

ZB APPLICATION #223-17(MOD)

TEXT CHANGE

Regulations for Marijuana and Cannabis-related Uses

PUBLIC COMMENTS

From: "Waldman, Paula" <PaulaWaldman@bhhsne.com>

Date: May 23, 2023 at 10:40:33 AM EDT

To: "Dell, Theresa" <TDell@stamfordct.gov>

Subject: Fw: Letter to be shared with members of the Planning Board for this evening's meeting

Ms. Dell,

The letter below is what I read last night at the public hearing for zoning regarding the location of a now third cannabis facility possibly.

In the public hearing last night, many focused on their anxiety issues and family member's cancer relief with cannabis use.

I totally support and understand that kind of use for medicinal reasons.

Anecdotally as they say, my daughter suffers from anxiety herself and used it for a time which ultimately had a huge negative impact on her life. Now she is NOT using this and she is much better. She still takes medication but using the weed made her issues significantly worse.

But when we, the neighborhood, was invited to Sweetspot's meeting for those living within 500 feet, Sweetspot made it clear that "medical" economically was not enough. Right now that is all that is on the books is legally only for medicinal.

Traffic aside, I live there and cannot turn onto Oaklawn at 5 in the afternoon. I have to be vigilant just walking my dog around there with so much traffic.

Halpin is loaded on both sides with cars and more businesses will be coming soon into the area.

Whole Foods alone will make it impossible to drive, let alone Shake Shack, Pepe Pizza, Starbucks and we now have Digs from prior diner facility. We will have people from out of state here too looking to conveniently purchase their weed.

Cars now speed up and down both High Ridge and Long Ridge. Have you ever tried crossing the street on High Ridge?

Neighbors are distraught and feel like our appointed officials are not listening to us who live here.

This evening the planning board is now considering text changes to be implemented for our city. My hope and prayer is that your board will consider the ultimate impact this has on our city and its future STAKEHOLDERS, especially our children. There is a daycare practically across the street, a tutoring center, an emergency PEDIATRIC clinic, a coding facility for youth PLUS 3 additional private schools and a church nursery school.

RESIDENTIAL AND CHILD CENTRIC BUSINESSES HERE

There was argument that Research Park was near Dolan. Have you driven in there as it is not in the community. You must drive into Research Park which has a gentleman's club. Kids don't go there. These facilities should be "out of sight" for our children.

We are making it normal putting it into this location right across the street from homes with young children.

Meanwhile I spoke with 2 teachers in the neighborhood who said, weed is prevalent in the schools and the children are coming in "high" already!

Do you cave or make a stand?

I have gone door to door and those whom I have spoken with are first of all, completely unaware and secondly are opposed.

Whether others say it is not a gateway drug, there is much evidence to site the potential evolution of this drug.

<https://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2016/04/26/is-marijuana-a-gateway-drug/marijuana-has-proven-to-be-a-gateway-drug>

That is what it is.

While "the cat is out of the bag" many nearby communities have rejected these facilities all together. This ultimately will have negative impact upon families...it is in your hands to make wise and long-lasting decisions for our future city and the children.

Sincerely,
Paula Waldman
110 Old North Stamford Road

Paula Waldman
Fine Home Specialist
Berkshire Hathaway New England Properties
136 East Putnam Avenue
Greenwich, CT 06830
pwaldman@bhhsne.com

Good evening.

Paula Waldman 110 Old North Stamford Road.

I am a resident of my property for now over 40 years and have seen many physical changes to the neighborhood. Some might call them progress, others may beg to differ. The fabric of the community is why folks settle in a certain town or city. Changes are inevitable but must be done with thought and consideration of long term effects to the city and its citizens.

I have spent enough time speaking to neighbors about this issue to know that the majority are unaware and when told are completely against such a facility in this neighborhood. The zoning rules are meant to protect the citizenry- the stakeholders. Some who work in the school system said to me the impact of weed in school is staggering and students come to school already stoned. WHY MAKE THIS MORE AVAILABLE?

