

Exhibit B

John George

From: Jennifer <jnnfrwns@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2024 8:10 AM
To: John George
Cc: Robert Holt
Subject: Re: P21-00989 Notice of Action (Herndon and Prospect)
Attachments: P21-00989_Notice-of-Action_Final.pdf

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments

Mr George,

As a concerned neighbor, I would like to have this decision appealed. This complex with units of three and four story units will negatively affect this neighborhood. Is this setting a precedent for Fresno? As I drive around Fresno, I am pressed to find other high rise complexes anywhere. The high density does not fit given the parameters of the space. Have you actually visited the site? These units will tower over any other structure in this neighborhood. Your decision does not address the how traffic will be addressed, given that there is no room for the increased traffic, or how parking will be able to accommodate the number of cars that will result from each family. If 82 units produced the need to accommodate two cars per unit where will the over flow parking go? How will the adjacent park and school traffic be affected?

What is the plan if emergency fire vehicles cannot navigate the turnabout. Also it has been brought to my attention that fire services do not have the capability to reach the fourth story with current equipment. So many questions... who I'll answer them? There are still many more concerns.

Jennifer Owens

Sent from my iPad

On Mar 25, 2024, at 3:25 PM, John George <John.George@fresno.gov> wrote:

Good Afternoon,

As requested, please find attached the Notice of Action Granting Development Permit Application No. P21-00989.

This is a notice of approval for the 82 unit multi-family complex at the northeast corner of West Herndon and North Prospect Avenues. The final date to appeal the project is end of business day on April 9, 2024. Appeals can be submitted to me (John.George@fresno.gov) and cc Robert.Holt@fresno.gov.

If you have any questions feel free to contact me. Thank you.

Respectfully,

John George

From: Dexter Marr <marr.environmental@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 27, 2024 3:00 PM
To: John George
Cc: Robert.Hall@fresno.gov; Jenifer.Clark@fresno.gov; Mike Karbassi
Subject: P21-00989 Notice of Action
Attachments: P21-00989 Notice of Action.pdf

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments

John George, Planner III

(John.George@fresno.gov)

Fresno City Planning Department

2600 Fresno St. (2nd Floor)

Fresno CA 93721

RE: Appeal of Development Permit Application No. P21-00989

Mr. George,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the approval of Permit Application No. P21-00989. The proposed 82-unit multi-family complex at the northeast corner of West Herndon and North Prospect Avenue. As a concerned neighbor, I believe it is crucial to address several significant concerns regarding this development.

First and foremost, the proposed complex raises serious concerns about inadequate parking. With 82 units planned, the recommended available parking space may not be sufficient to accommodate the needs of both residents and visitors. There is no street parking allowed and the only parking allowed is at Orchid Park and it is becoming crowded most days and especially weekends since the opening of the new eight Pickleball Courts.

Additionally, large multi-family complex is likely to increase traffic congestion along West Herndon and North Prospect Ave. The additional vehicles entering and existing the area could exacerbate existing traffic problems like the traffic issue we currently have with the school nearby and the community park. The traffic does pose challenges for residents and commuters alike. I believe a full traffic study has not been provided concerning the subject area.

Moreover, there is valid concerns regarding the potential for an increase in crime, particularly vehicle break-ins and property crime, associated with the proposed development. A larger residential

complex may attract unwanted attention from individuals with malicious intent, putting our community's safety and security at risk.

Furthermore, the proposed 4-story building does not align with the character of the surrounding housing projects within the Herndon corridor. This lack of conformity could disrupt the aesthetics appeal of our neighborhood and set an undesirable precedent for future development in the area. Along Herndon Avenue from east of Highway 99 to Clovis Avenue (within 12 miles) there is not one housing development greater than two stories. In a neighbor meeting in 2021, it was noted the closest fire department on West Avenue indicated their fire station does not have an apparatus to fight a 4-story structure.

In light of these concerns, I urge the Planning Department to carefully reconsider the approval of Development Permit Application No. P21-00989. It is essential to prioritize the well-being and interests of the existing residents and preserve the integrity of our neighborhood.

While we understand the need for affordable housing in our area, we strongly oppose the scale and design of the current development proposal. However, we remain open to the idea of development that is more in line with the existing aesthetic and scale of our neighborhood. If the proposal were scaled down and limited to two stories or less, we would be much more receptive to the idea.

We have been disappointed by the lack of communication and transparency from the developers. Despite our efforts to engage with them and express our concerns, they seem to be avoiding direct dialogue with the community. We believe that by working together, we can find a solution that meets the needs of both the developer and the residents.

