

From: [Wilber Rosales](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:36:59 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.

Wilber Rosales
wilberosales84@gmail.com
40 Leland
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Anselmo 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 11:37:05 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.

Anselmo Sanchez
chemosm@yahoo.com
40 leland ave
San francisco, California 94134

From: [Jeziel Rosales](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:39:34 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.

Jeziel Rosales
jezielrosales13@gmail.com
40 Leland
San Francisco , California 94111

From: [Jessica De la Cruz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:40:28 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.

Jessica De la Cruz
1shanyprincess@gmail.com
40 Ieland
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Samantha Rosales](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:41:01 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.

Samantha Rosales
shany1600@att.net
40 Leland
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Christian Mata](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:44:09 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.

Christian Mata
christianmata940@yahoo.com
733 Filbert Street
San Francisco, California 94133

From: [Onorio Orellana](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:51:54 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.

Onorio Orellana
onoriooa@gmail.com
1433 Marelia Ct
San Pablo, California 94806

From: [Elaine Ding](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:57:55 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.

Elaine Ding
elainedingusa@gmail.com
5851 Mission St.
San Francisco , California 94112

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 11:59:44 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.

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

From: [Info BetterHousingPolicies.org](http://Info.BetterHousingPolicies.org)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 2:51:16 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.

Info BetterHousingPolicies.org
info@betterhousingpolicies.org
945 Taraval Street #167
San Francisco, California 94116

From: [Amy Chen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 2:55:57 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.

Amy Chen

amy080chen@gmail.com

My relatives live in Leland & Delta

San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Josephine Zhao](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 3:06:47 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.

Josephine Zhao
josephine_zhao@yahoo.com
Our community in Visitation Valley
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94134

From: [Jenny Choy](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 3:09:41 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.

Jenny Choy
jennychoy1000@gmail.com
100 block of Raymond Ave
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94134

From: [Baiping Xie](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 3:58:56 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.

Baiping Xie
bp_xie@yahoo.com
10719 Verawood Dr
Riverview , Florida 33579

From: [zong li feng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 8:50:01 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.

zong li feng
zlf94112@gmail.com
55 Oliver St
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [mei.ling.feng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 8:51:01 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.

mei ling feng
mlf94112@gmail.com
55 Oliver St
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Kevin Feng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 8:51:59 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.

Kevin Feng
knjfeng2@gmail.com
55 Oliver St
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [ning kun Feng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 8:52:18 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.

ning kun Feng
kev81421@gmail.com
55 Oliver St
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Melinda Yuen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 9:18:10 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.

Melinda Yuen
vincentyy168@gmail.com
775 Mcallister St. apt J
San Francisco , California California 94102

From: [Xiao Zhu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 10:23:57 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.

Xiao Zhu
ying6578@yahoo.com
259 Dublin Street
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Bo Jun Xiao](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 10:25:37 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.

Bo Jun Xiao
jeff.xiao@att.net
75 Oliver St
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Mike Liang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 10:29:25 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.

Mike Liang
mikel32804@gmail.com
Geneva Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Mei Yan Zeng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 10:38:06 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.

Mei Yan Zeng
meiyannatalie@gmail.com
298 Oliver st
Daly City, California 94014

From: [Jiantong Kuang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 10:44:29 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.

Jiantong Kuang
jiantong618@hotmail.com
271 Bright St
San Francisco, California 94132

From: [Xiuling Feng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 10:58:23 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.

Xiuling Feng
xiulingf@yahoo.com
Revere and third
St, California 94124

From: [Michelle zhang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 11:07:56 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.

Michelle zhang
michelle_zjb@yahoo.com
247 Bright street
san Francisco, California 94132

From: [Lai Yee Au](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 11:27:29 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.

Lai Yee Au
laiyeeau@gmail.com
48 Peabody Street
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Liqing Zhang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 11:31:01 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.

Liqing Zhang
lzh0318@hotmail.com
Geneva ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Xiaozhen Xiao](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 11:43:40 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.

Xiaozhen Xiao
xiaoxiaozhen@hotmail.com
20 Byron ct
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Chenyun Li](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 11:46:26 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.

Chenyun Li
alysiali888@yahoo.com
89 Farragut Ave
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Yue Yuan Ruan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 7:27:30 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.

Yue Yuan Ruan
joyceyruan0809@gmail.com
263 Madrid street
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Yue Yuan Ruan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 7:31:01 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.

Yue Yuan Ruan
joyceyruan0809@gmail.com
263 Madrid street
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Jean L 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 8:42:29 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.

Jean L Lau
jlau368@gmail.com
391 Capistrano Ave
San Francisco , Ca 94112

From: [Kai M. 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 8:47:35 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.

Kai M Lau
klau8338@gmail.com
391 Capistrano Ave
San Francisco , Ca 94112

From: [Marlene TRAN](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 9:59:30 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.

Marlene TRAN
tranmarlene@yahoo.com
23 Ervine Street
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Curt Yagi](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 10:19:56 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.

Curt Yagi
curt@rocksf.org
73 Leland Ave
San Francisco, California 94134

From: [Sammi Huang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 10:37:40 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.

