

JOAN JACOBS LEVIE, ESQ.

5310 North Roosevelt Avenue
Fresno, California 93704

559-439-3143
levielaw@gmail.com

To: Fresno City Planning Commission
Fresno City Council Members

This letter is to oppose the proposed Granville development at West San Jose and North Colonial Avenues adjacent to both city and county properties. The original proposal as presented at a neighborhood meeting in April 2016 was for a rental community comprised of 18 two-story residences with a mere six foot setback from the fences separating the proposed project from existing residences. No on-site visitor parking was included in the plan. In August, the Granville design was allegedly changed to 16 units with a 10' setback

The neighborhood is upset about this proposal primarily due to traffic and privacy concerns. In fact, the developer of the next door Seviles complex, offered to buy the property from Granville to keep the integrity of the neighborhood, but Mr. Assemi refused. Neighborhood residents made several overtures to Granville but have not succeeded in meeting and conferring with Mr. Assemi and Mr. Roberts on the project. To the best of my knowledge, the project has not been submitted.

I reside on the corner of Roosevelt and San Ramon avenues. I am troubled by the level of traffic and safety on San Ramon between Palm and Maroa Avenues where people walk and ride bikes. In fact, after the Fig Garden Financial Center was constructed, causing traffic to increase, my son, a Gibson student at the time, was struck by a speeding motorcycle at our corner while riding his bike home from school. After that incident, a single stop sign was erected at Roosevelt and San Ramon. Since then, two complexes were built on San Jose, adding to the traffic. There is no traffic signal at Palm and San Ramon or at Maroa and San Jose. Vehicles can and do travel from Palm to Delmar Avenues to avoid traffic lights. Additional density in this quiet residential neighborhood would require additional traffic lights. There are existing lights on Palm at Shaw, San Jose, Barstow, Browning, and Bullard. a light at San Ramon will be required as well. The air is bad enough in Fresno without increased stop-and-go traffic making it worse.

I am not opposed to infill development at this location. To the contrary, it makes sense when done right without harming neighbors. If done properly with the right esthetics and respect for neighbors it would be a welcome addition. To that end, the development should consist of no more than 12 single-story, owner-occupied residences in keeping with the surrounding area.

Yours truly,

/s/ Joan Jacobs Levie

Joan Jacobs Levie, Esq.

March 3, 2017

Jodi Fitzpatrick, ASID CID CCRM
5326 N. Roosevelt Avenue, Fresno, CA 93704
559-994-6150
jodi@paxdomus.com

To Whom It May Concern,

This letter is written to express objections to the approval of the proposed project at 614 W. San Jose on the northwest corner of San Jose and Colonial Avenues in the Fig Garden neighborhood, APN:417-140-21, and identified within the City of Fresno's Development and Resource Management, DARM, department as Routed Packet C16062 and T6160. I'm a resident of the neighborhood, a certified interior designer, real estate investor, and am completing an infill project at 1479 W. Barstow, a carbon-neutral, completely solar-powered residence.

The first items concern the project application itself. The second deal with how the project in its current form doesn't support or conform to the vision of Fresno's 2030 General Plan.

The Proposal:

1. Tax records list the property's acreage at 1.03. Under the new development code, 12 units would be allowed. Granville's Operational Statement lists the project's acreage as "1.13." Were the property to actually be 1.13 acres, this would allow the 13th unit that this project shows. On the Notice of Environmental Finding dated February 3, 2017, there are two properties listed, this one and EA-16-140HSR. The project on San Jose has its acreage is listed as "+ or - 1.13 acres." EA-16-140-HSR's acreage is listed as 26.94 acres. Period. No plus or minus. The survey included with the application, prepared by Gary G. Gianetta Civil Engineering and Land Surveying, lists in the specifications that the property has "Gross Area = 1.13" and "Net Area = 1.03." Almost every dimension regarding the property and buildings have a "+ or -" symbol next to them. I've had four properties surveyed by two different engineers and all of them show precise dimensions. *That is the point of a legal land survey.* When the neighborhood first met with the second planner assigned to this project (there have been three), they were told that the acreage was being figured from easement at the middle of the road. The developers and real estate people of this group knew this to be erroneous. Given this previous attempt to inflate the acreage, the neighborhood finds this discrepancy (1.13 acres versus 1.03) suspicious. It requests that it be allowed to contract with a civil engineering firm to procure another survey of the property, at its own expense.
2. The "Project Description" of the Operational Statement acknowledges that, "The Bullard Community Plan Policy 4.1.3 states that Medium-Density Development, which was previously designated as 10.37 to 18.15 units per acre, requires a direct access to a major street, and cannot pass through single family neighborhoods prior to intersecting a major street. The policy doesn't apply to this proposed project because the project is being built within the Medium Density designation as single family housing." At the end of the Operational Statement, the section "Project Management and Security," states, "The

