

From: [Steve Olsen](#)
To: [Debbie Wetzel](#)
Cc: [Contact Council](#); [Low, Sam](#); [Mead, Jared](#); [Nehring, Nate](#); [Dunn, Megan](#); [Peterson, Strom](#)
Subject: Re: Motion 26-155 Public Hearing July 8 10:30 am - Cannabis Retailer Code Change Proposal in the CRC
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2026 7:13:11 PM

CAUTION : This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

Strongly agree. We do not need any more stores of this nature.
Sent from my iPhone

> On Jul 2, 2026, at 11:26 AM, Debbie Wetzel <debbieleewetzel@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> not directly benefit from any local tax proceeds generated by these sales.

From: [Daniel Salinas](#)
To: [Debbie Wetzel](#); [Contact Council](#); [Low, Sam](#); [Mead, Jared](#); [Nehring, Nate](#); [Dunn, Megan](#); [Peterson, Strom](#); [Low, Sam](#); [Peterson, Strom](#)
Subject: Re: Motion 26-155 Public Hearing July 8 10:30 am - Cannabis Retailer Code Change Proposal in the CRC
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2026 11:45:05 AM

CAUTION : This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

Council Members,

I wholeheartedly agree with Debbie Wetzel's comments on this matter. Please seriously consider the long-term negative effect of this type of decision on our community. It's not just allowing one cannabis dealer to squeeze into a community, it means another loophole for other types of associated businesses to use that are not allowed currently. I have written before on how I saw this happen to the Licton Springs Community of North Seattle over the 28 years I worked for a business in that area. You see on the news how that has turned out. It started with allowing one or two businesses that generate sin tax in, and it ballooned from there. Please be careful not to make the same mistakes.

Respectfully,

Daniel Salinas
425.418.7420

On July 2, 2026, at 11:26, Debbie Wetzel <debbieleewetzel@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Members of the Council - I am submitting this public comment in opposition to Motion 26-155

The residents of Clearview are suffering from participation fatigue. A year ago, we engaged deeply in the original permitting process for Mr. Gahan's proposed location at the Hearing Examiner level. That permit was denied and never appealed. Furthermore, because Mr. Gahan opened illegally anyway, the County was forced to issue a temporary injunction against the operation. We reasonably assumed his efforts were permanently halted. Now, we find ourselves forced back to the table because Mr. Gahan has initiated a code change to bypass that denial.

Let's be entirely clear: this is not a citizen-led initiative. This is a request driven exclusively by a single business owner who does not even reside in Clearview. The Clearview community spent years working to establish our current zoning code. Altering it just a few years later solely for one individual's financial gain is highly concerning—especially when the majority of the community stands in united opposition. There are plenty of appropriate locations inside the UGA for cannabis retailers. It remains entirely unclear why this operator is so determined to rewrite Clearview's Rural Commercial zoning just for his own benefit.

The CRC zone is outside the UGA and must not be confused with it. Established 25 years ago—long before cannabis distance codes existed—the CRC was specifically designed to

provide our local community with neighborhood-oriented retail and personal services. Allowing additional cannabis retailers does not serve the neighborhood, particularly since Clearview already has an existing cannabis retailer. While there is a high volume of commuter traffic passing through our corridor, commuter volume does not justify rewriting community zoning. Furthermore, because Clearview is an unincorporated area and not a city, our community does not directly benefit from any local tax proceeds generated by these sales.

We did the work, we followed the process, and the system worked when the permit was denied. Forcing residents to repeatedly defend their community plan against a non-resident applicant undermines public trust and makes us feel like we are being bullied. Approving this Motion sends a message to the community that the County doesn't care about local residents.

I strongly urge the Council to deny this Motion and preserve the CRC zoning as it stands.

