

MOTION

A public hearing process is ideal to ensure public input and accountability during the application process for cannabis licensing. By replicating public notice requirements in existing City code, notice should be required for application, initial public hearing, and appeals. The type of notice that must be given at each stage should be clearly delineated in the ordinance.

Generally, the notice requirements should be consistent with other City noticing requirements, but should allow for email notice to be given when possible. As with most of the City's notice provisions, the applicant should be required to provide public notice at application and before a public hearing.


Moreover, instead of singling out various groups to receive notice, the City should follow the notice procedures generally found in the LAMC, which typically includes notice to nearby addresses and to any resident or community group that requests to be included as an "interested party."

The more transparency that exists on the front end, the better the needs of the community will be served. The public hearing process should be clearly outlined in the Ordinance, and modeled after existing City code. Moreover, the proposed requirements lacked several common provisions governing public hearings such as the findings necessary for approval or denial, a standard of review, and timelines for scheduling hearings and issuing notices of determination.

I THEREFORE MOVE that the CAO, CLA, and other appropriate departments, including the cannabis department, report back on how best to incorporate these best practices into a public hearing process for cannabis.

Presented By: 

MARQUEECE HARRIS-DAWSON
Councilman, Eighth District

Seconded By: 

ORIGINAL

AUG 18 2017