applicant currently owns and manages several hundred units in the City of Fresno with its own staff. The applicant/owner will rent and manage the property with experienced professional staff.” A PUD whose units are entirely owned and operated by one entity (or closely-related entities) is a multifamily project by another name. The neighborhood believes this is an intentional misrepresentation of the nature of the project.

3. The Operational Statement notes that “The PD Permit will request approval of reduced lot sizes which range from 1,700 square feet to 4,200 square feet.” Under the new 2030 General Plan rezone, the project has “by right” to develop 12 units per acres on this property. The neighborhood feels that due to the “highly-regarded nature” of the Fig Garden and surrounding community (as defined by Chapter 3.6 of the General Plan), the setbacks and minimum lot sizes stipulated by the development code should be adhered to and these requests denied. If this means fewer units and/or smaller ones, the developer should have taken this into consideration during its discovery and estimating period. It should not be allowed favors and special treatment that enable it to squeeze more and/or larger units onto the property at the expense of the existing community’s “sense of place,” (as defined in Chapter 3.6 D-1 of the General Plan).

The 2030 General Plan Chapter 3.6 Buildings and Design

“Areas such as the Tower District, Huntington Boulevard, Wilson Island, Van Ness Boulevard in the Fresno High Area, and Old Fig Garden possess architectural and urban design characteristics that are highly valued by local residents and businesses. There are other areas in Fresno that are not so well known, but are highly regarded by their neighborhood because of urban design features.”

1. Objective D-1: “Provide and maintain an urban image that creates a “sense of place.”
 - a. The style of the proposed project is lovely for a Copper River/North Fresno neighborhood. It would be at home in any upscale suburban community in the southwestern United States. In that respect, since it could belong anywhere, it lacks a “sense of place.” The buildings are two-story with 10-foot setbacks from the adjacent properties. If this is allowed, the owners of those one-story properties will lose the privacy and sunlight they originally purchased, including the right to make their own solar power. The proposed project’s ceiling heights are 9 feet with 8-foot doors, as opposed to 8-foot ceilings and 7-foot doors. This scaled difference, combined with the elevated building pads now required by code, make the buildings out of scale with the surrounding architecture. The adjacent properties have 20’ setbacks. The proposed project has 10’ front setbacks. A two-story project on a corner that juts 10’ farther out than its neighbors will dominate this neighborhood, and destroy its sense of place.
 - b. “The California ranch home movement produced notable homes in Old Fig Garden.” (General Plan 3-61). This neighborhood is approaching 60 years old. The General Plan notes a historic property as 50 or more years. The homes are classic ranch style and midcentury modern homes, several by noted midcentury architect, Robert Stevens. They are all one-story, with 35-foot setbacks which preserves the historic atmosphere of the neighborhood.