--

I remain,
Deborah Wetzel
206-261-0941

From: vivian-scott@comcast.net
To: [Contact Council](#); [Low, Sam](#); [Mead, Jared](#); [Nehring, Nate](#); [Dunn, Megan](#); [Peterson, Strom](#)
Cc: ["Debbie Wetzel"](#)
Subject: RE: Motion 26-155 Public Hearing July 8 10:30 am - Cannabis Retailer Code Change Proposal in the CRC
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2026 5:56:02 PM

CAUTION : This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

Hello all:

Please add my name to the below comments. Ms. Wetzel puts it a bit more politely than I'm feeling right now when she talks about participation fatigue. I genuinely do not understand why we keep having the same conversation and considerations over and over again. Please deny the code change.

Thank you,

-Vivian Scott

From: Debbie Wetzel

Sent: Thursday, July 2, 2026 11:26 AM

To: Contact Council ; Sam. Low@co. snohomish. wa. us ; jared.mead@snoco.org; Nehring, Nate ; megan.dunn@snoco.org; Peterson, Strom

Subject: Motion 26-155 Public Hearing July 8 10:30 am - Cannabis Retailer Code Change Proposal in the CRC

Dear Members of the Council - I am submitting this public comment in opposition to Motion 26-155

The residents of Clearview are suffering from participation fatigue. A year ago, we engaged deeply in the original permitting process for Mr. Gahan's proposed location at the Hearing Examiner level. That permit was denied and never appealed. Furthermore, because Mr. Gahan opened illegally anyway, the County was forced to issue a temporary injunction against the operation. We reasonably assumed his efforts were permanently halted. Now, we find ourselves forced back to the table because Mr. Gahan has initiated a code change to bypass that denial.

Let's be entirely clear: this is not a citizen-led initiative. This is a request driven exclusively by a single business owner who does not even reside in Clearview. The Clearview community spent years working to establish our current zoning code. Altering it just a few years later solely for one individual's financial gain is highly concerning—especially when the majority of the community stands in united opposition. There are plenty of appropriate locations inside the UGA for cannabis retailers. It remains entirely unclear why this operator is so determined to rewrite Clearview's Rural Commercial zoning just for his own benefit.

The CRC zone is outside the UGA and must not be confused with it. Established 25 years ago—long before cannabis distance codes existed—the CRC was specifically designed to provide our local community with neighborhood-oriented retail and personal services. Allowing additional cannabis retailers does not serve the neighborhood, particularly since Clearview already has an existing cannabis retailer. While there is a high volume of commuter traffic passing through our corridor, commuter volume does not justify rewriting community zoning. Furthermore, because Clearview is an unincorporated area and not a city, our community does not directly benefit from any local tax proceeds generated by these sales.

We did the work, we followed the process, and the system worked when the permit was denied. Forcing residents to repeatedly defend their community plan against a non-resident applicant undermines public trust and makes us feel like we are being bullied. Approving this Motion sends a message to the community that the County doesn't care about local residents.

I strongly urge the Council to deny this Motion and preserve the CRC zoning as it stands.

--

I remain,
Deborah Wetzel
206-261-0941

From: [Debbie Wetzel](#)
To: [Contact Council](#); [Low, Sam](#); [Mead, Jared](#); [Nehring, Nate](#); [Dunn, Megan](#); [Peterson, Strom](#)
Subject: Motion 26-155 Public Hearing July 8 10:30 am - Cannabis Retailer Code Change Proposal in the CRC
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2026 11:26:38 AM

CAUTION : This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

Dear Members of the Council - I am submitting this public comment in opposition to Motion 26-155

The residents of Clearview are suffering from participation fatigue. A year ago, we engaged deeply in the original permitting process for Mr. Gahan's proposed location at the Hearing Examiner level. That permit was denied and never appealed. Furthermore, because Mr. Gahan opened illegally anyway, the County was forced to issue a temporary injunction against the operation. We reasonably assumed his efforts were permanently halted. Now, we find ourselves forced back to the table because Mr. Gahan has initiated a code change to bypass that denial.

Let's be entirely clear: this is not a citizen-led initiative. This is a request driven exclusively by a single business owner who does not even reside in Clearview. The Clearview community spent years working to establish our current zoning code. Altering it just a few years later solely for one individual's financial gain is highly concerning—especially when the majority of the community stands in united opposition. There are plenty of appropriate locations inside the UGA for cannabis retailers. It remains entirely unclear why this operator is so determined to rewrite Clearview's Rural Commercial zoning just for his own benefit.

