

From: [Wei Ye](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 1:52:50 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Wei Ye
ye1558@yahoo.com
McKinnon Ave x third street
San Francisco , California 94124

From: [marlene tran](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Marlene TRAN](#)
Subject: Re: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue/ 2400 Bayshore Blvd Re: File No. 210756
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 1:46:06 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Subject: [Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue/ 2400 Bayshore Blvd](#) Re: File No. [210756](#)

Dear Supervisors,

As a longtime volunteer community activist in Visitacion Valley and on behalf of hundreds of residents (and our largely non-limited English speaking residents), we are strongly opposed to a second cannabis store at the entrance to Visitacion Valley. According to our City's current legislation:

*“Conditional Uses require a Planning Commission hearing in order to determine if the proposed use is **necessary or desirable** to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”*

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in **direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter. Why did the Appellants' official submittal misrepresent this fact?**

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably **NOT necessary**. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) **undesirable**.

We do **not** support a second cannabis dispensary in our neighborhood.

Please vote NO on a second cannabis store in our Visitacion Valley community.

Respectfully,

Marlene Tran

From: [Ada Ling](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 1:41:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Ada Ling
sfyl2020@yahoo.com
27th ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Ken Tam](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 1:40:36 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Ken Tam
kentam28@sbcglobal.net
1524 Hyde Street
San Francisco , California 94109

From: wongsam.wong
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 1:37:09 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

主题: **反对位于 5 Leland Avenue/2400 Bayshore Blvd 的大麻零售店面**

尊敬的主管 _____,

我强烈反对在 Visitacion Valley 的入口处种植第二种大麻。根据我市现行法规:

“有条件使用需要规划委员会举行听证会,以确定提议的使用是否对社区来说是必要的或可取的,它是否可能对周围社区产生负面影响,以及使用是否符合旧金山总体规划。”
在与该提案相同的街区有一个现有的大麻药房。不需要第二个大麻药房。

现有的大麻药房面临着巨大的社区阻力。没有证据支持与现有大麻药房位于同一街区的第二个大麻药房的可取性。

纽约市出于很好的理由对大麻药房制定了 600 英尺的半径限制,以避免聚集。关于集群的普遍共识是,如果不加以解决,这种经常有争议的用途的集中将导致商业走廊和周边社区的负面影响。5 Leland 提案试图利用一个非常有限的漏洞来规避 Visitacion Valley 对高度争议使用的保护。与现有大麻药房位于同一街区(距离不到 200 英尺)的第二家大麻药房与纽约市对此事的明确立法和编纂决定直接矛盾。

5 Leland Ave 提案无疑是没有必要的。鉴于社区对第一个提议的抵制,应该清楚的是,第二个大麻药房至少同样(如果不是更多)也是不可取的。

我不支持我附近的第二个大麻药房。请对该项目投反对票。

非常感谢!

(name)

From: [Haulap Choi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 1:35:17 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Haulap Choi
haulapchoi@yahoo.com.hk
325 Campbell Ave
San Francisco , Colorado CA 94134

From: [yanllai Lai](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 12:59:09 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

yanllai Lai
yanllai90@gmail.com
125 mason ST
San Francisco, California 94102

From: [Maria Calles](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 12:56:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Maria Calles
calles.maria@gmail.com
240 oriente st
Daly City , Ca 94014

From: [Phoebe Kuong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 12:55:56 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Phoebe Kuong
kuong1628@gmail.com
1592 28th Ave
San Francisco , California 94122

From: [Doris Kwong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 12:51:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Doris Kwong
emmiek88@gmail.com
40 Rae ave
Sf , California 94112

