

**pbscommissions - Fwd: Campagna Opposition R\_2019-0012**

**From:** PBS PBS  
**To:** pbscommissions  
**Date:** 1/31/2022 2:20 PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Campagna Opposition R\_2019-0012

Mendocino County

JAN 31 2022

Planning &amp; Building Services

Planning & Building Services Staff

County of Mendocino

*Main Office:*

860 N. Bush St, Ukiah CA 95482

*Phone:* [\(707\) 234-6650](tel:(707)234-6650)

*Coast Office:*

120 W. Fir St, Fort Bragg CA 95437

*Phone:* [\(707\) 964-5379](tel:(707)964-5379)

*Web:* [www.co.mendocino.ca.us/planning/](http://www.co.mendocino.ca.us/planning/)

>>> Joan Campagna <jccfortbragg@gmail.com> 1/30/2022 9:01 AM >>>  
 Good day Mendocino County Planning Commission,

I am writing today to submit my opposition to Application R\_2019-0012, which aims to setup a CA District in the Mitchell Creek South neighborhood.

I have been a homeowner in this neighborhood for 5 years. My husband Mark, now deceased, and I purchased a retirement home in December 2016. He lived there part-time from August 2017 until he died in May 2018. I retired here full-time in August of 2019.

So I was an owner when the initial Michael Baker survey was distributed in 2018, asking for community feedback on the question of allowing a cannabis overlay district to be established in the Mitchell Creek South neighborhood.

I replied to that survey and other County venues at the time (email) with a resounding NO.

I repeated that NO in 2021, when I submitted my personal letter to the County in response to the scheduling of the June 3, 2021 Public Hearing.

Our neighborhood continued to organize after the hearing was cancelled, and we produced our "Consolidated Letter of Opposition" that was originally emailed to Russell Ford on 7/30/2021. That letter documents that 9 of the 16 APNs included in the -0012 application DID NOT support that application, leaving the applicant without the necessary 60% community approval required to adopt the application.

And now - for the 3rd time in 4 years - we are required to AGAIN to stand together against changes that would significantly alter the quality of life in our RR neighborhood.

The concerns we have raised in the past all appear to remain including:

- How water is used during a time of continuing draught. Per the Berkeley Cannabis Research Center, "Cannabis uses a similar amount of water per acre as other agricultural crops in California." If water is and remains a limited resource, it should be used to grow food. [https://crc.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/CRC\\_Brief\\_WaterUse\\_2020\\_1205.pdf](https://crc.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/CRC_Brief_WaterUse_2020_1205.pdf)
- The effect of ongoing and increasing traffic related to commercial use of the land. Given the location of the cannabis cultivation sites referenced in this application, as the Staff Report points out, cannabis-related traffic would need to transverse approximately 2 miles just to get to the sites, with the potential of disrupting the residential character of our neighborhood. And that of the neighborhoods all along the 2 mile trek they need to make to get to the commercial sites they have chosen to locate in residential neighborhoods.

- Lack of dependable data regarding the effect on home prices for homes in proximity to active commercial cannabis cultivation sites. For example, I can SMELL the cannabis - through closed car windows - when I turn onto Shane Drive from Turner. Other neighbors on the Jade Court side can see and hear operations. The push by cultivators to reduce or eliminate setbacks potentially places the entire community at risk by making these locations visible to the passing public. How long before the “smash and grab” crowd decides it’s easy enough to throw a few steaks to the pit bulls while they bridge the fence and rip out the plants?

Cannabis growers are fond of pointing out how the wine industry is allowed to grow grapes right up to the edge of the roadside, but I believe that to be a flawed comparison. You can’t drive up to a vine, pull off a bunch of grapes, and drive away with a usable product. You can do that with cannabis, which is why I believe the opportunity for mischief and lawlessness is exacerbated. Given that our RR-2 zone prohibits commercial operations, residents should not be asked to accommodate risks created by such operations. The financial investments residents have made in their homes needs to be respected.

- The effort to reverse the ability of homeowners to control quality of life issues, both short- and long-term, through the suspension of the Sunset Provision. The original date for this sunset was May 4, 2020 (3 years after the adoption of the MCCO), but coastal cannabis growers complained and were given an additional 2 years to comply - a total of 5 years to find alternative locations for their operations. My understanding is that this was the only group of Mendocino growers accommodated in this manner. Unfortunately, most of them seem to have used this bonus time to just dig in deeper where they are. And now they don’t want to be interfered with at all.

Well, us neighbors would like to see this provision enforced. We feel we’ve been strung along for long enough.

- The potential destruction of quality, long-standing, successful RR-2 neighborhoods in pursuit of propping up a cannabis industry whose prices are dropping. Whole neighborhoods could be sacrificed to the need for ever increasing harvest sizes without the financial payback the County anticipates. We should not allow the destruction of quality of life in these neighborhoods in service to the private commercial benefit of the few.  
<https://kymkemp.com/2022/01/14/community-members-ask-humboldt-county-bos-to-suspend-tax-in-the-midst-of-collapsing-cannabis-market/>
- The continuing effort by this Applicant to gerrymander the District in a manner that selectively excludes APNs that would keep her from reaching the 60% approval level needed for this application to be adopted.

For example, there are 14 parcels included in the Mitchell Creek Heights subdivision. However, not all of our parcels are included in Ms. Mouton’s application; 4 parcels are left out. As we consider our subdivision to be a cohesive unit, and operate that way through our CC&Rs, we consider this a blatant attempt to “divide and conquer.” For what it’s worth, at least 3 of the 4 parcels they chose to leave out are DEFINITE NO votes.

Additionally, 4 other parcels along Shane Lane (mailing address shows as Drive and not Lane) are also not on Ms. Moulton’s application, even though these parcels, while not formally part of our subdivision, operate as a unit with us. And have for decades. These parcels are APNs 019-590-10, 019-590-09, 019-590-08, and 019-590-11. One of these parcels abuts directly to the Harris cultivation site; another has received notice as being within 300 feet of a different site. For what it’s worth, at least 3 of these 4 parcels have also indicated they do not support the application.

Our community resents Ms. Mouton’s continuing attempts to force a change we don’t want on our neighborhood. Her actions have created conflict and division within our subdivision that didn’t exist before and that rip and tear at the bonds that hold this community together. We respectfully ask the County to consider the importance of strong, inclusive, durable communities to the OVERALL health and wellbeing of our County.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Mendocino county has a total area of **3,878 square miles**, of which 3,506 square miles is land and 372 square miles is water. There should be plenty of room for growers to ply their trade without destroying the existing, vibrant, residential neighborhoods that support the life we all came here for.

We thank the County for this opportunity to present our concerns and our suggestions.

Best regards,  
Joan Campagna  
15780 Shane Drive