I would like to ask each of you if you would prefer this business across the street from your homes. We are the stakeholder and pay our share of taxes. Would you like your children or grandchildren to play across the street? Would you be concerned about being late to pick your child up from the bus if folks are loitering nearby or chewing their items or smoking in the car?

There must be strict parameters to keep our community and children safe. Stamford's citizens need to feel safe. The traffic is horrific around MANY HOURS OF THE DAY, PARTICULARLY RUSH HOUR. The parking lot is often overflowing much of the time and will continue to get worse with all the new OTHER businesses. We have child-centric businesses there ALREADY.

Would you want your children to have tutoring with such a facility nearby? Would you choose Firefly if you knew there was a marijuana dispensary nearby? Think about it. Use common sense please.

Our mayor once lived in our area and made a point about the impact of drugs and caring for the children. Now she and her family live in Shippan. As I understand, Shippan disapproved of this type of facility. Yet there is much more of an industrial area nearby and better suited. Would our mayor want to live across the street with her children from such a facility? Would any of you, including any Zoning members or Land Use employees want the same for their family?

It is absolutely the WRONG place for such a facility.

Set the standards that protect the children. Don't make High Ridge....High

Best regards,
Paula

Paula Waldman
Fine Home Specialist
Berkshire Hathaway New England Properties
136 East Putnam Avenue
Greenwich, CT 06830
pwaldman@bhhsne.com

Cell: 203-273-1563
Direct: 203-637-6215
Please click on link for information on Fairfield County
<http://www.ourdigitalbook.com/BHHSNE>

From: Shelley Michelson <shelley.michelson@gmail.com>
Date: May 23, 2023 at 10:24:07 AM EDT
To: "Dell, Theresa" <TDell@stamfordct.gov>
Subject: Tonight's meeting re: ZB Application #223-17(MOD)

Dear Chairperson Dell,

The residents of Stamford did not sanction a text change that would permit hybrid marijuana facilities throughout the City. Please listen to the concerns of mothers and schoolteachers from last night's Zoning Board Public Hearing.

Attached is my request for the Planning Board to issue a negative advisory opinion to the Zoning Board on this text change.

Thank you for your kind consideration,
Shelley

Shelley A. Michelson

May 23, 2023

Ms. Theresa Dell
Chair, Stamford Planning Board
888 Washington Boulevard
Stamford, CT

Dear Chairperson Dell and Esteemed Members of the Planning Board,

I am writing to you in opposition to ZB Application #223-17 (MOD) Stamford Zoning Board Text Change. The description of the purpose of the text change “to protect the welfare and safety, in particular, of children and adolescents,” does exactly the opposite, even with distances from schools. Distance parameters should include private as well as public schools. The approval of this text change would subject the entire city to house many of these cannabis enterprises.

Health consequences of heavy marijuana uses are generally not discussed in consideration of whether to permit recreational marijuana. In addition to mental health concerns, physical harm has also been seen in the lungs of young regular marijuana users and these young people generally are also smokers and vapers, as evidenced by findings of my son who is a pulmonologist at a renowned academic medical center.

In addition to the health concerns, many of which were documented in testimony at last night’s Zoning Board public hearing, the proposed location is not suitable for such an enterprise. Proprietors of child-centric businesses proximate to that location and local residents have come out against the application. They were there first. Don’t they have a right to protect the integrity of their businesses which have leases and mortgages they must pay?

Finally, the whole category of cannabis is best left to Master Plan formulation. The Zoning Board is always much too eager to slip in text changes (which they finally recognized they needed to do in this case) without seriously considering community input. Carmody’s meeting, which Attorney Feinberg maintains was not well-attended, was not well publicized.

I am urging you and your fellow Board members to issue a no as an advisory opinion.