2. Objective D-3: "Create unified plans for Green Streets, using distinctive features reflecting Fresno's landscape heritage."
- a. Two historic deodar cedar trees (the famous Christmas Trees of Christmas Tree Lane) had stood in a City of Fresno easement on the south frontage of 614 W. San Jose for nearly 100 years. Other deodar cedars line San Jose between Colonial Avenue and Maroa Avenue. The neighborhood requested repeatedly for the developers to retain the two trees and incorporate them in the project's landscaping. City preservationist, Karana Hattersly-Drayton, recommended this.
 - b. The developer cut them down several weeks ago, before this project was approved. It employed an unlicensed subcontractor with a crew of 4-5, who carries no workers compensation insurance and provided no traffic barriers to protect pedestrians and vehicles in the neighborhood. Since this action was taken in a City of Fresno easement, the developer put the city in jeopardy of a lawsuit should any injury have occurred. The developer was in the process of cutting down one tree when they were interrupted by the neighborhood. The neighborhood was told were by the developer's superintendent on site that the developer planned to keep the other tree. The neighborhood informed planning, who said they would handle this immediately. Apparently, the developer was fined. The developer returned a week later and removed the last tree, employing the same unlicensed and uninsured subcontractor.
 - c. There is a great contrast in standards and behavior between this proposed project and its developer and the project and development to its immediate east. The Seviles, a 16-unit condominium project on two acres was completed in 2003 by Valley Pacific Builders. It's a model of sensitive and integrated infill building. At the time, city planning required Valley Pacific Builders to keep the two deodar cedars in front of their property. They went to the expense of designing and building a sidewalk that winds among the trees, making for a very attractive frontage for the neighborhood to enjoy. The project was so profitable for this developer that it built a second one a few miles away.

This proposed project fails in every way to support the vision of the General Plan of a vibrant, architecturally-sophisticated metropolis that Fresno has said it wants, and has spent a huge amount of resources in preparing for. Hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars were spent on the 2030 General Plan document, as well as thousands of staff hours. If city planning, the Planning Commission and the City Council support this poorly-designed project, and others like it, they are squandering those funds.

Yes, infill building and affordable housing are two of the city's major goals. However, affordable housing and good design are not mutually exclusive. The city needs to raise the bar to the architectural level that the plan intended. In meetings with this proposed project's developer, it repeated time and again that it had to make a certain profit, therefore our requests were unreasonable. A neighborhood should not suffer an irreparable negative alteration to fit a development company's business plan, one that was designed around lower cost tract building. A smaller company such as Valley Pacific Builders was financially successful with their high quality project. If this development company's overhead is too high to allow it to create a well-designed infill plan profitably, then maybe it should not attempt infill building projects.

The General Plan supposes a sophisticated development community as found in metropolises that are less provincial than Fresno. The planning department and city government have a responsibility to know what's in the General Plan and insure that it works in action as it was designed to on paper by insisting on good quality projects. As of now, there seems to be a disconnect there. As a taxpayer and a third-generation Fresnan, I will continue to pursue this outcome.

Respectfully,
Jodi Fitzpatrick, ASID CID CCRM

October 23, 2016

TO: CITY OF FRESNO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

WHOM ELSE IT MAY CONCERN

RE: PROPOSED ASSEMI PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT ON THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF WEST SAN JOSE AVENUE/COLONIAL DRIVE

AS RESIDENTS OF THE SEVILLE GATED COMMUNITY (562-592 WEST SAN JOSE AVENUE), BORDERING THE EAST SIDE OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT, WE HAVE GREAT CONCERN FOR THE SCOPE & DENSITY OF THE PROJECT. THE DEVELOPER CURRENTLY PROPOSES 2-STORY BUILDINGS WHICH ARE CONTRARY TO THE CHARACTER OF THE EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD (SINGLE STORY HOUSES AND CONDOS NORTH & EAST OF THE LOCATION). THE PROPOSED DENSITY OF SIXTEEN (16) UNITS INCREASES THE VEHICLE & PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC ON THE STREETS LEADING INTO AND OUT OF THE DEVELOPMENT WHICH WILL CAUSE A POOR CONDITION TO BECOME MORE AGGRAVATED. YOU DO NOT NEED TO BE A TRAFFIC ENGINEER TO RECOGNIZE THE EXISTING TRAFFIC FLOW ON WEST SAN JOSE AVENUE CAUSED BY DRIVERS DESIRING TO PROCEED EAST OUT OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD FROM PALM VIA SAN RAMON & COLONIAL IS ALREADY HEAVY. IN ADDITION, THOSE RESIDENTS LIVING ON WEST SAN JOSE, AND THE NEIGHBORHOODS TO THE NORTH, WHILE TRYING TO AVOID CONGESTED SHAW AVENUE, OFTEN USE COLONIAL TO SAN RAMON TO PALM TO PROCEED WEST & NORTH FROM THE NEIGHBORHOOD, CAUSING ADDITIONAL STRESS TO THE OVERBURDENED INTERSECTION OF NORTH PALM & SAN RAMON. THE EXISTING, SHARP "L" SHAPED CURVE AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE LIMITED WIDTH STREETS OF SAN JOSE/ COLONIAL EVEN NOW PROVIDES A CONCERN FOR VEHICLES & PEDESTRIANS