There are lots of neighbors who have the same concern and many others who have other concerns that I may have not addressed. We hope that Planning and the developers will be willing to engage in constructive dialogue and address our concerns in a transparent and collaborative manner. Thank you for considering our request, and we look forward to the opportunity to discuss this matter further.

Sincerely,

Dexter Marr
Northwest Neighbor

Cc: Jennifer Clark, Director of Development (Jennifer.Clark@fresno.gov)

Mike Karbassi, City Council (Mike.Karbassi@fresno.gov)

Robert Holt, Planning (Robert.Holt@fresno.gov)

John George

From: Sara Ford <sara@saraforddesign.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2024 12:11 PM
To: John George
Subject: Appeal project

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments

Hi! I would like to appeal project by Forkner school. What do you need from me to do so?



SARA FORD, NCIDQ | Interior Designer

 949.355.5884

 Sara@saraforddesign.com

 www.saraforddesign.com



John George

From: Edwin Darden <dardendesigns@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2024 5:05 PM
To: John George; Robert Holt
Subject: Herndon and Prospect

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments

John,

My name is Edwin S. Darden IV and I live in the Sierra sky park. I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to express my concerns and appeal the decision regarding the proposed 82-unit multi-family complex at the northeast corner of West Herndon and North Prospect Avenues.

While I understand the importance of urban development and the need for housing solutions, I believe there are significant factors that warrant further consideration and potentially a reassessment of the project's approval.

1. **Community Impact Assessment:** It is crucial to conduct a thorough assessment of the potential impacts of this development on the local community. This should include evaluating factors such as traffic congestion, strain on existing infrastructure, and the character of the neighborhood. Community input and concerns should be carefully addressed and integrated into the decision-making process.
2. **Environmental Considerations:** The environmental impact of the proposed complex must be carefully evaluated. This includes assessing the effects on local ecosystems, water resources, and air quality. Sustainable building practices should be encouraged, and measures should be taken to minimize the project's carbon footprint and preserve natural habitats.
3. **Urban Design and Aesthetics:** The architectural design and aesthetic impact of the multi-family complex should enhance the visual appeal of the neighborhood and complement the surrounding built environment. Attention should be given to factors such as building scale, materials, and landscaping to ensure that the development contributes positively to the overall urban fabric.
4. **Infrastructure and Public Services:** Adequate provision of infrastructure and public services, including transportation, schools, and recreational facilities, is essential to support the needs of both existing and future residents. Investments in infrastructure should be carefully coordinated to accommodate the increased demand generated by the development.

In light of these considerations, I respectfully urge you to reconsider the decision regarding the proposed 82-unit multi-family complex. A more comprehensive review process, taking into account the concerns raised above, would ensure that the development aligns with the long-term interests and well-being of the community.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I am available to discuss this further and provide any additional information or perspectives that may be helpful in the reconsideration process.

John George

From: Jeff Boswell <JBoswell@fresnoirrigation.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2024 12:11 PM
To: John George; Jennifer Clark
Cc: Jeffery Boswell; Shirley Boswell
Subject: Development Permit # P-21-00989 Letter of Appeal
Attachments: 20240402080608358.pdf

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments

To: City of Fresno
From: Jeff & Shirley Boswell
jeffreygboswell@gmail.com
Re: Letter of Appeal P21-00989

Jeff & Shirley Boswell
3823 W. Fir, Fresno, CA 93711
Phone: (559) 439-7732

City of Fresno
Planning and Development Department
Attn: John George & Jennifer K. Clark, AICP HDFP, Director
John.George@fresno.gov
Jennifer.Clark@fresno.gov
2600 Fresno Street
3rd Floor,
Fresno, CA 93721

Re: Appeal from Development Permit Application No. P21-00989 & Related Environmental Assessment: APNs 500-200-27s-29s

Dear Ms. Clark and Mr. George;

Jeff and Shirley Boswell, residing at 3823 W. Fir Ave., Fresno, CA 93711, hereby appeal the Grant of the Development Permit noted above (for the proposed development of parcels APN 500-200-27s-29s) We have lived at this address, just west of the Project for 45 years. All 4 of our children attended Forkner Elementary School just west of the Project site. Ours was the second home built west of the school. I have lived within a mile of the Project site since 1964 and am very familiar with the area, its history and its surroundings. My personal perspective is a result of proximity to the Project as well as my 45 years practicing property law in Fresno, which qualifies my comments inasmuch as I have represented many well-known local commercial and residential developers in that process.