Many thanks,
Shelley Michelson

From: Jeanette Bilcznianski <biltro96@gmail.com>
Date: May 23, 2023 at 11:18:35 AM EDT
To: "Blessing, Ralph" <RBlessing@stamfordct.gov>
Cc: "Dell, Theresa" <TDell@stamfordct.gov>
Subject: Public Comment application 223-17 (cannabis regulations)

Thank you for your input. As I have learned from my work on the Charter Commission, Land Use can ask that the Planning Board require public hearings other than those required in regulations. If you choose not to include, that is fine. I would encourage you to voice your individual concerns to our co-chairs Tom Lombardo Tlombardo1@stamfordCt.gov and Michael Larobina MLarobina@StamfordCT.gov about the length of the report and more opportunities for the public to be heard.

Regarding the smoke shops, will that be separate application? Will that require a special permit or limit how many are in the city?

Regards,
Jeanette

On May 23, 2023, at 10:59 AM, Blessing, Ralph <RBlessing@StamfordCT.gov> wrote:

The public will have an opportunity to voice their opinion when the Zoning Board.

I find it quite disingenuous of you to complain about opportunities to speak when you as a member of the Charter Revision Commission hold a single public meeting and giving the public less than a week to read a 200-page document.

Ralph Blessing
Land Use Bureau Chief
City of Stamford

On May 23, 2023, at 10:20 AM, Jeanette Bilcznianski <biltro96@gmail.com> wrote:

Please also consider requiring a public hearing at the Planning Board level for marijuana dispensaries and smoke shops. If the Board has to vote on the neighborhood friendliness of such retail, you should hear from the public. Public hearings should not be limited to map changes. A public hearing on the Planning Board level should be required of cannabis dispensaries and incorporated into these text changes. Especially, since there are additionally applications that will be heard. I believe the planning board should determine the cap on dispensaries rather than a prescribed ratio.

Thanks,
Jeanette

On May 23, 2023, at 10:10 AM, Jeanette Bilcznianski <biltro96@gmail.com> wrote:

Good morning,

Hope all is well. Regarding item 223-17 (Cannabis and smoke shop regulations), please do not approve and ask Land Use to include all schools, not just private. I would ask that you go one step further, and model regulations after Denver, Colorado who has been in the business of marijuana sales for quite some time. Please also note federal intervention in 2012 that closed shops less than 1,000 feet from schools in Colorado.

<https://www.denverpost.com/2012/01/12/feds-colorado-medical-marijuana-dispensaries-within-1000-feet-of-a-school-must-close/#>

Denver, CO Regulations

https://www.denvergov.org/files/assets/public/business-licensing/documents/marijuana_facility_location_guide.pdf

Medical and Retail Marijuana Stores

Proximity Restrictions: No medical or retail marijuana store license shall be issued if the proposed location is within 1,000 feet of any of the following locations:

- Any school, with the distance computed by direct measurement in a straight line from the nearest legal parcel line of the land used for the school to the nearest external portion of the building in which the marijuana store is proposed to be located.
- Any childcare establishment*, with the distance computed by direct measurement in a straight line from the nearest legal parcel line of the land used for the childcare establishment to the nearest external portion of the building in which the marijuana store is proposed to be located.
- Any other medical or retail marijuana store* licensed by the City and County of Denver, with the distance computed by direct measurement in a straight line from the nearest external portion of the building in which one (1) store is located to the nearest external portion of the building in which the other store is proposed to be located.
 - ✦ In the event the department receives two or more applications for a medical or retail marijuana store with proposed locations within one thousand (1,000) feet of each other, the director shall act upon only the first complete application received and shall not issue a license to subsequent applications proposing to be located within one thousand (1,000) feet*.
- Any alcohol or drug treatment facility*, with the distance computed by direct measurement in a straight line from the nearest external portion of the building in which the alcohol or drug treatment facility is located to the nearest external portion of the building in which the marijuana store is proposed to be located.
- Any location where, within the two (2) years preceding the date of the application, the director denied an application for a medical or retail marijuana store license because the reasonable requirements of the neighborhood and the desires of the adult inhabitants were satisfied by the existing outlets or the adult inhabitants did not otherwise need or desire an additional medical or retail marijuana store license.