From: [sandy tom](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 12:51:16 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

sandy tom
mootomtom@gmail.com
2038 43rd
san francisco , ca94116

From: [Christy Tan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 12:45:09 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Christy Tan
christystam@yahoo.com
179 Madrid St
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Lisa Park](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 12:39:34 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Lisa Park
blessingtoyou@gmail.com
301 Crescent Ct., APT 3405
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Guadalupe Lara](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 12:36:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Guadalupe Lara
GuadalupeElara@outlook.com
2420 bayshore Blvd
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Heling Zheng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 12:19:25 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Heling Zheng

helings8899@gmail.com

8200 oceanview ter.ATP.217

San Francisco , Ca94132

From: [Stankey Lee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 12:18:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Stankey Lee
stanleyleehk@hotmail.com
1190 key Ave
Sf, Ca94124

From: [Daoan Wu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 12:18:31 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Daoan Wu
daoanwu@gmail.com
91 Oliver St
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Heling Zheng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 12:18:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Heling Zheng

helings8899@gmail.com

8200 oceanview ter.ATP.217

San Francisco , Ca94132

From: [Justyna To](#)
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Mar., Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Oppose Cannabis Store at 5 Leland Ave
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 12:17:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue/ 2400 Bayshore Blvd

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing my strong opposition to a second cannabis at the entrance to Visitacion Valley. According to our City's current legislation:

*“Conditional Uses require a Planning Commission hearing in order to determine if the proposed use is **necessary** or **desirable** to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”*

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in **direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.**

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably **NOT necessary**. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) **undesirable**.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote NO on this project.

Thanks so much!

--

Justyna "Tina" To
415-830-1235

From: [Yufei Zheng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 12:17:08 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Yufei Zheng
fafaontheway@gmail.com
91 Oliver St
San Francisco , California 94122

From: [Joel Xie](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 3:50:25 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Joel Xie
joelle_11699@hotmail.com
Visitacion Ave
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [tam tam](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 3:41:40 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

tam tam
tam94134@gmail.com
360 Hamilton
san francisco, California 94134

From: [Tiffany LI](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 3:39:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Tiffany LI
Tiffanydailyinfor@gmail.com
77 Guttenberg street
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Tieming Liu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 3:38:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Tieming Liu
tieming438@yahoo.com
438 Wilde Ave
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Yong Luo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 3:37:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Yong Luo
lcbizsys1@yahoo.cim
4019 Mission Street
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Kit Chau](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 3:35:22 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Kit Chau
kitchau438@yahoo.com
438 Wilde Ave
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Lisa Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 3:21:38 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Lisa Smith
Tiger123888@yeah.net
Bayshore
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Amy Zheng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 3:15:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Amy Zheng
q805@yahoo.com
426 Head Street
San Francisco , California 94132

From: [Lisa p](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 3:07:13 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Lisa p
lisap2013@yahoo.com
2143 Quesada Ave
SF, Colorado CA 94124

From: [Chris Delfi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue/ 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 3:06:59 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor's,

I am writing my strong opposition to a second cannabis at the entrance to Visitacion Valley. According to our City's current legislation:

“Conditional Uses require a Planning Commission hearing in order to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary. The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary. The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter. The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote NO on this project.

Thanks so much!

Sincerely,

Chris Fidel
Resident of Visitacion Valley, Leland Avenue

From: [Margaret Ng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 2:58:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Margaret Ng
mng1124@gmail.com
3535 Rivera st
Sf, California 94126

From: [Juan Aucedá](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 2:57:48 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Juan Acueda
acedajuan443@gmail.com
40 Leland ave
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Delmer Andino](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 2:53:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Delmer Andino
rnst_pstrn@hotmail.com
Leland ave
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Carolina Venegas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 2:41:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Carolina Venegas
stephanyv777@gmail.com
40 Leland ave
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Jie Jian Kuang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 2:37:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Jie lian Kuang
jieliankuang24@yahoo.com
201 Schwerin
S f, California 94234

From: [Gloria Asaro](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Cannabis Dispensary
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 2:31:33 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am a longtime resident of Visitation Valley (Little Hollywood section).