PLEASE UNDERSTAND OUR CONCERNS DO NOT ARISE OUT OF A NOT-IN-MY-BACK-YARD (NIMBY) VIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT. WE UNDERSTAND THE NEED TO 'INFILL' AND WOULD PROMOTE A USE FOR THIS PROPERTY THAT IS LESS DENSE AND MORE COMPATIBLE TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD. WE WANT TO SEE THE SITE DEVELOPED BECAUSE IT IS NOW AN UNATTRACTIVE , VACANT LOT THAT IS A POTENTIAL NUISANCE.

OUR TRAFFIC SAFETY CONCERNS CAN BE IDENTIFIED, ANALYZED, AND QUANTIFIED. TRAFFIC COUNTS CAN BE DONE TO CONFIRM VOLUME. FUTURE IMPACTS BROUGHT BY THIS DEVELOPMENT CAN AND MUST BE PROJECTED, AND RESTRICTIONS OR MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS CAN AND MUST BE IMPOSED ON THE DEVELOPER BEFORE HE IS ALLOWED TO PROCEED.

WE RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THESE ISSUES BE STUDIED AND ADDRESSED BEFORE THIS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PROCEEDS FORWARD. IF SO, WE REMAIN CONFIDENT IN OUR BELIEF THAT IT SHOULD BE DOWNSIZED. ANY CONSIDERATION YOU GIVE IN THAT REGARD WILL BE GREATLY APPRECIATED.

SINCERELY,

JOHN & JANET GOMES

562 WEST SAN JOSE AVENUE , FRESNO, CALIFORNIA 93704-2316

10/25/2016

cyndiparkinson@att.net - att.net Mail

Q All Search

Search All

Search Web

Home

Cyndi



Compose

Archive Move Delete More



Inbox

Drafts (2)

Sent

Archive

Spam

Trash (6)

Smart Views

Important

Unread

Starred

People

Social

Shopping

Travel

Finance

Folders

Recent

Proposed Grandville project and San Jose and Colonial Avenues.

Cyndi Parkinson <cyndiparkinson@att.net>
To Jodi Fitzpatrick

Today at 2:27 PM

When I moved into the area twelve years ago, I moved here because of the county feel. The area is a mixture of City and County properties. This is a sixty year old neighborhood and has a similar feel of Old Fig Garden. The neighborhood is made up of City and County properties, primarily single family homes, single story condo complexes and one older single story gated apartment complex.

The first owner of the Seville Condo's bought at the height of the market 2004/2005. The remaining original owners have over \$400,000.00 invested in our individual homes. These upscale condo's will loose even more value if apartments are built on this site. I'm hoping Grandville can build similar building that are single story and are not taking away the privacy of the residence next door to property. I would like to see single story structures. Owner occupied to insure they will be well maintained. Even building small cottages, would fit the area, like the ones just down the street.

I'm sure Grandville is aware of the petition that was signed by the residents in the area, showing a strongly concerned in regards to this project.

We already have traffic problems in the area and placing this size project on a one acre parcel is only going to increase the traffic problem. There is a bottle neck problem at the corner of San Jose and Colonial Avenues, Colonial Ave. is a narrow street and dangerous. This is a walking neighborhood, which can be seen each and everyday, we do not have sidewalks in most of the area, leaving people to walk on the side of the roads.

I'm hoping that Grandville can come up with something different for a change and be more creative when it comes to infill in older Fresno neighborhoods, and not just build apartments or tract homes.

