

ERIKA FOY

PROTECTING PASADENA

April 27, 2020

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.

Dear Planning Commission,

I am very concerned about the proposed marijuana dispensary at 536 South Fair Oaks for the following reasons:

1) The Arroyo Treatment Center is an intensive outpatient rehabilitation resource for families located just across from the proposed marijuana location at 1 West California Blvd. The center helps their clients manage substance abuse issues as well as other psychological disorders. As their website states, 50% of their patients have co-occurring substance abuse disorders. Per our zoning code, the location requirements for dispensaries specifically states *no retailer can be established within 600 ft of a substance abuse center*. The Arroyo Treatment Center is 200 ft away from 536 South Fair Oaks.

2) The location of 536 South Fair Oaks was not on the original map for Measure CC. In the hearing for Harvest, city staff continually referred to the draft saying voters were well aware of the locations they were voting on. This location was not listed as a potential location and therefore should be reconsidered.

3) South Fair Oaks is a professional medical corridor that hosts Huntington Hospital, Huntington Medical Research Institute, and Shriners Hospital for Children. The two hospitals are sensitive receptors and this CUP violates the General Plan. Is this the reason the proposed location was not originally listed in the draft for potential locations in [2018](#)?

4) Union Station Homeless Shelter is just outside the 600 ft radius, however the area already struggles with incredible public nuisance issues. Has the city verified other MedMen locations for property nuisances in various other cities? Has our city staff considered investigating other cities' public nuisance reports? It seems this would be an important factor to consider.

It is concerning to me that this hearing is scheduled during temporary stay-at-home orders. It would be more appropriate for it to be postponed until these orders are lifted and it can be heard through the regular public process.

I appreciate the commission considering the issues brought forth in this letter.

Thank you,

Erika Foy