The CRC zone is outside the UGA and must not be confused with it. Established 25 years ago—long before cannabis distance codes existed—the CRC was specifically designed to provide our local community with neighborhood-oriented retail and personal services. Allowing additional cannabis retailers does not serve the neighborhood, particularly since Clearview already has an existing cannabis retailer. While there is a high volume of commuter traffic passing through our corridor, commuter volume does not justify rewriting community zoning. Furthermore, because Clearview is an unincorporated area and not a city, our community does not directly benefit from any local tax proceeds generated by these sales.

We did the work, we followed the process, and the system worked when the permit was denied. Forcing residents to repeatedly defend their community plan against a non-resident applicant undermines public trust and makes us feel like we are being bullied. Approving this Motion sends a message to the community that the County doesn't care about local residents.

I strongly urge the Council to deny this Motion and preserve the CRC zoning as it stands.

--

I remain,
Deborah Wetzel
206-261-0941

From: [Mark Wilson](#)
To: [Debbie Wetzel](#); [Contact Council](#); [Low, Sam](#); [Mead, Jared](#); [Nehring, Nate](#); [Dunn, Megan](#); [Peterson, Strom](#)
Subject: Motion 26-155 Public Hearing July 8 10:30 am - Cannabis Retailer Code Change Proposal in the CRC
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2026 11:59:22 AM

CAUTION : This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

Dear Members of the Council - I am submitting this public comment in opposition to Motion 26-155

The residents of Clearview are suffering from participation fatigue. A year ago, we engaged deeply in the original permitting process for Mr. Gahan's proposed location at the Hearing Examiner level. That permit was denied and never appealed. Furthermore, because Mr. Gahan opened illegally anyway, the County was forced to issue a temporary injunction against the operation. We reasonably assumed his efforts were permanently halted. Now, we find ourselves forced back to the table because Mr. Gahan has initiated a code change to bypass that denial.

Let's be entirely clear: this is not a citizen-led initiative. This is a request driven exclusively by a single business owner who does not even reside in Clearview. The Clearview community spent years working to establish our current zoning code. Altering it just a few years later solely for one individual's financial gain is highly concerning—especially when the majority of the community stands in united opposition. There are plenty of appropriate locations inside the UGA for cannabis retailers. It remains entirely unclear why this operator is so determined to rewrite Clearview's Rural Commercial (CRC) zoning just for his own benefit.

The CRC zone is outside the Urban Growth Area (UGA) and must not be confused with it. Established 25 years ago—long before cannabis distance codes existed—the CRC was specifically designed to provide our local community with neighborhood-oriented retail and personal services. Allowing additional cannabis retailers does not serve the neighborhood, particularly since Clearview already has an existing cannabis retailer. While there is a high volume of commuter traffic passing through our corridor, commuter volume does not justify rewriting community zoning. Furthermore, because Clearview is an unincorporated area and not a city, our community does not directly benefit from any local tax proceeds generated by these sales.

We did the work, we followed the process, and the system worked when the permit was denied. Forcing residents to repeatedly defend their community plan against a non-resident applicant undermines public trust and makes us feel like we are being bullied. Approving this Motion sends a message to the community that the County doesn't care about us.

As a resident and property owner in Clearview strongly urge the Council to deny this Motion and preserve the CRC zoning as it stands.

Mark M Wilson

From: [Sherri Larkin](#)
To: [Debbie Wetzel](#)
Cc: [Contact Council](#); [Low, Sam](#); [Mead, Jared](#); [Nehring, Nate](#); [Dunn, Megan](#); [Peterson, Strom](#)
Subject: Re: Motion 26-155 Public Hearing July 8 10:30 am - Cannabis Retailer Code Change Proposal in the CRC
Date: Friday, July 3, 2026 3:03:18 PM

CAUTION : This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

Our neighbor residents here in Wheeler precinct agree. This process has been exhaustive for homeowners to keep up with. Let's stop the ongoing game on this topic and uphold the code that has been in place.