I understand there will be a vote by the Board of Supervisors on July 27, 2021 regarding a second cannabis dispensary on Leland Avenue.

I am asking you as a whole to vote against it! We already have one and most residents have stated they do not want another one. For many years we have wanted to see Leland Avenue upgraded, vital and safe. This would deter from that. Also, this violates the 600 ft. restriction per the Planning Code.

The Planning Commissioners voted AGAINST this application last May. I ask that you as a body vote NO on July 27.

From: [Yi Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 1:59:23 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Yi Wong
wkaran@hotmail.com
71 Teddy ave
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Sherry Lau](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 1:58:20 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Sherry Lau
slafu@yahoo.com
1823 41st Ave
San Francisco , California 94122

From: [Peiyang Su](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 1:57:12 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Peiyang Su
peiyang0819@gmail.com
Thrift street x Plymouth
San Francisco , Colorado CA 94112

From: [Carmen Hernandez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 1:53:29 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Carmen Hernandez
Cramenhh@gmail.com
40 Ieland ave
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [sophia liu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:36:26 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

sophia liu
sophialiu320@gmail.com
175 frankfort st
daly city, California 94014

From: [William Fong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:35:40 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

William Fong
fong_kim@sbcglobal.net
1722 41st Ave
San Francisco , California 94122

From: [Nellie Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:27:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Nellie Wong
nellie211@yahoo.com
33rd Ave and Noriega
San francisco, ca. , California 94122

From: [Heling Zheng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:24:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Heling Zheng

helings8899@gmail.com

8200 oceanview ter.ATP.217

San Francisco , Ca94132

From: [Israel.gonzalez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:23:40 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Israel gonzalez
israelgonzalez_54@gmail.com
24454 willimet way
hayward, California 94544

From: [man_wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:12:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

man wong
lumwong@hotmail.com
2928 Vicente
s.F., California 94116

From: [Heric rodas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:10:34 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Heric rodas
hericrodas106@gmail.com
2036 elwin way
modesto, California 95350

From: [man_wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:09:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

man wong
lumwong@hotmail.com
2928 Vicente
s.F., California 94116

From: [Katie.gonzalez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:08:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Katie gonzalez
perezkatie8696@gmail.com
2036 Elwin Way
modesto, California 95350

From: [Raquel_gonzalez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:06:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Raquel gonzalez
gonzalez.k4@gmail.com
24454 willimet way
hayward, California 94544

From: [Suk Ling Tam Ng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:05:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Suk Ling Tam Ng
christinang25@yahoo.com
781 Delta St
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Vicente Milan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:05:14 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Vicente Milan
mian1503@outlook.com
2420 Bayshore Blvd #9
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Yu Qun Chen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 4:49:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Yu Qun Chen
sfdating@yahoo.com
1958 19th Ave
San Francisco , Colorado CA 94116

From: [William Lou](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 4:48:22 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

William Lou
william94121@gmail.com
Weight Ct
Brentwood, California 94513

From: [Lai Tam](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 4:48:13 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Lai Tam
victoriayuly@gmail.com
1391 37th Ave
San Francisco , California 94122

From: [May Zhu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 4:43:48 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

May Zhu
usa4153624471@gmail.com
1056 grant ave
San Francisco, California 94133

From: [george w](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 4:30:59 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

george w
wongsamw@gmail.com
71 teddy Ave
SF, California 94134

From: [Kit Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 4:10:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Kit Wong
kentwong25@yahoo.com
383 Mount Vernon Sve
SF, Can 94112

From: [Ming Sun](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 4:04:26 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Ming Sun
msun201@gmail.com
1647 via fortuna
San jose, California 95120

From: [Rosa Chen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 4:02:56 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Rosa Chen
syc118@gmail.com
Burrows St
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Queenie Li](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 9:29:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Queenie Li
qlm012@yahoo.com
1958 31st Avenue
San Francisco , California California 94116