More specifically, the application as proposed/granted is inconsistent with required Findings and Implementing Policies in that three (3) aspects of the Permit/Project are inconsistent with and cannot support a finding that the Project, as planned: (a) will not be detrimental to public health, safety or general welfare of the community; and, (b) will not be detrimental to residents as well as surrounding properties or improvements. With some adjustments, I believe that the Project can overcome these inconsistencies, and such adjustments should be required. The three (3) inherent adverse conditions that bely this project, as approved are: (A) the wood frame construction and height of the one 4-story Project Building, (B) streets that are too narrow for the density of the project and the self-generated as well as the external traffic that will be experienced by residents and neighbors alike; and, (C) there is no safe walking pathway for elementary school students living in the Project to walk to and from the elementary school located to the west of the Project, especially when student safety is an essential element of Project Goals 7 & 8. These Rules must be met by the Project, as described in the application or the Project itself must either be modified to ameliorate these unsafe conditions or must be denied if they cannot be addressed and resolved for the benefit of the prospective residents of the Project and others in the area who's protection, safety and welfare is the reason in the first place for the Rules, guidelines and land use mandates.

Our suggestions to resolve all 3 challenges to the Project so as to warrant approval are discussed below. As noted in the Project Application Approval, these Goals must be met. First, they include:

Goal 7: “Develop complete neighborhoods, housing types, (including affordable housing), residential densities, job opportunities, recreation , open space, and educational venues that appeal to a broad range of people throughout the City “

Goal 8: “Develop Complete Neighborhoods and districts with an efficient and diverse mix of residential densities, building types and affordability which are designed to be healthy, attractive, and centered by schools, parks, and public and commercial services to provide a sense of place and that provide as many services as possible within walking distance.”

This Project, properly sized and designed, could be the poster child for an infill project that almost achieves harmony with Rule 7 and with a few tweaks can comply suitably with Rule 8. If adjusted, the Project’s unique location fits wonderfully with Rule 8. It is surrounded by a shopping center that offers many services immediately east of the Project that can be easily and safely be accessed by pedestrians using existing sidewalks without even crossing the access roadways. There is a neighborhood park right across the street to the north, so check that box, if you add a crosswalk to and from the park midway on the Project’s frontage to allow pedestrians to safely cross Fir Avenue to access Orchid Park. There is a narrow Prospect roadway on the west and Fir Avenue north of the Project that were neither designed for nor intended to accommodate the volume of traffic that will be generated by the Project with its planned density. However, if you reduce the number of cars by dropping the height of the 4-story building to 2 or 3 stories, that would reduce traffic counts on Prospect and Fir, and result in safer streets that align with the safe standards for street widths commensurate with a slightly lower density. A reduced density would not only insure fewer cars and therefore safer streets despite their substandard widths, but will create less congestion during peak traffic times and traffic uses that compete with pedestrian students going to and from school. As planned, the area will be unnecessarily overburdened by putting high density units sited on a street that struggles now with safe traffic flows with existing residents, park users and parents taking kids to and from the elementary school that they access via the “Valentine/Herndon” light and the narrow and ½ completed Herndon frontage road that is too precarious for pedestrian use on either shoulder. This existing traffic signal and street configuration with the roundabout requires an immediate U-turn just north of Herndon that is neither safe nor helpful in high traffic times associated with school arrivals, school departures and traffic from the existing neighborhoods coming and going from work. The elementary school immediately west of the Project will likewise generate foot traffic including kindergarten, first and second grade students that will be introduced onto an already busy street environment as they walk to and from school. This cries out for the creation and dedication of a safe cross-walk pathway across Prospect distanced from the traffic light and the roundabout which similarly suggests the requirement of a traffic guard before and after school at a safe crosswalk for these pedestrian students. These students will need to be directed away from the local and non-local drivers coming to school, going to work, coming back from school, etc. at the same time that there will be a significant number of youngsters walking to and from school. Prospect is very dangerous to pedestrians between Herndon and the roundabout, as is the area of 90 degree angled turn at Prospect and Fir, as drivers from both streets will have a Project-occluded view of students crossing those roads close to the turn. A pedestrian crossing midway along the Project’s Fir Avenue frontage would be safest. . There needs to be a planned and safe walkway that does not put elementary school students on the unfinished shoulder of Prospect Avenue and avoids, altogether any pedestrians’ use of the Herndon frontage road immediately west of the Project. As roadways exist today, there is no safe way for students walking to and from that school to walk on the shoulder of the Herndon frontage road (using a width or shoulder measured by inches, not feet) during times when parents taking and picking up students in automobiles are using that frontage road at the same time as students will be walking to and from school and using that same sub-standard frontage roadway that has a dangerously narrow south-side shoulder and no shoulder at all along