Sherri and Gary Larkin
9804 Waverly Dr
Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 2, 2026, at 11:26 AM, Debbie Wetzel wrote:

Dear Members of the Council - I am submitting this public comment in opposition to Motion 26-155

The residents of Clearview are suffering from participation fatigue. A year ago, we engaged deeply in the original permitting process for Mr. Gahan's proposed location at the Hearing Examiner level. That permit was denied and never appealed. Furthermore, because Mr. Gahan opened illegally anyway, the County was forced to issue a temporary injunction against the operation. We reasonably assumed his efforts were permanently halted. Now, we find ourselves forced back to the table because Mr. Gahan has initiated a code change to bypass that denial.

Let's be entirely clear: this is not a citizen-led initiative. This is a request driven exclusively by a single business owner who does not even reside in Clearview. The Clearview community spent years working to establish our current zoning code. Altering it just a few years later solely for one individual's financial gain is highly concerning—especially when the majority of the community stands in united opposition. There are plenty of appropriate locations inside the UGA for cannabis retailers. It remains entirely unclear why this operator is so determined to rewrite Clearview's Rural Commercial zoning just for his own benefit.

The CRC zone is outside the UGA and must not be confused with it. Established 25 years ago—long before cannabis distance codes existed—the CRC was specifically designed to provide our local community with neighborhood-oriented retail and personal services. Allowing additional cannabis retailers does not serve the neighborhood, particularly since Clearview already has an existing cannabis retailer. While there is a high volume of commuter traffic passing through our corridor, commuter volume does not justify rewriting community zoning.

Furthermore, because Clearview is an unincorporated area and not a city, our community does not directly benefit from any local tax proceeds generated by these sales.

We did the work, we followed the process, and the system worked when the permit was denied. Forcing residents to repeatedly defend their community plan against a non-resident applicant undermines public trust and makes us feel like we are being bullied. Approving this Motion sends a message to the community that the County doesn't care about local residents.

I strongly urge the Council to deny this Motion and preserve the CRC zoning as it stands.

--

I remain,
Deborah Wetzel
206-261-0941

From: [JAMES W SNYDER](#)
To: [Contact Council](#)
Subject: Cannabis shops in Clearview
Date: Monday, July 6, 2026 8:11:09 PM

CAUTION : This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

Dear Council members, we are opposed to more cannabis shops in the Clearview area. We have lived in Clearview since 1977 and believe that more cannabis shops would degrade our community. There are already more of these shops here than are necessary. Jim and Marilyn Snyder

From: [Dunn, Megan](#)
To: [Contact Council](#)
Subject: FW: PUBLIC HEARING ON CANNABIS SHOP CODE CHANGE
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 10:37:56 AM

Megan Dunn | *Snohomish County Council Chair, District 2*

O: (425) 388-3494 | megan.dunn@snoco.org

Pronouns: she/her/hers

NOTICE: All emails and attachments sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56).

From: bruce thomas

Sent: Monday, July 6, 2026 11:35 PM

To: Mead, Jared ; Dunn, Megan ; Low, Sam ; Nehring, Nate ; Peterson, Strom

Subject: PUBLIC HEARING ON CANNABIS SHOP CODE CHANGE

CAUTION : This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

Dear Councilmembers:

We are writing as concerned citizens that the code change for the distance between cannabis shops **not** be allowed to be changed for one business owner, specifically Hangar 420 and his shop at 180th and Highway 9.

It was a hard fought struggle a few years ago for the Clearview community to get the present code of 10,000 feet distance between cannabis shops.

It is wrong to change that code now because one business owner, not even a resident of Clearview is our understanding, wants the code changed and has deposited monies into each of your coffers, as well as to others in the County in order to sway your votes. Also, that business owner knew what the code was prior to purchasing his shop at 180th and Highway 9. It seems a bit after the fact and presumptuous to purchase the business building and then work for a few years giving donations and showing up at Council meetings to try to change the minds of the Council to his favor.