From: [Ana Euceda](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 9:04:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Ana Euceda
ana.ucedal966@gmail.com
40 Leland ave
San francisco, California 94134

From: [Delma Andino](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 9:00:26 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Delma Andino
molis_2689@hotmail.com
40 Leland ave
San francisco, California 94134

From: [Qi wen Liu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 8:59:48 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Qi wen Liu
wang0v0wang@gmail.com
Silver AVE
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Ondina Aucedá](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 8:48:34 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Ondina Aucaeda
yolibet3@gmail.com
40 Ieland ave
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Veronica Peraza](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 8:48:04 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Veronica Peraza
villanuevaveronica352@gmail.com
40 Leland Avenue
San Francisco California , California 94134

From: [Chun yu Tan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 8:07:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Chun yu Tan
da888chengli@hotmail.com
658 Athens street
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [jiaqi liang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 8:02:36 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

jiaqi liang
yukijiaqi1409@gmail.com
36 Curtis street
san francisco, California 94112

From: [IRENE LI](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 7:34:22 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

IRENE Li
xjfbamboo@att.net
15 Granada aVe
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Kit Chong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 6:37:26 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Kit Chong
kittsechong@gmail.com
2342 31st Ave
San Francisco , Colorado CA94116

From: [Cristina Bandy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 6:32:25 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Cristina Banday
ninaebanday@gmail.com
383 Raymond Ave
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Xiaoling Fong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 6:30:27 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Xiaoling Fong
xyf28@yahoo.com
87 Tioga Ave
San Francisco , California 94134

From: lmckay@pobox.com
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 5 Leland Ave - cannabis dispensary project - OPPOSED
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 6:28:15 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I'm opposed to the 5 Leland Ave project. Planning got it right when it denied this project. The 600' buffer protects neighborhoods from clustering, and there should be no exceptions. The project sponsors lied on the challenge when they said there is "... no other cannabis retail store for 1 mile in any direction ...". There are two. One less than a block away, and another on San Bruno Ave near Paul.

1/ we don't need 2 cannabis retail stores within one block, and 2/we shouldn't reward developers who play so loose with the truth.

Linda McKay
241 Tocoloma Ave
San Francisco CA

From: [María Olmedo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 6:25:31 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

María Olmedo
mariaolnedo38@gmail.com
90 Leland ave
San Francisco California , California 94134

From: [caizhong wu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 6:21:33 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

caizhong wu
wujoe321@gmail.com
89 meda ave
san Francisco, California 94112

From: [Itzury Sanchez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 6:12:18 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Itzury Sanchez
peque0908@gmail.com
40 Leland Ave
San Francisco CA, California 94134

From: [Nellie Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:50:06 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Nellie Wong
nellie211@yahoo.com
33rd Ave and Noriega
San francisco, ca. , California 94122

From: [Hong Liu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:43:24 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Hong Liu
vosogi4385@dmsdmg.com
Frankfurt ST
Daly City, California 94014

From: [Zhaoran Liu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:41:59 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Zhaoran Liu
zhaoran10086@gmail.com
175 Frankfort St
Daly city , California 94014

From: [christina_abass](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:39:17 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

christina abass
christinaguoln@yahoo.com
jonquil
livermore, California 94552

From: [Huanzhan Feng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:38:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Huanzhuan Feng
chulingl@outlook.com
175 Frankfort St
Daly City, California 94014

From: [Anthony Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:38:04 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Anthony Wong
Anthonyk@yahoo.com
37th and Rivera Avenue
San Francisco, Ca. , California 94116

From: [Cody Jaffe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 9:02:27 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Cody Jaffe
cody@codyjaffelaw.com
21 Junior Terrance
SF, California 94112

From: [Wing Pak Tam](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 8:03:29 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Wing Pak Tam
wingpaktam179@yahoo.com
179 Madrid St
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Wai Wah Yu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 8:01:52 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Wai Wah Yu
waiwahyu@yahoo.com
469 Vienna St
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Rebecca Leung](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 7:04:10 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Rebecca Leung
rebeccaywleung@gmail.com
809 Garfield Street
San Francisco , Ca94132