Sammi Huang
sam.xm.huang@gmail.com
434 Moscow St
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Rigoberto Rivera](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:24:53 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.

Rigoberto Rivera
riverapainting@hotmail.com
731 Niantic Ave
Daly City , Ca 94014

From: [Lisa Tsang](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:25:03 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.

Lisa Tsang
lisa.tsangusa@hotmail.com
29th Avenue
San francisco, California 94116

From: [Clara Eng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:26:33 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.

Clara Eng
claraeng49@yahoo.com
344 Felton st
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 11:28:17 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.

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

From: [Stephany Rosales](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:29:04 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.

Stephany Rosales
shanns330@gmail.com
295 Miramar ave
San Francisco , California 94112

From: [Godofredo Mina](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:29:36 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.

Godofredo Mina
godomina67@gmail.com
40 Leland Ave.
San Francisco, Ca, California 94134

From: [Jessica Rosales](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:31:19 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.

Jessica Rosales
shany1600@att.net
23370 Nevada Rd
Hayward, California 94541

From: [Oswald Milan Jr](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing a Cannabis Retail Storefront at 5 Leland Avenue and 2400 Bayshore Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:32:42 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.

Oswald Milan Jr
oswald_m@hotmail.com
2420 bayshore Blvd
San Francisco, California 94134

Wong, Jocelyn (BOS)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 9:36 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); Ng, Wilson (BOS); Laxamana, Junko (BOS); Mchugh, Eileen (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: FW: SUPPORT for the dispensary applicant 5 Leland Avenue
Categories: 210756

-----Original Message-----

From: David Goldman <brownie.marysf@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 12:49 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Kenneth Koehn <kmkoehn@gmail.com>; John Delaplane <johnny@access-sf.org>; Quentin Platt <q@access-sf.org>; Bram Goodwin <goodwin.bram@gmail.com>; Michael Bostarr <michaelbostarr@gmail.com>; Keith Baraka <keithbaraka@gmail.com>; Conor Johnston <conorj@otterbrands.com>
Subject: re: SUPPORT for the dispensary applicant 5 Leland Avenue

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

Dear Supervisors:

On behalf of the membership of the San Francisco Chapter of the Brownie Mary Democratic Club, we are writing to you today in strong support for the proposed dispensary at 5 Leland Avenue.

We have known John Delaplane for over 10 years. John and his team are dedicated to the highest standards of professional conduct and integrity. Their South of Market dispensary Project Cannabis is an exemplar. They have also worked assiduously to make 5 Leland Avenue another top notch dispensary, dedicated to supporting the neighborhood. Due to the moratorium on cannabis dispensary applicants several years ago, their application was delayed. This delay should not be construed as lack of support. In fact, many neighbors and businesses to 5 Leland Avenue have expressed strong support for this project.

Like Project Cannabis, 5 Leland Avenue will be a credit to the neighborhood. We urge you to support their application.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Goldman
President, San Francisco Chapter
Kenneth Michael Koehn
Secretary, San Francisco Chapter
Brownie Mary Democratic Club
Brownie.MarySF@gmail.com

https://avanoan.url-
protection.com/v1/url?o=www.BrownieMaryDemClub.com&g=ODAzZTYyYmFIZWZmYzcxZQ==&h=YzA3OGRIYTIyNDU4N
mY5MwY3N2ExMGYyMWZmOTM1ODc4NGRIZjZmOWRmNzJhYTlxMzY1NzZmNGVhZWUwNDg3YQ==&p=YXAzOnNmZH
QyOmF2YW5hbGpvcjgyZDM5MDJhYjQ4ZGM0ZmFiMTU3M2Q0YjgzMGRjNjJiOnYx
Instagram: @bmsf415
m: 415-728-7631

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: agenda item removal
Date: Wednesday, July 14, 2021 2:06:00 PM

From: Gina Tobar <ginatobar@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 14, 2021 10:33 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: agenda item removal

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

There is an agenda item which is set for the Board of Supervisors meeting scheduled for July 27th which is requesting an appeal of a planning board decision and it is based on an untruth.

Five supervisors signed on to place this on the agenda but the statement that they were provided is deceitful because it contains a critical untruth. The appeals asks for review claiming that there isn't a cannabis store within 1 mile of the proposed location, which is fundamentally untrue.

This cannabis business location was rejected by the Planning Commission because local outcry is that the locals do not see a need nor do they want another cannabis business on the same block; and since this area is very suburban/residential with a tiny commercial zone along Leland Avenue of only three blocks (from Bayshore to Rutland), locals don't want it dominated by 2 cannabis stores!

Please tell me how to remove this from the agenda.

Can the supervisors who voted to add it to the agenda let you know that they retract their name? I think that when they learn that the request for a hearing is based on a lie, the Supervisors would want to avoid wasting time in a BOS meeting and certainly wouldn't want the scandal of aligning themselves with this deceitful company.

Thank you for your guidance in this matter.

Kindly,
Gina Tobar, Visitacion Valley resident
925-395-7600 cell
wk cell 415-269-0582