Meanwhile the citizens who do live in Clearview and who have worked hard to improve the business character of the city are not making monetary investments to get their way. They followed the lawful process in previous years, and there is no need to make any change to that code.

The majority of the Clearview residents clearly spoke a few years ago and that has not changed from all indications of letters, conversations, and input.

Again, one individual should not be the source of a dynamic code change that the majority of the residents do not want.

We are asking that the Council NOT approve this code change from the current 10,000 foot distance between cannabis shops in Clearview.

Thank you,

Bruce and Joan Thomas

Bothell residents but concerned about codes being upheld and citizens' concerns being foremost.

From: [PETE AND KATE GROSVENOR](#)
To: [Contact Council](#); [Low, Sam](#); [Mead, Jared](#); [Nehring, Nate](#); [Dunn, Megan](#); [Peterson, Strom](#)
Subject: Re: Motion 26-155 Public Hearing July 8 10:30 am - Cannabis Retailer Code Change Proposal in the CRC
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 10:00:21 PM

CAUTION : This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

Excuse me, I hit "Send" by mistake before I finished composing my message.

Here is my intended message:

I wish to express my continued opposition to any change which would allow additional cannabis dispensaries to operate in the Clearview CRC.

The change would benefit one particular type of business against the greater needs of the residents of the Clearview area. Some members of the Council may be aware of the efforts several years ago by Clearview residents to restrict cannabis dispensaries in Clearview. This previous effort was in response to a cluster of several dispensaries that operated along a short stretch of SR 9 centered on Clearview. That cluster raised a variety of concerns among residents. This past action by local residents helped create the ordinances that are currently on the books.

Any change to separation distances sets a bad precedent whereby businesses with sufficient financial resources could subvert the intent of the Growth Management Act specifically for the CRC. This could lead to unnecessary and unwanted development, which would be especially harmful to Clearview.

As I understand it, there is a further proposal under discussion to change the separation distance requirements for many portions of Snohomish County, with Clearview CRC's distance dropping from 10,000 feet to 2,500 feet. This could allow more than two dispensaries to operate in Clearview, thus creating the clustering of dispensaries that local residents previously rejected.

The Planning Commission staff recently supported the idea of having dispensary separation distances consistent across Snohomish County. While consistency is often desirable, Clearview should have larger separation distances because Clearview's situation is unique. The Clearview CRC is one of very few places in the state with a commercial development zone outside of the County's urban growth boundary. In the Clearview CRC, we only have room for a small group of businesses. Allowing more dispensaries would reduce the opportunity to attract more diverse businesses to the limited commercial area.

The Clearview area already has access to at least three dispensaries within a 15 minute drive. We can reach a second dispensary faster than we can reach a second grocery store or pharmacy. Clearview needs more diverse businesses that serve a wider range of needs for its residents.

Please do not allow additional dispensaries to operate in the Clearview area.

Sincerely,
Peter Grosvenor
16008 95th Avenue SE
Snohomish, WA 98296

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: PETE AND KATE GROSVENOR

Sent: Tuesday, 07 July 2026 21:53:50

To: Contact Council ; Sam. Low@co. snohomish. wa. us ; jared.mead@snoco.org ; Nehring, Nate ; megan.dunn@snoco.org ; Peterson, Strom

Subject: Motion 26-155 Public Hearing July 8 10:30 am - Cannabis Retailer Code Change Proposal in the CRC

I wish to express my continued opposition to any change which would allow additional cannabis dispensaries to operate in the Clearview CRC.

The change would benefit one particular type of business against the greater needs of the residents of the Clearview area. Some members of the Council may be aware of the efforts several years ago by Clearview residents to restrict cannabis dispensaries in Clearview. This previous effort was in response to a cluster of several dispensaries that operated along a short stretch of SR 9 centered on Clearview. That cluster raised a variety of concerns among residents. This past action by local residents helped create the ordinances that are currently on the books.