From: [Ying Lu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 5:46:13 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Ying Lu
lu.ying.biostat@gamil.com
Pinon Ave & Marcell
Millbrae, California 94030

From: [Quan Liu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 12:11:07 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Quan Liu
quanliu09@gmail.com
Desmond Street
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Alan Lau](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 12:09:22 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Alan Lau
alanlau1260@gmail.com
Raymond Street
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Alice Lau](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 12:07:38 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Alice Lau
alice1260mpr@gmail.com
Raymond Street
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Quan Liu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 12:05:58 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Quan Liu
quanliu09@gmail.com
Desmond Street
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Ray Liu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 12:04:59 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Ray Liu
qxrlu@gmail.com
Desmond St
SF, California 94134

From: [Ray Liu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 12:04:31 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Ray Liu
qxrlu@gmail.com
Desmond St
SF, California 94134

From: [Hong Wu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 12:00:49 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Hong Wu
xiaohongwu2013@yahoo.com
Desmond St
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Quan Liu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:59:14 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Quan Liu
quanliu09@gmail.com
Desmond St
San Francisco, California 94134

From: dasmith7172@gmail.com
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: No dispensary on Leland
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:57:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

We have one, we don't need two cannabis storefronts on the same block. Please do not allow another dispensary on Leland.

Thank you

Deb Smith

From: [Hui Hui](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 5 Leland ave project
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 10:14:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am opposed to the 5 Leland ave project. We don't need two . We already have one.
Best,
Ken Guan

From: [..M i L d..](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Sucre, Richard \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: 5 Leland ave . Project
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 10:04:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am opposed to the 5 Leland ave project. We don't need two . We already have one.

Best,
Sara Guan

From: [Jianxin Situ](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 9:58:17 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Jianxin Situ
helings8899@gmail.com
8200 Oceanview ter.Apt217
San Francisco , Ca94132

From: [Wankun Luo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 9:53:38 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Wankun Luo
Amy21280@yahoo.com
4800 3rd street
San Francisco , California 94124

From: [Aihong Zeng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 9:50:48 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Aihong Zeng
alicecjzeng@hotmail.com
244 Thrift st
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Zoe Zhang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 9:43:56 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Zoe Zhang
zoeqzhang@yahoo.com
1730 36th ave
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Neildili Auaceda](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 6:46:23 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Neildili Acueda
yolibet3@gmail.com
40 Ieland AVE
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Neildili Auaceda](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 6:45:38 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Neildili Acueda
yolibet3@gmail.com
40 Ieland AVE
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Neildili Auaceda](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 6:44:39 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Neildili Acueda
yolibet3@gmail.com
40 Ieland AVE
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Cinthya Martinez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 6:41:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Cinthy Martinez
Sintinohemi@gmail.com
40 Leland Ave
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Cynthia Martinez](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 6:20:48 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Cinthy Martinez
Sintinohemi@gmail.com
14 Spruce ave
SSF, California 94080

From: [Nancy Aguirre](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 6:12:34 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Nancy Aguirre
ningna@sbcglobal.net
261 Chicago way
San Francisco, California 94112

From: lihma@yahoo.com
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 4:56:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

lihma@yahool.com

50 Lansing

San Francisco, California 94105

From: [Bi ru Xie](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 4:32:34 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Bi ru Xie
bi_xie@yahoo.com
1309Geneva Ave
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Kelly Chen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 4:13:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Kelly Chen
cyfwjh@yahoo.com
4451 Mission st
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Karen Jiang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 3:55:18 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Karen Jiang
wenjiang0918@msn.com
125 Talbert St
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Lihua Deng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 3:42:06 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Lihua Deng
samhd12hd@gmail.com
3551 E 100 th Ct
Thornton , Colorado 80229