Location Restrictions: No medical or retail marijuana store shall be issued at any of the following locations:

- Within any residential zone district as defined by the Denver Zoning Code or Former Chapter 59, in any MS- 2, MS-2x, MX-2, MX-2A or MX-2x zone district as defined by the Denver Zoning Code or Former Chapter 59, or in any location where retail sales are prohibited by the Denver Zoning Code, Former Chapter 59, or by any ordinance governing a planned unit development.*

- At any location within a neighborhood of undue concentration (see page 5) of marijuana store locations at the time of the application. This location restriction shall not apply to an application submitted to change the location of an existing licensed medical or retail marijuana store from its current location within a neighborhood of undue concentration of store locations changing to a new location within the same neighborhood of undue concentration of store locations. This location restriction also does not apply to a new retail marijuana store proposing to co-locate with a commonly owned medical marijuana store that has existed in continuous operations.
- At any location where, within the one (1) year preceding the date of the application, the director scheduled a public hearing for an application for a medical or retail marijuana store license and the application was subsequently withdrawn by the applicant prior to final action by the director.

** This shall not apply to any application for a retail marijuana store that proposes to share a location with a licensed medical marijuana store that has existed in continuous operation and can demonstrate common ownership with that same medical marijuana store license.*

Further, I do not support the ratios for proposed dispensaries of 20,000:1. Stamford will become the marijuana destination for Southwestern CT and Westchester, NY if all seven are approved in Stamford. If you review Denver's regulations, there are other situations like the marijuana hospitality industry not considered in our regulations. Land use, Planning and Zoning Board members should be made aware of what maybe coming down the road if not explicitly addressed in current regulations.

Finally, I would ask land use for more public outreach regarding crafting cannabis language rather than just limiting it to 1,000 feet of public schools.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Be well,
Jeanette Bilicznianski

From: Paul Arvoy <ifyouseekstamford@gmail.com>

Date: May 23, 2023 at 12:10:29 PM EDT

To: "Dell, Theresa" <TDell@stamfordct.gov>

Subject: Paul Arvoy(No to text change)

It is time to stop changing text in language referring to our zoning laws to accommodate businesses and intrusive housing that are not welcome in our neighborhoods. What needs to be changed is the Zoning Board mind set. These bureaucratic officials are not in charge of what happens in Stamford their purpose is to maintain a certain standard of living for all its residents without a state agenda. We are separate from Hartford or any other city with rights to say no we don't want this. The Zoning Board's job is to make decisions with discretion along with the input from residents that bought to settle here and aren't going anywhere. The Zoning Board has no oversight and rubber stamps everything, like government stooges, that comes in front of them. Simply put the Zoning Board should be appropriating language that denies cannabis applications for the simple fact that it's not mandatory and we do not want this here and even though Stamford decided to get into the illicit drug trade partnering with the common criminal to secure a profit, it is still "FEDERALLY ILLEGAL" and a dangerous drug. Profits are being made off the backs of the addicted. Common sense residents know this is a way to self-destruct a city. This illegitimate entity has no benefit to a thriving and successful community. On top of all this, the Mayor and her family are now common drug dealers and should hang their head in shame. The only way marijuana dispensaries will exist into the future is because they are, "banking on our young children of today to be their 40-year-old customer in the future". The disturbing fact here is that the people buying government marijuana are either addicted or diagnosed with mental illness. We are diagnosing people with mental illness and then prescribing them, without a medical Dr., an illegal psychotropic drug and allowing them to walk our streets while being diagnosed with mental illness and high on a psychotropic drug. Can someone at the Zoning Board make a positive common-sense decision. Stop changing text for government profit off the backs of addicted residents. It's time for the Zoning Board to step aside, with each member past their term forced to resign having brought Stamford to the verge of collapse. These incompetent decisions have to end. This does absolutely nothing to benefit the City of Stamford that thrived for hundreds of years way before the criminal legalization of marijuana infiltrated our City and way before Mr. Blessing even new Stamford was a city. Stop the madness this is making our lifestyle and community unsafe.