Further, any change to separation distances sets a bad precedent whereby businesses with sufficient financial resources could subvert the intent of the Growth Management Act specifically for the CRC. This could lead to unnecessary and unwanted development, which would be especially harmful to Clearview.

As I understand it, there is a further proposal under discussion to change the separation distance requirements for many portions of Snohomish County, with Clearview CRC's

distance dropping from 10,000 feet to 2,500 feet. This could allow more than two dispensaries to operate in Clearview, this creating the clustering of dispensaries that local residents previously rejected.

The Planning Commission staff recently supported the idea of having dispensary separation distances consistent across Snohomish County. Clearview should have larger separation distances because Clearview's situation is unique. The Clearview CRC is one of very few places in the state with a commercial development zone outside of the County's urban growth boundary. In the Clearview CRC, we only have room for a small group of businesses. Allowing more dispensaries would reduce the opportunity to attract more diverse businesses to the limited area.

The Clearview area already has access to at least three dispensaries within a 15 minute drive. We can reach a second dispensary faster than we can reach a second grocery store or pharmacy. Clearview needs more diverse businesses that serve a wider range of needs for its residents.

Please do not allow

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Debbie Wetzel

Sent: Thursday, July 2, 2026 11:26:34 AM

To: Contact Council ; Sam. Low@co. snohomish. wa. us ; jared.mead@snoco.org ; Nehring, Nate ; megan.dunn@snoco.org ; Peterson, Strom

Subject: Motion 26-155 Public Hearing July 8 10:30 am - Cannabis Retailer Code Change Proposal in the CRC

Dear Members of the Council - I am submitting this public comment in opposition to Motion 26-155

The residents of Clearview are suffering from participation fatigue. A year ago, we engaged deeply in the original permitting process for Mr. Gahan's proposed location at the Hearing Examiner level. That permit was denied and never appealed. Furthermore, because Mr. Gahan opened illegally anyway, the County was forced to issue a temporary injunction against the operation. We reasonably assumed his efforts were permanently halted. Now, we find ourselves forced back to the table because Mr. Gahan has initiated a code change to bypass that denial.

Let's be entirely clear: this is not a citizen-led initiative. This is a request driven exclusively by a single business owner who does not even reside in Clearview. The Clearview community spent years working to establish our current zoning code. Altering it just a few years later solely for one individual's financial gain is highly concerning—especially when the majority

of the community stands in united opposition. There are plenty of appropriate locations inside the UGA for cannabis retailers. It remains entirely unclear why this operator is so determined to rewrite Clearview's Rural Commercial zoning just for his own benefit.

The CRC zone is outside the UGA and must not be confused with it. Established 25 years ago—long before cannabis distance codes existed—the CRC was specifically designed to provide our local community with neighborhood-oriented retail and personal services. Allowing additional cannabis retailers does not serve the neighborhood, particularly since Clearview already has an existing cannabis retailer. While there is a high volume of commuter traffic passing through our corridor, commuter volume does not justify rewriting community zoning. Furthermore, because Clearview is an unincorporated area and not a city, our community does not directly benefit from any local tax proceeds generated by these sales.

We did the work, we followed the process, and the system worked when the permit was denied. Forcing residents to repeatedly defend their community plan against a non-resident applicant undermines public trust and makes us feel like we are being bullied. Approving this Motion sends a message to the community that the County doesn't care about local residents.

I strongly urge the Council to deny this Motion and preserve the CRC zoning as it stands.

--

I remain,
Deborah Wetzel
206-261-0941

From: [Joshua Estes](#)
To: [Nehring, Nate](#); [Dunn, Megan](#); [Low, Sam](#); [Mead, Jared](#); [Peterson, Strom](#)
Cc: [Contact Council](#); [Sean O Sullivan](#)
Subject: Opposition to Motion 26-155 - Cannabis Zoning Docket Proposal - Testimony Attached
Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2026 7:52:05 AM
Attachments: [image.png](#)
[Testimony Before the Snohomish County Council - Opposition to Motion 26-155.pdf](#)

CAUTION : This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

Good Morning Council Members,

I will not be able to attend this morning's hearing due to a conflict. I am formally submitting my testimony on behalf of my retail Client, The Kushery. Please reach out if there are any questions that I can help clarify. For the record, I am testifying in strong opposition to advancing this proposal.