Cyndi Parkinson

Reply Reply to All Forward More

Print Attachments Links Images Smiley Face More

To Whom it may concern

My late husband bought our property in 1987 we loved the street the park like setting along San Ramon to Colonial

We loved the quiet and built 3 homes and a duplex which his parents owned one we owned two and rented the duplex

He grew up in old fig and he always wanted to stay so we chose this neighborhood for safety, quiet relaxing days

The most rewarding gift is the Walkers some with dogs everyone stopping and connecting, we drive by wave, stop, chat and enjoy our piece of heaven there is even a mother who walks her children to school. Who does that anymore?

You want to build an apartment building with all the extra traffic and visiting traffic of friends and family what would these streets look like?

No more quiet walks the neighborhood would change i hope you've noticed not one car parks on the streets.

Please think, really think about
us as people who love our
neighborhood

Thank You
Shannon Christensen
5295 N Colonial

November 18, 2016

**To: Jeffrey T. Roberts
Granville Homes**

**From: Georgette Andreis
Mike Urrutia**

This letter is being written in reponse to the proposed Granville apartment project at San Ramon and Colonial Avenues in Fresno.

It appears that the developers of this project have shown no respect for the residents who would be affected if this plan proceeds.

The current plan imposes on the privacy of the adjacent residents and severely impacts the value of their residences. The plan also ignores the inherent problems of a transient population and disregards the consequences of increased traffic and parking problems. In addition the proposed project would disrupt the serene and secure nature of the neighborhood as it is now.

We perceive the project as a multifaceted disruption to our way of life and to that of all of our neighbors as well. The proposed apartments do nothing to complement this unique owner-owned residential area.

We are the property owners in the existing neighborhood of San Jose and Colonial Avenues, 93704. We're writing to object to the proposed development by Granville Homes on an approximately one-acre parcel on the northeast corner of these two streets as it was presented to us in an informational meeting on April 26, 2016 at the Bullard High School cafeteria.

We objected to the proposal for the following reasons:

1. Density
 - a. 18 3BD/2BA/2GAR approximately 1800 square-foot apartments.
 - i. The new General Plan states 12-units per acre.
 - ii. Most homes existing homes are 1800-2100 square-feet, but on 1/3-1/2 acre lots.
2. Height
 - a. Two-story in a one-story neighborhood.
 - b. 20-foot roof PLATE vs. 12-foot roof PEAK.
3. Setbacks
 - a. Six foot rear/side, 8-foot front.
 - b. Versus 35-foot front setbacks.
4. Onsite Visitor Parking
 - a. None.
5. Traffic
 - a. Neighborhood has only two exits, onto major arteries.
 - b. There is already a bottleneck at peak hours.
 - c. A Gunner/Andros multifamily project across from the Granville proposed site was cancelled several years ago due to a negative EIR finding on this issue.

Our objections were shared verbally and in writing with a City Planner early in May. Although requested, neither the City of Fresno Planning nor Granville Homes updated us on the project. After an inquiry on July 26, we learned it was assigned to different Planner without our knowledge. Another inquiry on August 1 discovered that the proposal had changed to:

16-unit PUD vs. 18-unit Multifamily
10-foot rear/side setback vs. 6-foot

Our objections still stand on all issues except the setback. We request that the proposal be withdrawn and reworked until it integrates more harmoniously with our existing neighborhood.

1. One story.
2. Density conforms to the code – 12 units per acre.
3. Onsite visitor parking.
4. CC&R's to state that all residences be Owner Occupied.
5. EIR report produced to study the traffic issue.

The point of the new General Plan was to increase density in a way that would enhance our existing neighborhoods. "Density" implies that the elements of a thing become smaller as they become more numerous. To take the scale and size of newer homes on the outskirts of town and insert them into a neighborhood with a different historical scale and aesthetic negatively affects the property values of the existing homes. In a middle-class neighborhood, these property values are often the bulk of the homeowner's net worth. Is this fair to the taxpayers of Central Fresno?