Paul Arvoy

203 274 3012

From: mmitri <mmitri@tutormesos.com>

Date: May 23, 2023 at 12:44:18 PM EDT

To: "Dell, Theresa" <TDell@stamfordct.gov>, racquel.smithanderson@gmail.com, "Morris, William" <WMorris@stamfordct.gov>, "McManus, Rosanne" <RMcManus@stamfordct.gov>, "Stein, David" <DStein@stamfordct.gov>

Subject: Marijuana Dispensary

I'd like to say that Blake Costa's presentation was laughable and it is appalling that I even had to sit through it for close to 3 hours before the public was given the opportunity to speak. Costa mentioned that his new "money maker" dispensary would cut the black market out of this area. I'm not sure why he would think that, given the comments from CEO Jason Webski:

"I just want to remind people that our customers are 60-year-old women. It's not like high school students," Webski said. "Unfortunately, a lot of that younger (demographic) still consumes from the illegal market ... I think you'd be shocked at the age demographics of our consumer."

I found this in a Stamford Advocate article from March 23.

<https://www.stamfordadvocate.com/local/article/sweetspot-seeks-open-hybrid-cannabis-dispensary-17854633.php>

So if the demographic obviously does not include young people, where are they getting it from? And even if this dispensary pushes illegal dealings away from this area, it's not like black market weed will be wiped from Stamford. Teens can drive anywhere or pay anyone to get it from somewhere else.

Also, I heard a lot about "security". Are these security guards going to be posted up outside the dispensary? Will they be in view of the public, or more importantly, the kids who attend the tutoring center, the coding center, or the pediatric facility? Even if they are indoors, are they armed? I, for one, would not want armed guards ANYWHERE near my children and would think twice before going to any of those businesses given this threat. The tutoring facility, coding center, pediatric center, even the LIQUOR STORE on the other side of the plaza does not have ANY kind of security. What makes this so dangerous that it requires this level of security? Should we have this kind of business in a high traffic area, given the potential threats that SweetSpot hires mercenaries for?

My last grievance is the name of the weed shop. I was reassured by Costa that nothing in or on the premises would be advertised to children. Then on the next slide of the presentation, his attorney showed a blueprint of what the exterior would look like. A bunch of opaque windows with an equal amount of "SweetSpot" stickers on it. SweetSpot sounds like a candy shop to me. What am I supposed to tell my children when they ask to go to the candy shop right across from where I bring them for tutoring or medical checkup?

Mona Mitri

Tutor Me SOS

From: Mona Mitri <mona_mitri@hotmail.com>

Date: May 23, 2023 at 1:09:19 PM EDT

To: "Dell, Theresa" <TDell@stamfordct.gov>, "McManus, Rosanne" <RMcManus@stamfordct.gov>, "Morris, William" <WMorris@stamfordct.gov>, racquel.smithanderson@gmail.com, "Stein, David" <DStein@stamfordct.gov>

Subject: RE: Marijuana Dispensary

This is what you would see if you were standing in my center where my kids learn!!

How is this NOT advertising to children?? How is this discrete exactly?

Tutor Me SOS help produce the best results for OUR children in Stamford! Our kids deserve better! Our parents and families deserve better!

Please vote NO! My customers and students are uncomfortable having this in this complex. Many are late for their appointments because there is already a problem with the parking.

And to go to the lower parking, my students will have to exit the parking on High Ridge and go left which is extremely dangerous because there is no access to the bottom lot.

Please do not put my students at risks. Please don't jeopardize the safety of my students and my award winning business including the Best of the Gold Coast for many years, for a recreational Marijuana Dispensary. I am confident those people will have no problem driving a couple of extra miles to go to another location.

I cannot afford to move. I just moved into this space and I have a long term lease.