Respectfully Submitted,



Josh Estes, PNWRS

Testimony Before the Snohomish County Council
Regarding Proposed Motion for Final Docket XXII

July 8, 2026

To: Council President Nate Nehring, Council Vice President Megan Dunn, Council Member Strom Peterson, Council Member Jared Mead and Council Member Sam Low

Good afternoon.

For the record, my name is Joshua Estes. I am a resident of Marysville, Washington, and I am appearing today on behalf of my client, Licensed Cannabis Retail Operator, DbA “The Kushery,” in opposition to the proposed motion to include File No. 25-118727 submitted by J&L Properties of Washington, LLC and PG Management, LLC on Final Docket XXII.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on this important matter.

I respectfully urge the Council to deny this request and decline to advance this proposal.

This is not simply a question of whether one cannabis retailer should receive relief from an existing zoning requirement. It is a question of whether Snohomish County will continue to administer its Comprehensive Plan and zoning code fairly, consistently, and comprehensively, or whether it will begin making isolated exceptions that benefit individual property owners while ignoring broader policy questions affecting every cannabis license holder and every community in the county.

The County has spent years developing a comprehensive regulatory framework governing cannabis businesses. That framework represents a balance between land use compatibility, public policy, neighborhood expectations, market competition, and state licensing requirements. If that framework is going to be revisited, it should be revisited in its entirety—not one section at a time, not one applicant at a time, and certainly not for the benefit of a single property owner.

This proposal fails that test.

More importantly, approving this proposal for further processing would establish a precedent that individual operators may obtain zoning relief through piecemeal amendments rather than through comprehensive policy review. That is not sound planning.

This Is a Spot Accommodation, Not Comprehensive Planning

The proposed amendment does not seek to modernize the County's cannabis regulations as a whole.

Instead, it requests a very narrow modification that affects a single zoning district and ultimately benefits a single property that knowingly operated contrary to the County's zoning regulations from the outset.

That distinction matters.

The applicant was not surprised by the County's code.

The applicant was not subjected to a recently adopted ordinance.

The applicant knowingly established operations despite the existing separation requirements and now asks the County to amend those requirements after the fact.

Land use policy should not reward that approach.

Doing so sends the wrong message to every other business owner who invested time and resources identifying compliant locations before making significant financial commitments.

On behalf of Josh Shade and The Kushery, I can tell you that my client has made significant investments based upon the County's existing code. Like many other operators throughout Snohomish County, those investments were made only after carefully evaluating compliant locations, accepting the limitations imposed by County regulations, and making business decisions accordingly.

Many operators have invested substantial resources because they chose to follow the County's rules as written.

Changing those rules now to accommodate a business that knowingly occupied a location inconsistent with the County's zoning code unfairly disadvantages every operator who respected those regulations from the beginning.

That is neither equitable nor consistent with good governance.

Comprehensive Reform Must Mean Comprehensive Reform

If the Council believes the County's cannabis regulations deserve review, then that review should include every major component of the regulatory framework.

It should not focus exclusively on one separation standard benefiting one applicant.

A true policy review should include:

- The overall cap on retail cannabis licenses permitted within Snohomish County.
- Separation requirements from schools, parks, childcare facilities, recreation centers, libraries, and other protected uses.
- Commercial zoning districts where cannabis retailers may be permitted.
- Separation distances between cannabis retailers.
- Whether existing inter-store separation requirements continue to serve any legitimate planning purpose.

If market competition—not government regulation—is the desired policy objective, then the County should eliminate retailer-to-retailer separation requirements entirely and allow market forces to determine appropriate locations.

Government should not artificially shield businesses from competition.

Likewise, government should not selectively eliminate competition restrictions only where doing so benefits a single applicant.

Those are fundamentally different policy choices.

If the County wishes to modernize its regulations, it should evaluate the entire framework simultaneously and apply those changes equally across every zoning district and every licensed operator.

