

Molinar, Tess

From: Nina Chomsky <nrchomsky@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2020 4:39 PM
To: Nunez, Guille
Subject: PC Agenda Item 2.C.; CUP #6788; 536 Fair Oaks Ave. Hearing 4/29/2020

CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Please distribute to the Planning Commission -- Thank You

Chair David Coher and Members of the Planning Commission

c/o Guille Nunez Management Analyst IV

100 North Garfield Ave. Pasadena, CA 91101

RE: Conditional Use Permit: Cannabis Retailer Application #6788: Request to Allow the Retail Sales of Cannabis at 536 S. Fair Oaks Avenue for MME Pasadena Retail, Inc.

Hearing: Wednesday, April 29, 2020; Agenda Item 2.C.

Planning Commissioners:

I am writing to you in my individual capacity to express my opposition to the approval of a Cannabis Retailer Conditional Use Permit at the following proposed location: 536 South Fair Oaks Avenue, Pasadena. The primary basis for my opposition is the proposed location of the retail dispensary adjacent to the Huntington Memorial Hospital and its supportive medical offices, clinics and services.

1. Impact on Sensitive Receptors; Finding Cannot Be Made. It is clear that the Huntington Hospital itself plus its supportive medical offices, clinics and services, are all “sensitive receptors” as intended by the applicable Zoning Code requirements limiting the location of a retail cannabis dispensary. Why traditional medical services were not included in the sensitive receptor lists, such as Huntington Hospital, is not clear, but, certainly, the City did not intend to facilitate and enable patients having such adjacent ease of access from all the various Huntington operations to a cannabis dispensary which, in effect, would be adjacent to the Hospital and all its related services. And, it is clear from the 600 foot radius map, as well as the 1000 foot radius map, that the proposed dispensary is not sufficiently distant from

Huntington Hospital and its supportive services as measured in accordance with the applicable Zoning Code provisions. Finding No. 1 cannot be made.

2. No General Plan Consistency; Findings Cannot Be Made. Staff asserts, as a general matter, that this proposal is a new and diverse commercial use in the Specific Plan area, and, therefore, the proposed use is consistent with the Specific Plan and the General Plan. In fact, this proposed use in its proposed location is not, as required by the Land Use Element of the General Plan, compatible and contextual with its surroundings, specifically the Huntington Hospital Medical campus, and the large amount of nearby neighborhood commercial services. Further, due to its proposed location, this proposal is not a cohesive Corridor use as required by the Land Use Element (Goal 25.3). The Land Use Element refers numerous times to the Huntington Hospital and encourages development and land uses that complement and enhance the Hospital. Is this cannabis retail location what was intended? On these bases, it is clear that Findings 2,3,4, and 5 cannot be made.
3. Environmental Determination of Exemption Cannot Be Made. This proposal is distinguishable from other cannabis dispensary proposals in that the proposed dispensary is adjacent to the Huntington Hospital campus; unusual circumstances are present for the same reason; and, the Huntington Hospital Medical campus is environmentally sensitive in that there are General Plan Land Use Consistency issues presented by this proposal. A CEQA Initial Study is required.

Thank you for your attention to my concerns and comments.

Sincerely,

Nina Chomsky
1500 Lancashire St.,
Pasadena, CA 91103