Mona Mitri
Tutor Me SOS

----- Original message -----

From: Mona Mitri <mona_mitri@hotmail.com>

Date: 5/23/23 12:39 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: tdell@stamfordct.gov, RMcmanus@stamfordct.gov, wmorris@stamfordct.gov,
racquel.smithanderson@gmail.com, dstein@stamfordct.gov

Subject: Marijuana Dispensary

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Bull's Head Marijuana Dispensary location. Stamford is against this horrible choice of location for a dispensary. Few proponents of the location argue that Marijuana is legal now, and there should be less hesitation to "embrace" it. Since when was legality a replacement for morality? Does this mean that we should also embrace vaping, since it's legal? The government is hardly a moral compass. Big Tobacco used to advertise to children and groom them to be customers! Even to this day they profit off of addicts who need their product to get through everyday life. Do we want future generations of Stamford residents to crutch on smoking weed to get through the day? We've come so far in almost eradicating cigarette smoking just to have weed take its place. Approving SweetSpot in this location is the approval of subjecting children to the same conditions that children 20, 30, 40, 50 years ago have already been through. Why are we continuing the problem?

Mona Mitri

Tutor Me SOS

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S23+ 5G, an AT&T 5G smartphone



From: Peter Suciu <petersuciu@yahoo.com>
Date: May 23, 2023 at 1:21:14 PM EDT
To: "Dell, Theresa" <TDell@stamfordct.gov>
Subject: marijuana use

My name is Peter Suciu
For helping this Neighborhood
Please do not introduce marijuana in our Neighborhood.

That will not help at all.
Thank you
Peter

From: Jeanette Bilcznianski <biltro96@gmail.com>
Date: May 23, 2023 at 4:23:49 PM EDT
To: "Dell, Theresa" <TDell@stamfordct.gov>
Cc: "Blessing, Ralph" <RBlessing@stamfordct.gov>
Subject: **Public Comment Application 223-17**

Good afternoon,

One more point regarding a request to add a public hearing at the Planning Board Level for Cannabis Dispensaries as part of zoning regulations:

It is imperative to hear from the public rather than abstaining from voting. Planning Board members would have more information to cast their votes and have their views supported rather than hearing about personal narratives from the developer's representative and other board members. The fact that only two people voted for the Bull's Head dispensary and it passed is also problematic. There should be a majority or 2/3 requirement to pass. If a public hearing had been required, maybe the outcome would have been different and the application would not have advanced to the Zoning Board.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Be well,
Jeanette

From: Barry Michelson <bmichelson@optonline.net>

Date: May 23, 2023 at 5:29:26 PM EDT

To: "Dell, Theresa" <TDell@stamfordct.gov>

Cc: Joseph Andreana <rightfield75@yahoo.com>, Paula Waldman <paulawaldman@bhhsne.com>, Stephen Garst <sgarst@promo-consultants.com>, Mike Battinelli <mbatt6@aol.com>

Subject: Denial Application 223-17

Stamford Neighborhoods Coalition

We do not support Application 223-17

Recommend Denial

The Act

Senate Bill No. 1201

June Special Session, Public Act No. 21-1

AN ACT CONCERNING RESPONSIBLE AND EQUITABLE REGULATION OF ADULT-USE CANNABIS.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

Sec. 148.(b) Any municipality may, by amendment to such municipality's zoning regulations or by local ordinance, (1) **prohibit** the establishment of a cannabis establishment,

<https://www.cga.ct.gov/2021/ACT/PA/PDF/2021PA-00001-R00HB-06514-PA.PDF>

Let us dispel the myth that cannabis is like liquor. It is not! Federal regulations prohibit the possession and distribution of cannabis and classifies marijuana or cannabis, along with heroin and cocaine, as a schedule one drug with a high potential for abuse, and little to no medical benefit.

Our Zoning Regulations already accommodate Medical Marijuana Dispensaries.

There were over 100,000 drug overdoses nationally this past year. Cannabis has been classified as a gateway to stronger, more addictive drugs. Expanding recreational and adult uses of Cannabis only serves to normalize the use of destructive and potentially deadly drugs.

Public Act 21-1 expressly allows for municipalities to prohibit Cannabis establishment.