From: [Wei Tan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 3:33:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Wei Tan
Weitan6838@gmail.com
225 Berry St, #326
San Francisco , California 94158

From: [Stella Tan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 3:31:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Stella Tan
excelsolutionnow@gmail.com
4527 Lincoln Way
San Francisco , California 94122

From: [Pui Au](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 2:34:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Pui Au
tp8162000@yahoo.com
770 delta st
Sf, California 94134

From: [Jingjing Shi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 1:58:40 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Jinqing Shi
jessihaihao@gmail.com
30 Lydia Avenue
San Francisco , California 94124

From: [Sophia Cheng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 12:11:04 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Sophia Cheng
smcheng68@gmail.com
378 Rio Verde Street
Daly City, California 94014

From: [linda_hui](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 10:46:23 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

linda hui
huilindaxl@yahoo.com
420 Elmira st
sf, Colorado CA 94124

From: [Lewis Wei](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 10:28:48 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Lewis Wei
gearycrs@hotmail.com
685 Geary St. 606
San Francisco , California 94102

From: [Fanny He](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 9:38:30 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Fanny He
fannyholi@yahoo.com
157 Seashore Dr
Daly City , California 94014

From: [Cecelia Ng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 9:30:31 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Cecelia Ng
ceceliang@yahoo.com
80 Seneca ave
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [WENBANG Huang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Sunday, July 25, 2021 10:38:42 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

WENBANG Huang
wenbanghuang@gmail.com
811 Visitacion Ave
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Lai wah Hum](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Saturday, July 24, 2021 10:09:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Lai wah Hum
laiwah37@gmail.com
Lelend st
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Lai wah Hum](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Saturday, July 24, 2021 3:47:35 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Lai wah Hum
laiwah37@gmail.com
Lelend st
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [He Fu ming](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Saturday, July 24, 2021 10:03:44 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

He Fu ming
Fuming1118@gmail.com
167CAPISTRANO Ave
San Francisco , Colorado CA94112

From: [Xizhen Xiang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Saturday, July 24, 2021 9:20:56 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Xizhen Xiang
sunny619sun@gmail.com
1338 E 24Th
Oakland , California 94606

From: [Rachel Orellana](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 11:05:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Rachel Orellana
rachelorellana@yahoo.com
40 Leland Avenue
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Oralia Orellana](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 11:03:31 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Oralia Orellana
oraliaorellana0867@gmail.com
40 Leland Avenue
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Frank Lee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 9:26:36 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Frank Lee
franklee2018@gmail.com
2122 bay shore BLVD
San Francisco , Ca 94134

From: [Frank Lee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 9:25:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Frank Lee
franklee2018@gmail.com
2122 bay shore BLVD
San Francisco , Ca 94134

From: [Frank Lee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 9:23:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Frank Lee
franklee2018@gmail.com
2122 bay shore BLVD
San Francisco , Ca 94134

From: [Shirley Tam](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 9:23:42 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Shirley Tam
wkshirley@yahoo.com
910 Rutland
SF, California 94134

From: [Olga Pineda](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 9:07:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Olga Pineda
pineda.olga1966@gmail.com
40 Leland ave
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Nelva Pineda](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 9:04:29 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Nelva Pineda
nelvapuned@icloud.com
40 Leland ave
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Antonia Rivera](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 9:01:22 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Antonia Rivera
antonia.rivera54@hmail.com
40 Ieland
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Ana Bejaran](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 9:00:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Ana Bejaran
anabenarano1953@gmail.com
40 Leland ave
San francisco, California 94134

From: [Vilma Alvarado](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 8:57:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Vilma Alvarado
vilma1851@gmail.com
40 Leland ave
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Kwai Ian YungChiu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 8:54:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Kwai Ian YungChiu
ceciliachiu8@yahoo.com
1418 38th Ave
San Francisco , California 94122

