

Kaycee Hathaway

From: Timothy King <dcms.king@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 19, 2014 2:48 PM
To: Kaycee Hathaway
Subject: CU-14-00005

I am attaching the text to my response to the proposed application CU-14-00005 in this e-mail in addition to sending you a hard copy via US mail because this is a difficult time of year to insure written responses reach you by December 26th.

Timothy King
4871 Thrall Road

December 19, 2014

Kaycee Hathaway, Staff Planner

Kittitas County Community Development Services

411 N. Ruby St. Suite 2

Ellensburg WA 98926

Re: Project Name File Number (CU-14-00005) – Applicant Mary Gonzalez

Dear Ms. Hathaway

I am responding to your notice of the proposed marijuana producing projects at the proposed site located at 1006 Emerson Road in Kittitas County.

My wife and I are opposed to allowing the proposed project to be located at the subject property because I believe facilities of this nature should be located in an “industrial zone” away from areas where young children and families are being raised. My specific comments / questions include:

1. CRIME -- There is insufficient detail provided on how the applicant plans to insure their operation will not increase the level of crime in the neighborhood. The applicant is constructing a facility that produce a “high value” and “marketable” product that can be sold in Washington as well in surrounding States where it is illegal to grow and sell. There is no guarantee that all subsequent sales will be legal or not controlled by outside criminal elements. We believe this facility by its very nature will attract additional and new crimes to the neighborhood. We are served by a County Sherriff’s department that has limited time and resources to

adequately police these new activities in a rural environment. Insufficient information or details (other than a promise that it will be secure and the construction of an 8 foot high metal fence) is contained in the application to access additional policing needed to protect this facility or it's neighbors from criminals intent on stealing and re-selling without the tax via the black market. The 8 foot fence by itself appears inadequate to secure the site. Adding to the height of the fence might increase security but would but would further impact views and overall nature of the rural neighborhood. Consequently we believe facilities of this nature should be confined to areas zoned for industrial use to simplify police operations and distance unwanted criminal activities from families.... especially small children.

2. VIEWS – The proposed 8 foot high solid metal fence will have a negative impact on rural views. The surrounding area is composed of small and large farms with low / open fencing with isolated small to large residences and associated farm out buildings. The proposed 8 foot high solid security fence (with or without landscaping) will provide a visual barrier that will limit views from adjacent properties while at the same time provide no barrier to their operation from higher elevation properties. This will be particularly objectionable as the operation grows to the full limits of the 15 acre site.

3. LIGHTING -- The operation of the proposed facility indicates all growing will be outdoors. However, other areas of the applicant's application suggest greenhouse lighting will be required in early morning and evening hours. Greenhouse lighting after sunset and before sunrise visible and to adjacent and surrounding higher elevation neighbors is objectionable and out of character for the neighborhood. All grow house lighting should be in totally enclosed in barns or other structures to limit observation during dark hours.

The applicant indicates that all night time security lighting will be pointed downward. The issue is not just the direction of the lighting, it is the amount of lighting. High pole lights or other lighting systems than shed sufficient light for security will by definition result in excessive / objectionable lighting to the surrounding farms and residences. Specific details of the proposed lighting (location and type of lights, number of lights, height of lights, lighting direction, lighting levels at and adjacent to the site, etc.) are necessary to properly review. Please provide.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment.

However, I would request that additional time be given to respond. This is a busy time of the year where many are traveling and possibly unable to respond to the December 26 deadline. Additional time is appropriate.

Please provide information on all future correspondence and actions as they become available.

Sincerely,