It is shocking to think that the Land Use Bureau would propose regulations that would permit cannabis to be sold in commercial districts throughout the City.

Barry Michelson

bmichelson@optonline.net



Dear Mayor Simmons,

I am writing to express my concern about the proposed location for the Sweetspot marijuana dispensary at 111 High Ridge Road. High Ridge Road is a busy area that is popular among families and students, as it is located near businesses that cater to kids. A dispensary in this area would be sending the wrong message to our children and create an unsafe environment for them.

There is a high likelihood that people will be using cannabis in the surrounding area, which could attract people from far and wide and overcrowd the spaces normally used by students and parents.

Stamford has a reputation as a clean and safe city for families to raise their children, and I believe that the proposed dispensary would be a terrible and irresponsible decision. Please reconsider your decision as it can negatively impact our community.

Thank you

Diane and James Mannello
154 Pepper Ridge Rd
Stamford Ct

Dear Mayor Simmons,

I am writing to express my concern about the proposed location for the Sweetspot marijuana dispensary at 111 High Ridge Road. While I support the growth of new businesses in our city, I believe that this particular location is not appropriate for a recreational cannabis store.

High Ridge Road is a heavily-trafficked area that is popular among families and students, as it is located near several schools and educational programs. A dispensary in this area would tarnish its image and create an unsafe environment for children who pass by on their way to and from school.

Although Sweetspot may claim to prohibit drug use in or near the store, it will be difficult to enforce this policy in reality. There is a high likelihood that cannabis consumption will occur in the surrounding area, which could attract people from far and wide and overcrowd the spaces normally used by students and parents.

Stamford has a reputation as a clean and safe city for families to raise their children, and I believe that the proposed dispensary would be a bad decision. I urge you to carefully consider the potential negative impact that this business could have on our community.

TINA AMITI
8 Konandras Dr
Stamford CT 06903

Dear Mayor Simmons:

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed recreational cannabis dispensary, Sweetspot, that is being established in the Bull's head Plaza. I am very upset and disappointed by the decision to locate the dispensary in the Bull's Head area. While I am neutral about the legality surrounding marijuana, I believe the intended location is a bad idea for a number of reasons. The shopping centers on High Ridge Road are busy throughout the day and into the night, with shoppers use every inch of space. The lot is often full, and it is frequently used by shoppers, including parents and children accessing early education facilities in the area.

The addition of a cannabis dispensary would lead to an overwhelming level of activity. Fine Fettle Dispensary is in a more appropriate location near the industrial area of town, where it can manage high levels of traffic. I support small businesses, but I cannot agree with the placement of Sweetspot dispensary in this location. Please help our families and ask them to move to an industrial location away from our children. Our children are already struggling and having a difficult time recovering from Covid. We don't need more problems in our city. We need responsible adults to assist us in this situation. Please help us.

Sincerely,

Lilian Terentino
69 Cove road apt B4 Stamford

Dear Mayor Simmons,

I am very upset about the Marijuana dispensary that might open on High Ridge Rd. I believe that the intended location is highly unsuitable. The shopping centers on High Ridge Road are already overcrowded, and the addition of a cannabis dispensary would only exacerbate this problem. The photographs presented at the zoning meeting were misleading, showing a vacant lot during spring break when many of the businesses were closed.

If SweetSpot were to open in this location, the lot would be overwhelmed by traffic, compromising our children's safety. I appreciate the addition of small businesses to our community, but I do not support the placement of SweetSpot in this location. Help protect our children. We need stricter laws. This is not acceptable to any parents and honestly, it is ridiculous that this idea is even entertained. Any parent or adult with common sense would agree that this location is inappropriate.

Thank you for taking the time to read my letter.