From: [Oi Ming Chow](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 7:21:25 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Oi Ming Chow
oimingmindychow7313@gmail.com
318 Hale St
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Chunyi He](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 7:18:35 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Chunyi He
chunyihe1975@yahoo.com
2350 Alemany Blvd
San Francisco , Ca 94112

From: [Emily Liu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 7:13:01 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Emily Liu
hong06@live.cn
600 Broadway street
San Francisco , California 94133

From: [Yuen Wong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 8:34:45 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Yuen Wong
kevieepig@hotmail.com
150 Felton st
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Robert Cowan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Oppose cannabis store at 5 Leland
Date: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 7:10:16 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Supervisors,

Please deny the appeal requesting permission for a cannabis store at 5 Leland. The initial hearing was proper and the area is already amply supplied

Robert Cowan, pastor

From: [Moon Ong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 11:24:38 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Moon Ong
spillmoon@hotmail.com
350 Friedell st, Apt 509
San Francisco , California 94124

From: [Po Poon](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 11:21:48 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Po Poon
applewong82@hotmail.com
15 Regent Street
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Yanying Zhang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 9:36:26 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Yanying Zhang
f313257087@gmail.com
5870 Mission St.
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Yuhao Situ](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 9:35:17 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Yuhao Situ
yuhaositu@gmail.com
5870 Mission St.
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Wei Situ](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 9:35:03 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Wei Situ
kpsgty@gmail.com
5870 Mission St.
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Yanying Zhang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 8:41:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Yanying Zhang
f313257087@gmail.com
5870 Mission St.
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Yuhao Situ](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 8:40:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Yuhao Situ
yuhaositu@gmail.com
5870 Mission St.
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Wei Situ](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 8:36:05 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Wei Situ
kpsgty@gmail.com
5870 Mission St.
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [LYDIA Lee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 6:58:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

LYDIA Lee
lydias_Lee@yahoo.com
3801 San Bruno Ave
San Francisco, Colorado CA 94134

From: [Anita Lau](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 6:45:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Anita Lau
ahlau399@gmail.com
43 John st
Sf, California 94133

From: [Sun, K Kong](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 4:35:30 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Sun. K Kong
sunkong51@yahoo.com
345 Wilde ave
San francisco, California 94134

From: [Gilbert Lam](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 4:35:20 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Gilbert Lam
lanyauman@126.com
Ney/Congdon
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Connie Lam](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 3:42:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Connie Lam
minngai@gmail.com
Ney/Congdon
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Hong chen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 3:06:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Hong chen
akamelonman@yahoo.com
64 wabash ter
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Mei Tam](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 2:54:27 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Mei Tam
mei.k.tam@gmail.com
939 Rutland street
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Dong Mei Yu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 10:48:24 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Dong Mei Yu
dongmyu.1969@gmail.com
728 Cayuga Avenue
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Feng Zhou](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 10:48:21 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Feng Zhou
zhou81@hotmail.com
933 Evergreen Way
Millbrae, California 94030

From: [Rong Ti Liu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 10:42:36 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Ms. Clerk of The Board,

As a neighbor and a member of the community, I agree with Planning Commission's decision on 5/27/2021 that the project doesn't meet the criteria for Conditional Use Authorization. We already have a cannabis retail a few doors down. We don't need another one. / 作為鄰居和社區成員,我同意規劃委員會於 2021 年 5 月 27 日的決定,即該項目不符合有條件使用授權的標準。我們已經在幾扇門外有一家大麻零售店。我們不需要另一個。 / Como vecino y miembro de la comunidad, estoy de acuerdo con la decisión de la Comisión de Planificación el 27/05/2021 de que el proyecto no cumple con los criterios para la Autorización de uso condicional. Ya tenemos una tienda de cannabis a unas pocas puertas. No necesitamos otro.

“Conditional Uses require ... to determine if the proposed use is necessary or desirable to the neighborhood, whether it may potentially have a negative effect on the surrounding neighborhood, and whether the use complies with the San Francisco General Plan.”

