

#1 4890

Code or shall be deemed to abandon and extinguish any associated municipal license or conditional use permit

8. Applicant shall provide a Parking Plan that complies with Section 22.20.100 for all uses present and proposed at the current property including striped parking spaces where feasible (i.e. concrete or asphalt areas).

9. Odor Control shall include charcoal filters and other best means to limit and mitigate odor impacts to surrounding uses. Should a meritorious odor complaint be received the Planning Commission may require additional odor control measures to mitigate any actual negative impacts.

10. The proposed cultivation site shall not be located within 500 feet of any school grounds, recreation or youth center, religious service building, or correctional facility that was legally established prior to approval of this conditional use permit as intended by licensing restriction and regulations of the state in 3 AAC Chapter 306.

11. This permit only conditionally approved the use of cultivation; however, at the same time, all legally vested uses operating within Units O and P must comply with all pertinent state and local regulations, licenses, and permits to remain valid.

12. The Planning Commission may, at its discretion and upon receiving meritorious evidence of negative impacts to public health, safety, and welfare, schedule a review to address issues of concern and pursue mitigation through additional conditions if necessary.

Motion PASSED 5-0.

L

Public hearing and consideration of a conditional use permit request for marijuana cultivation at 4614 Halibut Point Road, in the C-2 general commercial and mobile home zone. The property is also known as Lot 3 of Carlson Resubdivision. The request is filed by Green Leaf, Inc. The owners of record are Connor K. Nelson and Valerie L. Nelson.

Scarcelli explained the request for a cultivation facility. The applicant has worked with staff to mitigate staff concerns. Cultivation tends to have lower traffic than other manufacturing uses. Staff have received public comment about noise from the fans; however, the property is commercially zoned. The applicant has proposed extensive ventilation. Staff recommends approval.

Aaron Bean asked that the application be amended to list Green Leaf, Inc. as the applicant. Spivey asked if the applicant plans to do retail in the future. Bean stated that he hopes to eventually do retail on a different lot at the same site. Spivey thanked the applicant for the thorough application.

Hughey/Pohlman moved to APPROVE the required findings.

Required Findings for Conditional Use Permits. The planning commission shall not recommend approval of a proposed development unless it first makes the following findings and conclusions:

1. The city may use design standards and other elements in this code to modify the proposal. A conditional use permit may be approved only if all of the following findings can be made regarding the proposal and are supported by the record that the granting of the proposed conditional use permit will not:
 - a. Be detrimental to the public health, safety, and general welfare;
 - b. Adversely affect the established character of the surrounding vicinity; nor
 - c. Be injurious to the uses, property, or improvements adjacent to, and in the vicinity of, the site upon which the proposed use is to be located.

2. The granting of the proposed conditional use permit is consistent and compatible with the intent of the goals, objectives, and policies of the comprehensive plan and any implementing regulation.
3. All conditions necessary to lessen any impacts of the proposed use are conditions that can be monitored and enforced.
4. The proposed use will not introduce hazardous conditions at the site that cannot be mitigated to protect adjacent properties, the vicinity, and the public health, safety, and welfare of the community from such hazard.
5. The conditional use will be supported by, and not adversely affect, adequate public facilities and services; or that conditions can be imposed to lessen any adverse impacts on such facilities and services.
6. Burden of Proof. The applicant has the burden of proving that the proposed conditional use meets all of the criteria in subsection B of this section.

The city may approve, approve with conditions, modify, modify with conditions, or deny the conditional use permit. The city may reduce or modify bulk requirements, off-street parking requirements, and use design standards to lessen impacts, as a condition of the granting of the conditional use permit. In considering the granting of a conditional use, the assembly and planning commission shall satisfy themselves that the general criteria set forth for uses specified in this chapter will be met. The city may consider any or all criteria listed and may base conditions or safeguards upon them. The assembly and planning commission may require the applicant to submit whatever reasonable evidence may be needed to protect the public interest. The general approval criteria are as follows:

1. Site topography, slope and soil stability, geophysical hazards such as flooding, surface and subsurface drainage and water quality, and the possible or probable effects of the proposed conditional use upon these factors;
2. Utilities and service requirements of the proposed use, including sewers, storm drainage, water, fire protection, access and electrical power; the assembly and planning commission may enlist the aid of the relevant public utility officials with specialized knowledge in evaluating the probable effects of the proposed use and may consider the costs of enlarging, upgrading or extending public utilities in establishing conditions under which the conditional use may be permitted;
3. Lot or tract characteristics, including lot size, yard requirements, lot coverage and height of structures;
4. Use characteristics of the proposed conditional use that affect adjacent uses and districts, including hours of operation, number of persons, traffic volumes, off-street parking and loading characteristics, trash and litter removal, exterior lighting, noise, vibration, dust, smoke, heat and humidity, recreation and open space requirements;
5. Community appearance such as landscaping, fencing and screening, dependent upon the specific use and its visual impacts.

Specific Guidance from 22.24 on Findings for Marijuana Uses

Findings of Fact: Upon review and considerations of the required criteria, the Planning Commission shall determine whether the proposed use(s) at the proposed project location are found to not present a negative impact to the public's health, safety, and welfare.