Reject Proposed Granville Project at San Jose and Colonial Avenues, Fresno, 93704

	Name	Address	Phone	Email
1	RONALD DuBois	5258 N. Nantucket Ave.	439 9303	rwmdubois@gmail.com
2	ASILEY Hyatt	592 W. San Jose Ave	906 9961	hyatt.ash@gmail.com
3	Bryan Gollmer	5350 N Roosevelt Ave	940 0544	btgollmer@hotmail.com
4	Emily Alessandri	5350 N Roosevelt Ave	908 3696	ealessandri@gmail.com
5	CAROLYN FRIES	477 W. SAN JOSE	559-2607195	(Carolyn Fries)
6	Kristen Rippee	487 W. Scott	304 6305	KristenRippee@gmail.com
7	Scott Rippee	487 W. Scott	203 5007	scott.riptide@gmail.com
8	REGGIE REED	474 W. SCOTT	227 9199	REEDR302@comcast.net
9	DOUNTA Reed	474 W. Scott	227 7198	
10	Alexandra Szchenyi	5342 N Colonial #102	908 3567	afsz@mr.com
11	NATHAN ROTHE	5324 N COLONIAL #101	288 4761	N3ROTHER@GMAIL.COM
12	Kathy Hrusky	474 W. San Ramon	260 9550	Kathy.Hrusky@fresno.ca.gov
13	Shannon Christensen	5295 N Colonial	431-1148	NO-email
14	Johleen Braham	714 W. San Ramon	960 1464	Keynote.johleen@globalink.net
15	Rick Braham	714 W. San Ramon	908 2003	crb4@globalink.net
16	Lloyd SKEDSEL	756 W SAN MADELE	259 0127	Tayhuni@comcast.net
17	Rhonda SKEDSEL	756 W SAN MADELE	259 0127	Tayhuni@comcast.net
18	Jennifer Berg	5246 N. Colonial Apt A	892 8185	Jennifer.berg1414@gmail.com
19	Kylie Sine, dga	454 W SAN RAMON #101	367 1559	coregidaddy087@att.net
20	Kristi Steer	497 W. San Ramon	240 7046	Kristi.S.Steer@stratix.com
21	Amelia Saldate	5257 N. Nantucket	289 5975	asaldate@fresno.gov
22	Andre Saldate	5257 N. Nantucket	301 4407	
23	Paul Saldate	5257 N. Nantucket	301 4422	
24	Tina Saldate	5257 N. Nantucket	301	
25	Claudia Arguelles Miller	476 W. San Jose Ave	824 4577	Claudia.Arguelles-miller
26	Bob Miller	476 W. San Jose Ave	250 6209	Bob.miller@fresno.gov
27	Diane Erickson	458 W. Scott	559-229-5142	
28	Kalem Kazerian	459 W. Scott Ave	559 289 3094	
29	Janelle Kazerian	459 W. Scott Ave	559 289 3096	
30	P. David Wassmiller	578 W. San Jose ave.	250 8528	vallepoci.FicBui@derse@gmail.com

Reject Proposed Granville Project at San Jose and Colonial Avenues, Fresno, 93704