Anything less amounts to special treatment.

Multiple Active Cannabis Proposals Require a Unified Review

This proposal is also procedurally premature.

There are currently multiple active proposals involving cannabis land use regulations before Snohomish County.

The Planning Commission has recently received testimony and staff reports regarding a separate zoning ordinance amendment that aims addresses many of the same cannabis land use issues. That proposal raises competing policy questions and concerns and, in many respects, presents a broader approach than the isolated amendment before you today. We are also noted in opposition to this proposal as well, as it is also not a comprehensive review of the code.

It would be inappropriate for the Council to advance one proposal while other cannabis-related proposals remain active and under consideration.

Doing so risks prejudging broader policy questions before the complete legislative record has been developed.

It also creates the possibility of inconsistent recommendations, conflicting ordinances, or unintended consequences requiring additional amendments shortly thereafter.

The better course is straightforward.

Complete a comprehensive review of all cannabis related sections of the code.

Evaluate them together.

Receive public testimony on the entire regulatory framework.

Then determine whether comprehensive amendments are warranted.

That is how comprehensive planning is intended to function.

Inconsistent Information Demonstrates the Need for Broader Review

There is another reason why this proposal should not advance at this time.

During recent Planning Commission proceedings involving a separate cannabis zoning ordinance amendment, Planning and Development Services staff presented information regarding portions of the County's cannabis zoning regulations that appears to have been inaccurate or, at minimum, inconsistent with how those regulations have historically been interpreted and administered.

Those inconsistencies are significant.

They demonstrate that there is not yet a consistent understanding of the County's cannabis zoning ordinance as a whole.

We intend to provide additional testimony addressing those inconsistencies when that separate proposal comes before the Council.

However, the existence of those inconsistencies reinforces why this Council should not move forward with isolated amendments benefiting individual properties before first undertaking a comprehensive review of the entire regulatory framework.

Before changing one section of the code, the County should ensure there is a clear and consistent understanding of all of it.

Fairness Requires Equal Treatment

Every property owner should be treated equally under the law.

Every business should compete under the same rules.

Every applicant should have equal access to the planning process.

The County should not establish a precedent whereby one operator receives individualized legislative relief after knowingly locating in conflict with existing County code while every other operator continues to comply with those same regulations.

That is not equal treatment.

It creates winners and losers based not upon sound land use policy, but upon who seeks a legislative exception.

Public confidence in the planning process depends upon consistency.

Rules should apply equally to everyone.

If those rules are to be changed, they should be changed comprehensively and equally for everyone.

Good Planning Requires Looking Beyond One Property

The purpose of the Comprehensive Plan is to establish long-term public policy for the benefit of the entire county.

It is not intended to resolve individual property issues.

The appropriate question before the Council is not whether this amendment benefits one applicant.

The appropriate question is whether this amendment improves County policy for all current and future property owners, businesses, and residents.

This proposal does not.

It simply creates a narrow accommodation benefiting one operator while leaving the remainder of the County's cannabis regulatory framework untouched.

That is piecemeal planning.

Conclusion

For these reasons, and on behalf of my client, Josh Shade and The Kushery, I respectfully request that the Snohomish County Council deny the proposed motion to include File No. 25-118727 on Final Docket XXII.

If the Council determines that cannabis zoning regulations should be reconsidered, that review should occur comprehensively and holistically. It should include retail license limits, separation requirements from protected uses, retailer-to-retailer separation distances, eligible zoning districts, and every other component of the County's cannabis regulatory framework.

Only after all active cannabis-related proposals have been evaluated together, supported by accurate staff analysis and a complete public record, should the Council consider whether amendments are appropriate.

Anything less risks creating the appearance—and the reality—of a legislative process that provides special accommodation to one property owner while expecting every other business to continue operating under rules they accepted and followed.

I respectfully ask the Council to preserve the integrity of the Comprehensive Plan process, maintain fairness for every operator, and deny the motion before you.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Joshua Estes". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Josh Estes, Managing Partner
Pacific NW Regional Strategies, LLC