stop? Must ordinary citizens have to constantly watch, complain, fight, and pay large fees to file appeals, to simply maintain a safe and healthy neighborhood?

For we, the people who LIVE here, nothing has changed. We still are opposed to further degradation to our neighborhood in terms of the down sides these industrial sized farms bring to our once peaceful country life style. Please say NO to this Lot adjustment appeal.

Thank you very much for your consideration,

Roxy Kennedy, Jim Bowdoin, Cindy & Rudi Weber, Bob & Vicki Van Horn, Julia Newcomb, Andrew J.S. Newcomb, James Frank Smith, Roger K. Warren. Old Hindley Ranch Road Neighbors, Honeydew

Regarding Dany Avi-David Lot Line Adjustment Honeydew area; PLN-2021-17465

27 March 2022

Dear Board of Supervisors,

This may be the 3rd letter that I've sent concerning the expansion of corporate cannabis permits. These folks aren't living on their permitted parcels, and I don't consider them community-minded, welcomed operations.

- 1. How can the County deem that agriculture zones are the only places for large greenrushers to grow weed, when they don't even use the earth under the pots to actually grow a crop on that land? They could do that anyplace where it doesn't wreck the land or water.
- 2. How much water have they saved in their pond, and where did they get the water used to fill it? (...as the start of the forebearance period, the first of April, is this coming Friday).
- 3. Why haven't these folks completed all the requirements stated on the current piece of their operations, after they were denied exploding that site with numerous RRR'd permits in the recent past?
- 4. How can they ask that the 8+-acre parcel be used for anything that would compromise neighbors' access to the river? Why buy something that has restrictions stated on all their neighbors' deeds, unless they were encouraged by the seller that they could 'just get a lot-line adjustment'. That landowner had a fire on the smaller piece in question, which almost burned up the whole Lower Hindley area a few years back...with numerous greenhouses threatened, let alone residences and food gardens. If Cal Fire copter 102 hadn't been available, using precious river water to knock it down, along with local fire company volunteers, the existing greenhouses would have been destroyed. I doubt that 102 can even dip water out of the Mattole right now...it's way low, and it should be at its highest level, in a good rain year. (But of course "wells aren't hydrologically connected to riverine systems"...you'd need to prove that to me, but that takes time and money, and is as yet an unrecognized objective for securing a County well permit for growing weed).
- 5. More water will be needed for this adjustment. I've measured about half of what I usually receive for rainfall this year, and am amazed at the warmth and dryness of this winter, boding severe fire danger in the now year-round fire season and lack of rainfall...be it the supposed 'new' owner being favored with more

- acreage or the probability that it would just increase the number of greenhouses for David.
- 6. Why weren't the neighbors notified of the submitted lot line adjustment when the Commission denied this plan in February? I'm thankful that there *was* a letter sent about the appeal, and ask that all new activity for any existing permit be required to notify all neighbors who would be affected everywhere in the county, but especially any here in the Mattole.
- 7. Why would any permitee want to increase their production when there's such a glut of product on the market now? I fear that when weed is federally legalized in the near future, these huge operations will be abandoned (I've been told that they don't grow outstanding weed like smaller 'grow it in the sun' operations that might survive it) and if the properties were sold (probably at a loss) the new owners will be left to clean everything up. Also, more electricity will be needed for any increase in greenhouses, and there's not enough for David's existing operation (remember the needed space for solar panels to provide more power?)...and PG&E is so broken already that I can't see them providing more so I hear the noise of generators in the Lower Hindley's future.
- 8. Don't reverse the decision of the Planning Commission on this appeal.

Best regards,

Clai 47 mm

Claire Trower, landowner since 1973, and resident since 1978

From: Hayes, Kathy

To: Ford, John; Lippre, Suzanne

Cc: <u>Damico, Tracy; Eberhardt, Brooke; Turner, Nicole</u>

Subject: FW: Response in favor of denial Date: Monday, March 28, 2022 8:18:17 AM

FYI

Kathy Hayes, Clerk of the Board County of Humboldt (707) 476-2396 khayes@co.humboldt.ca.us

----Original Message----

From: Victoria Van Horn <ivickivh@icloud.com>

Sent: Sunday, March 27, 2022 8:35 PM To: COB < COB@co.humboldt.ca.us > Subject: Response in favor of denial

Caution: This email was sent from an EXTERNAL source. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Humboldt County Board of Supervisors PLN-2021-17465-APPEAL of denial of Record Number- no agenda # given