	Name	Address	Phone	Email
1	DAVID MARMOREJO	514 W. KEATS AVE	559 696-4793	
2	Sidney J Kellas	520 W. Keats Ave	559-227-5141	
3	SYNTHIA DOERNER	532 W. Keats Ave	805-369-6426	
4	Carolyn Sterling	549 W. Scott Ave	255 542-288-8908	
5	Joseph Z. Ozarkian	529 W. Scott Ave.	559 229-082	
6	Ed Smith	519 W. Scott	559 226-2775	
7	Erin Cassell	515 W. Scott Ave.	559 227-1296	
8	Wayne K. Short	545 W SCOTT AVE	559 289-1736	
9	Colleen Short	545 W SCOTT AVE	559 289-1736	
10	ALAIN EKHALIAN	586 W SAN JOSE AVE	559 261-1026	
11	BILL MASON	528 W. SAN JOSE AVE	559 431-3291	
12	Nancy Mason	528 W. SAN JOSE AVE	559 431-3291	
13	Wade McFarson	580 W. SAN JOSE	559-225-6417	
14	TODD McFarson	580 W. SAN JOSE	559 220-6427	
15	John Bishop	544 W San Jose	559 333-2225	
16	Tish Gungis	544 W San Jose	559 497-8284	
17	Jason Hauer	548 W. San Jose Ave	559 908-1574	
18	Kees Shaffer	554 W. San Jose Ave	559 431-5966	
19	Juan Manzanola	5212 N Nantucket Ave	559 974-0522	emlight@yahooc
20	Emmanuel Manzanola	5213 N Nantucket Ave	559 974-0364	emlight@yahooc.com
21	John Gomes	562 W SAN JOSE AVE, Fresno 93704	559-449-1586	pzmjohn@yahoo.com
22	Janet Gomes	562 W. SAN JOSE AVE, Fresno 93704	559-449-1586	
23	Isabel Guadalupe Trevillo	5228 N. Nantucket Ave Fresno 93704	559-492-1200	
24	Gloria C. Trevillo	5228 N NANTUCKET AVE Fresno 93704	559-492-1200	
25	Henry Lengkeek	479 W. San Ramon, Fresno 93704	559-287-8325	h.lengkeek.fresno@gmail.com
26	Grace Lengkeek	479 W. San Ramon, Fresno 93704	559-522-6996	
27	Katherine Corbridge	423 W SAN BRUNO 93704	559-974-2449	katherinecorbridge@comcast.net
28	LARRY LINDBERG	499 W SAN BRUNO 93704	559 446-1379	
29	ANDY GUZIK	477 W. San Bruno Ave 93704	559 288-2280	
30	Kathleen V Guzik	477 W. San Bruno Ave 93704	same	

Reject Proposed Granville Project at San Jose and Colonial Avenues, Fresno, 93704

	Name	Address	Phone	Email
1	Cyndi Parkinson	566 W. San Jose, Tr 93704	559 4388472	3137337 cyndiparkinson@aatt.net
2	Cyndi Parkinson	439 W. Scott, Tr. 93704	"	"
3	Gerry Argain	430 W. Scott Ave, Fresno 93704	(559) 226-6529	gargain@comcast.net
4	GEORGE ARGAIN	430 W. SCOTT AVE.	559-226-6529	gargain@comcast.net
5	Richard White	442 W. SCOTT AVE	559-224-5913	N55re@hotmail.com
6	EVELYN WHITE	442 W. SCOTT AVE	559-224-5913	N55re@hotmail.com
7	Jeanne Perez	473 W. Scott Ave	(559) 571-4346	jeanne1perez@aol.com
8	Carlos Perez	473 W. Scott Ave	(559) 571-4071	
9	Christine Mueller	414 W. Scott Ave	(559) 226-1650	Christine77mueller@hotmail.com
10	Salvatore Kissler	425 W. San Jose Ave	(559) 439-0601	@att.net
11	WYMON KISSLER	445 W. SAN JOSE AVE	(559) 248-0924	wckissler@comcast.net
12	Nicola Lambert	546 W. San Jose Ave	(559) 473-6210	niclambert936@yahoo.com
13	Anna Bonsignore	542 W. John	(559) 435-3795	
14	JOHN H. EASTERLY	540 W. SAN JOSE AVE	559-435-7997	heaster2@sbcglobal.net
15	Charlotte Graham	556 W. San Jose Ave	(559) 431-2669	
16	Mary K Rowe	552 W. San Jose Ave	559 432-0330	mkr@comcast.net
17	Daryl Matthews	550 W. San Jose Ave	559 436-4713	colorelinth@msn.com
18	Lawrence Matthews	550 W. San Jose Ave	559 436-4713	Lawrence L. Matthews
19	IL R. R. R.	574 W. San Jose Ave	559 432-2203	
20	Susan Trimmell	572 W. San Jose Ave	"	438-8587 Susan.kh@stcglobal.net
21	John Trimmell	572 W. San Jose Ave	"	438-8588 Susan John Trimmell@stcglobal.net
22	Sanju Robinson	574 W. San Jose Ave	559 437-9845	sanjutom@fresnolink.net
23	JOHN PRANDINI	582 W. SAN JOSE AVE.	559-439-8607	PRANDINI@AOL.COM
24	JEANNE PRANDINI	582 W. SAN JOSE AVE	559-439-8607	PRANDINI@AOL.COM
25	Alice Rodriguez	564 W. San Jose Ave	415-310-1441	red_alice@yahoo.com
26	John Turner	564 W. SAN JOSE AVE	559-260-5619	red_alice@yahoo.com
27	JAMES STITER	5247 N COLONIAL AVE	559 226-1129	NONE
28	Mary M. Matthews	5303 N. Colonial #102	554 432-6922	NONE
29	Marilyn Prescott	5270 N. Colonial #A	559 9088176	
30	Joan Levee	5310 N. Roosevelt Ave	559-439-3143	levee@comcast.net