Gene Kugani
38 Quintard Terrace Stamford 06902

From: Mona Mitri <mona_mitri@hotmail.com>

Date: May 27, 2023 at 6:49:45 AM EDT

To: "Dell, Theresa" <TDell@stamfordct.gov>, "McManus, Rosanne" <RMcManus@stamfordct.gov>, "Morris, William" <WMorris@stamfordct.gov>, "Stein, David" <DStein@stamfordct.gov>, "Smith-Anderson, Racquel" <RSmithAnderson@stamfordct.gov>, "Bosak Jr., Gerald" <GBosak@stamfordct.gov>

Subject: Marijuana Dispensary Question

It was brought to my attention that the linen store will be moving up to the second floor so that the dispensary will expand and take over that line store.

I was also informed that there is a request for a permit and a floor plan on the 4,000 sf 1st floor in my building where Tutor Me SOS and Firefly Pediatrics are.

Rumors are that eventually those two buildings will be a marijuana hang out!!!

Can someone please confirm that there is a permit request and a floor plan for that spot? So both 111 High Ridge and 123 High Ridge have permit application and permit for a marijuana dispensary?

Thank you!

Mona Mitri

----- Original message -----

From: Mona Mitri <mona_mitri@hotmail.com>

Date: 5/26/23 12:10 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: tdell@stamfordct.gov, RMcmanus@stamfordct.gov, wmorris@stamfordct.gov, dstein@stamfordct.gov, Rsmithanderson@stamfordct.gov, GBosak@stamfordct.gov

Subject: RE: Marijuana Dispensary video Parking

Good afternoon,

Please watch this attached video clip.

It was taken today at 11:02am on May 26. Tutor Me SOS and Firefly were both closed at that time.

This parking is super tight and already full. Please do not put my staff and students at risk for accidents. Many of my students are late daily because they can't find a place to park.

I am a small business and I cannot afford to move.

Thank you.

Mona Mitri

----- Original message -----

From: Mona Mitri <mona_mitri@hotmail.com>

Date: 5/23/23 1:08 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: tdell@stamfordct.gov, RMcmanus@stamfordct.gov, wmorris@stamfordct.gov, racquel.smithanderson@gmail.com, dstein@stamfordct.gov

Subject: RE: Marijuana Dispensary

This is what you would see if you were standing in my center where my kids learn!!

How is this NOT advertising to children?? How is this discrete exactly?

Tutor Me SOS helps produce the best results for OUR children in Stamford! Our kids deserve better! Our parents and families deserve better!

Please vote NO! My customers and students are uncomfortable having this in this complex. Many are late for their appointments because there is already a problem with the parking.

And to go to the lower parking, my students will have to exit the parking on High Ridge and go left which is extremely dangerous because there is no access to the bottom lot.

Please do not put my students at risks. Please don't jeopardize the safety of my students and my award-winning business including the Best of the Gold Coast for many years, for a recreational Marijuana Dispensary. I am confident those people will have no problem driving a couple of extra miles to go to another location.

I cannot afford to move. I just moved into this space and I have a long term lease.

Mona Mitri
Tutor Me SOS

----- Original message -----

From: Mona Mitri <mona_mitri@hotmail.com>

Date: 5/23/23 12:39 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: tdell@stamfordct.gov, RMcmanus@stamfordct.gov, wmorris@stamfordct.gov, racquel.smithanderson@gmail.com, dstein@stamfordct.gov

Subject: Marijuana Dispensary

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Bull's Head Marijuana Dispensary location. Stamford is against this horrible choice of location for a dispensary. Few proponents of the location argue that Marijuana is legal now, and there should be less hesitation to "embrace" it. Since when was legality a replacement for morality? Does this mean that we should also embrace vaping, since it's legal? The government is hardly a moral compass. Big Tobacco used to advertise to children and groom them to be customers! Even to this day they profit off of addicts who need their product to get through everyday life. Do we want future generations of Stamford residents to crutch on smoking weed to get through the day? We've come so far in almost eradicating cigarette smoking just to have weed take its place. Approving SweetSpot in this location is the approval of subjecting children to the same conditions that children 20, 30, 40, 50 years ago have already been through. Why are we continuing the problem?

Mona Mitri
Tutor Me SOS