This request for a line adjustment, if approved, will undoubtedly lead to adding many more greenhouses to an already bursting small neighborhood. Many of the long term residents came here because of the quiet and pristine landscape and are being held captive daily by large numbers of trucks and cars coming and going, the many workers shouting and playing loud music, the daily and constant heavy equipment noise, dust and fumes of who-knows-what in the air. The actual greenhouses, while being eyesores are noisy with fans, motors and other machines pushing who knows what noxious odors and sprays into our homes (and our bodies) in addition to the above mentioned shouting and loud music of the workers. Adding to this unpleasantness by approving this line adjustment would enable another batch of greenhouses in this small area and further the catastrophe for the environment and the physical and mental health of people in the neighborhood. Please have some mercy for the people who actually are trying to live here peacefully and in an environmentally responsible way. Please imagine this happening in your own neighborhood and how you and your family would cope with the health and environmental issues that it causes and do not approve this line adjustment.

Another related issue is that we were never informed of the existence of this property that was apparently left to the neighborhood for recreational purposes at one time and was then sold because the taxes were not paid. This is my understanding of the issue, though it is difficult to imagine why we were never informed. The neighborhood could have shared the tax bill and all enjoyed access to this resource....if only we had known.

Thank you for your consideration Robert Van Horn Victoria Van Horn P.O. Box 42 Honeydew, CA 95545 be well RECEIVED
MAR 2 9 2022
Humboldt County
Planning Dept.



MAR 29 2022

March 23, 2022

Dear Supervisors,

Today we received a notice in the mail saying that our neighbor. Dany Avi-David is appealing a planning commission decision that denied them a lot line adjustment with the property on their western border. This is the first we've heard of this. We are grateful to know it was denied last time, and hope you will stick to that decision.

Dany's Ranch is **48.36** acres (APN 107-272-005). The property to the east of the Ranch is **8.76** acres (APN 107-272-006). This "006" property is a recreational easement we all have on our deeds, and was not to be developed. As far as we know this piece has passed from the Michelons and the Shinns, and now to Dany Avi David's group. Even though your Notice says they are held in "different ownerships", the two pieces are both part of the same cannabis group trying to increase industrial levels on Old Hindley Ranch Road.

We are the neighbors that appealed the last plan of "Dany's" Honeydew Ranch, to increase his 9 giant greenhouses to 40. They were not allowed to build those, in part, because the "Old Hindley Ranch Road Neighbors" group objected already to the amount of traffic, noise, smell, crime, litter, road damage, fire dangers, water use etc. that the current operations caused to our neighborhood. As well as other Mattole Valley neighbors objecting to such high level industrial operations so close to family homes.

At the time of that appeal, that the "Old Hindley Ranch Road Neighbors" put before you there were several options the planning department had posed to the Supervisors to decide upon. The option chosen included allowing a nursery, a pond, and a building that could be built. (on APN 107-272-005). No new cultivation greenhouses were to be built. They were supposed to set up a road association and invite all the neighbors to participate. Road repairs and maintenance were to happen. A culvert was to be replaced, and various other things. Well the update is that the pond was put in; no road association or road repair/maintenance has happened. And the "nursery" greenhouses are in full swing.

So our question now is why would they be allowed to expand their operations when they have not even complied with what they were asked to do last time? And why would they be allowed to build on the neighborhood's recreation easement that was not to be developed? And even if they had complied with all the previous requirements, why would they be allowed to expand operations, when the neighbors and Mattole Community went to so much troubles, stress, and expense to appeal their expansion before, and you responded by setting a limit to their growth.

Our neighborhood has continued to fill in with cannabis farm expansions and it is not pleasant to say the very least. Where does this stop? Must ordinary citizens have to constantly watch, complain, fight, and pay large fees to file appeals, to simply maintain a safe and healthy neighborhood?

For we, the people who LIVE here, nothing has changed. We still are opposed to further degradation to our neighborhood in terms of the down sides these industrial sized farms bring to our once peaceful country life style. Please say NO to this Lot adjustment appeal.

Thank you very much for your consideration,

Roxy Kennedy, Jim Bowdoin, Cindy & Rudi Weber, Bob & Vicki Van Horn, Julia Newcomb, Cedric Roy, Andrew J.S. Newcomb, James Frank Smith, Roger K. Warren. Old Hindley Ranch Road Neighbors, Honeydew