Reject Proposed Granville Project at San Jose and Colonial Avenues, Fresno, 93704

	Name	Address	Phone	Email
1	Charlotte Bowen	5319 N. Roosevelt Ave.	436 4846	NO
2	LAWRENCE A BOWEN	5319 N. ROOSEVELT AVE	436 4866	NO
3	Marilyn Riley	684 W. San Ramon Ave	431 4175	NO
4	Robert Riley	684 W. SAN RAMON AVE	431 4175	NO
5	Beverly Ackli	698 W. San Ramon	439 5804	NO
6	Howard Underwood	780 W. San Ramon Ave	701-789-9605	NO
7	Roberta Underwood	780 W. SAN RAMON AVE	701 789-9605	NO
8	Jacqueline Fritz	762 W. SAN RAMON AVE	559 285 9959	KenNacke@SbcGlobal.net
9	JENN KASANO	779 W. San Madele Ave	439 530	
10	Suzette KASANO	779 W. San Madele Ave	439 530	
11	KEN FRITZ	762 W. SAN RAMON AVE	431 7938	
12	Cheryl Gollmer	761 W. San Madele	431 8772	c-gollmer@hotmail.com
13	Larry Gollmer	761 W. San Madele	" "	
14	Blake Gollmer	761 W. San Madele	" "	
15	Farrell Marcure	761 W. San Madele	" "	
16	Edward FRITZ	762 W. San Ramon Ave	940 5611	
17	SUSAN FRANDSEN	740 W. SAN MADELE AVE	559 432-4079	
18	KENT FRANDSEN	740 W. SAN MADELE AVE	559 432-4079	
19	Diane Nocum	694 W. San Madele Ave	559 313-1503	diynocum@sbcslobal.net
20	David Hebert	729 W. San Madele	559 269 5333	dehmannhebert@gmail.com
21	Leborah Hebert	729 W. San Madele	559 435 0478	
22	IVID HAMLIN	678 W. San Madele	559 227 1898	
23	Kathy Hamlin	678 W. San Madele	559 227 1898	dhamlin@att.net
24	ROBERT M. RISCHÉ, JR	681 W. SAN MADELE AVE	261 2949	
25	BARBARA L. RISCHÉ	681 W. SAN MADELE AVE	261 2949	
26	Roy Schwabenland	604 W. SAN MADELE AVE	439 3018	
27	Virginia Schwabenland	604 W. SAN MADELE AVE	439 3018	
28	NATHAN R. WADSWORTH	578 W. SAN JOSE AVE.	260 515-0257	nwadsworth@gmail.com
29	Betty M. Wadsworth	578 W. San Jose Ave.	260 402-6714	bettywadsworth@gmail.com
30	MARY EKMALIAN	586 W. SAN JOSE AVE.	310 291-3550	maryekmalian@att.net

Reject Proposed Granville Project at San Jose and Colonial Avenues, Fresno, 93704

	Name	Address	Phone		Email
1	Loralee Geisler	494 W. San Jose Ave	447	1193	f-l geisler @
2	Frank Geisler	494 W San Jose Ave	447	1193	ameast.net
3	Jodi Fitzpatrick	5326 N ROOSEVELT	994	6150	jodifitz@paxdemos.com
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
29					
30					