There is an existing cannabis dispensary on the same block as this proposal. A second cannabis dispensary is not necessary.

The existing cannabis dispensary faced an enormous amount of community resistance. There is no evidence to support the desirability of a second cannabis dispensary on the same block as an existing cannabis dispensary.

The City enacted a 600' radius restriction on cannabis dispensaries for a very good reason, to avoid clustering. The general consensus regarding clustering was that, if not addressed, the concentration of this often-contested use would lead to negative effects along commercial corridors and the surrounding neighborhoods. The 5 Leland proposal is attempting to use a very limited loophole to circumvent Visitacion Valley's protection against a highly contested use. A second cannabis dispensary on the same block (less than 200' away) as an existing cannabis dispensary is in direct contradiction to the City's crystal clear legislated and codified determination on this matter.

The 5 Leland Ave proposal is unquestionably NOT necessary. Given the community resistance to the first proposal, it should be clear that a second cannabis dispensary is at least equally (if not more) undesirable.

I do not support a second cannabis dispensary in my neighborhood. Please vote no on this project.

Rong Ti Liu
rongtliu.1970@gmail.com
728 Cayuga Avenue
San Francisco, California 94112

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I live in Visitacion Valley. We have a place to buy cannabis. We do not need another place that sells cannabis, especially on the same block! Supervisor, please don't overturn Planning.

Sincerely,

JiAODu Xu JiAODu Xu

Visitacion Valley Resident

Arlita Ave SF . CA 94134

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

No neighborhood should have two cannabis stores on the same block. Please do not over turn the Planning Commission.

Sincerely,

 Queenie Lok

Visitacion Valley Resident

Raymond Ave - SF CA 94134

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I live in Visitacion Valley. The Planning Commission got it right when they denied the application for another cannabis storefront at 2400 Bayshore/5 Leland Ave. Visitacion Valley already has a business that sells cannabis. We do not need or want a second cannabis storefront On The Same Block!!

Supervisors, please do not overturn the Planning Commission. Thanks!!!

Sincerely,

 XIU FANG HUANG

Visitacion Valley Resident

Alpha Ave. San Francisco, CA 94134

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am a Visitacion Valley Resident. I do not want a second Cannabis store in my neighborhood less than 600ft from the other one because I believe that our neighborhood needs more youth programming, dining options, and possibly a diversity of produce/groceries that reflects the needs of our communities.

The planning commission got it right. Please read their report. In addition, the applicants have continued to lie to the community.

Sincerely,


Visitacion Valley Resident

Raymond Ave SF CA 94134

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I live in Visitacion Valley. We have a place to buy cannabis. We do not need another place that sells cannabis, especially on the same block! Supervisor, please don't overturn Planning.

Sincerely,



MAN WEN LI

Visitacion Valley Resident

DESMOND ST SF CA 94134

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

No neighborhood should have two cannabis stores on the same block. Please do not over turn the Planning Commission.

Sincerely,

Ruona Guo Ruona Guo

Visitation Valley Resident

DESMOND ST S.F.CA 94134

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I live in Visitacion Valley. The Planning Commission got it right when they denied the application for another cannabis storefront at 2400 Bayshore/5 Leland Ave. Visitacion Valley already has a business that sells cannabis. We do not need or want a second cannabis storefront On The Same Block!!

Supervisors, please do not overturn the Planning Commission. Thanks!!!

Sincerely,

Sou Kent Wong SOU KOEN WONG

Visitacion Valley Resident

Terry Ave. San Francisco CA 94134

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The Planning Code protects neighborhoods against cannabis clustering. Allowing this project to move forward would be in direct opposition to this protection.

Visitacion Valley deserves the same protections against clustering as every other San Francisco neighborhood! The Planning Commission affirmed this.

Sincerely,

 HUI LING WONG

Visitacion Valley Resident

Arleta Ave . SF . CA 94134