1. If such a finding can be made, then the proposed use shall be approved with standard regulations, dimensions, and setbacks.

2. In the alternative, where the Planning Commission finds negative impacts are present, the Planning Commission shall only approve conditional use permits where the negative impacts can be adequately mitigated by conditions of approval that preserve the public's health, safety, and welfare. These conditions of approval shall be case by case specific and in addition to the standard regulations.

3. If negative impacts to the public's health, safety, and welfare cannot be mitigated through conditions of approval then the Planning Commission shall so find and deny the proposed conditional use permit.

Motion PASSED 5-0.

Hughey/Parker Song moved to APPROVE approve the conditional use permit request filed by Green Leaf, Inc. for marijuana cultivation at 4614 Halibut Point Road, in the C 2 General Commercial and Mobile Home zone, subject to conditions of approval. The property is also known as Lot 3 of Carlson Resubdivision. The owners of record are Connor K. Nelson and Valorie L. Nelson.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Owners, operators, and staff of conditional uses shall comply with all state and municipal licensing regulations.
2. All licensed facilities shall comply with all life and safety regulations as promulgated by the municipal Building Official.
3. All licensed manufacturing and cultivation uses shall provide a fire safety plan, material handling plan, and comply with all fire safety regulations that satisfies the Fire Marshal or their designee and the Building Official.
4. All licensed facilities and/or uses shall provide screening from public view of any marijuana related commercial, retail, cultivation, or manufacturing use.
5. All licensed facilities and/or uses shall establish an active sales account and business registration with the Municipality and shall comply with all standard & required accounting practices.
6. It shall be a standard regulation that all conditional uses comply with all applicable state regulations and licensing laws or it shall be deemed to abandon and extinguish and associated municipal license or conditional use permit.
7. All approved Conditional use permits shall comply with all Sitka General Code or shall be deemed to abandon and extinguish any associated municipal license or conditional use permit
8. Applicant shall provide a Parking Plan that complies with Section 22.20.100 for all uses present and proposed at the current property including striped parking spaces where practical.
9. Odor Control shall include charcoal filters and other best means to limit and mitigate odor impacts to surrounding uses. Should a meritorious odor complaint be received the Planning Commission may require additional odor control measures to mitigate any actual negative impacts.
10. The proposed cultivation site shall not be located within 500 feet of any school grounds, recreation or youth center, religious service building, or correctional facility that was legally established prior to approval of this conditional use permit as intended by licensing restriction and regulations of the state in 3 AAC Chapter 306.
11. The Planning Commission may, at its discretion and upon receiving

meritorious evidence of negative impacts to public health, safety, and welfare, schedule a review to address issues of concern and pursue mitigation through additional conditions if necessary.

Motion PASSED 5-0.

M

Public hearing and consideration of a conditional use permit request for marijuana retail at 205 Harbor Drive, in the central business district. The property is also known as Lot 1 Van Winkle Subdivision. The request is filed by Mary Magnuson. The owners of record are Frank and Mary Magnuson.

Scarcelli reviewed the request. The ultimate decision about possible buffer zone issues would be determined by the state AMCO office. Staff recommends that the commission postpone the request to a later meeting so more information can be provided. Windsor asked if a postponement would "foul up" the process for the applicant. Scarcelli stated that he understands that the state is postponing some of their previously advertised dates. Spivey asked if staff have reached out to request additional information, and Scarcelli stated that he and Pierson had both been in touch with the applicant, requested additional information, and the applicant indicated that she would provide more information. Pohlman stated concern for proximity to the Lutheran Church.

Mary Magnuson stated that operations will be according to state regulations. Magnuson stated that she has difficulty luring her potential tenant before a permit is granted. The property has been retail in the past, and will be some sort of retail in the future. Magnuson stated that she believes her application is adequate. The building is already sprinkled and fire alarmed, has "tremendous" ventilation, and will have approximately 16 security cameras. Magnuson stated that she does not see the need to delay the request. Windsor asked if the applicant had plans for a smoking room, and Magnuson said no.

Margie Esquiro stated concern for the proximity to sensitive uses, and the city can be more stringent than the state.

Joe D'Arienzo stated that this is one of the only available sites in the central business district due to sensitive uses.

Scarcelli read a letter from Susan Jensen, in opposition to the proposal.

Windsor asked what would happen if the conditional use permit was granted but the state license was denied. Scarcelli stated that until a state license is granted, the conditional use permit is not activated. Hughey asked what would be required for staff to view the application as complete. Scarcelli stated that the ordinance pulls state regulations into municipal requirements, so the city can enforce issues as they arise; therefore, the planning department would like to receive the same information that is submitted to the state, including security, diversion, floor plan, and overall detailed plans. Parker Song asked if another retail would be analyzed to this extent. Bosak stated that uses that are conditional are analyzed by the framework in code.

Pohlman stated that community concerns have been raised, so she would like to see the lessee and his/her plans in full detail. Spivey stated that a conditional use requires detailed plans.