the north and east sides of the private property field across the street from the Project. Until and unless you, as part of the approval process, plan to require an “off-road” path that allows students to cross Fir and go through Orchard Park and thence through a mandated perpetually “open” gate to the school’s soccer field, there is NO SAFE pedestrian route from the Project to and from the school unless there is a dedicated and open (24/7) off-road access to and from school via Orchard Park or the open field just south of the school. The open field south of the school has no sidewalk along either that portion of the Herndon frontage road between the traffic signal and Valentine Avenue, on the west, that would be safe for pedestrian students use. As an alternative, the City could require the acquisition and construction of a dedicated improved E/W trail across that field for the exclusive use of students going to and from school from the Project, which could also suffice. While Rule 8 calls for the Project to encourage pedestrian students walking to and from school, the Project, as planned, does not accommodate any safe route for those students to walk to and from school. One needs to be found and put into use before the Project should be occupied.

Now, let me address an equally obvious safety concern. Given the tight quarters to maneuver a huge hook and ladder truck capable of safely accessing a 4-story wood framed high-rise apartment building given the site plan driveway and parking layouts of this Project, it begs the question: “Is the City Fire Marshall totally comfortable with the City’s fire department’s hook and ladder truck(s) having adequate access and site-maneuverability using the emergency vehicle rights-of-way and driveway widths and turn around areas to safely maneuver, deploy downriggers and run fire hoses while extending its ladders to 49’ 10” rooftop of a highly flammable 4-story wood framed residential building, in order to evacuate residents in the event of a fire with its concomitant need to quickly extinguish the fire? I suggest that you take the City Traffic Engineer and the City Fire Marshall and have them bring traffic cones, a site plan, and the City’s hook and ladder fire truck capable of reaching the roof of a 4-story building and place traffic cones to outline the planned roadways and the footprint of the proposed 4-story wooden structure and see how easily that fire truck can drive through the site within the sized driveways, maneuver where it can get water, put down its downriggers and extend its ladder to what would be the height of the rooftop at two inches shy of 50 feet in the air. Get a helium filled balloon from the shopping center and tether it to 50’ of string and see how easily that truck is going to be able to reach, let alone fight a fire and simultaneously rescue trapped residents in the event of a fire in that building. At that conclusion of an easily staged tryout, I think that you would thereupon be well advised to reduce the height of that structure to 2 or 3 stories, or require that it be a steel/concrete building for safety’s sake and still be accessible by a hook and ladder truck capable of reaching such a height to not only rescue folks but to extinguish a fire. The lowering of the height of that 4th story planned building to 3 or 2 storys would cure a host of ills that this Project faces with traffic volumes, large emergency vehicle accommodation and protecting pedestrian school children before and after school, all sharing less-than adequate street widths vis-à-vis the traffic that the full Project would generate as well as experience from the surrounding uses already employing Valentine, Prospect and Fir Avenues. Density needs to be reduced for all 3 of these issues to accommodate a Project design that would be workable, safe and in harmony with Rule 8, among other things, while harmonizing it with the existing uses and users surrounding the Project.

I am serious about inviting the Fire Marshall and his hook and ladder truck capable of reaching a 49’ 10” rooftop to see how that will work in the space provided on the site plan. In the interest of transparency, it would be a good idea to also invite some of the neighbors who might share my concerns over safety to be there on site to see how that experiment for safety turns out. We would welcome the invitation. The City’s comments on the 4 story wooden structure acknowledge that safety rules are being stretched to even consider a 4th story. It reads:

“The 4-story building (35’ eave elevation) does not comply with the prescriptive requirement of FFD development standards for ladder truck deployment to have the adjacent edge of the fire access road no more than 30 feet away from the corners on one long side of the building” .

The City’s pro-forma paper note pad sketched deployment of a hook and ladder truck at this location was based on a height of 35’ eave elevation but the plans show that the height of the roof is 49’ 10”, which is the actual height that a ladder truck should be able to reach---reinforcing our recommendation that you actually visit the site with the Fire Marshall, outline the routes for emergency vehicle/ladder trucks to deploy, extend their outrigger stabilization legs and see if they can safely reach 49’ 10”. This project was reviewed by the Fire Department only for “requirements related to water supply, fire hydrants, and fire apparatus access to the building(s) on site”. Review for compliance with fire and life safety requirements for the buildings interior and its intended use **TO BE** reviewed by both the Fire Department and the Building and Safety Section of DARM ONLY **“when a submittal for building plan review is made as required by the California Building Code by the architect or engineer of record for the building.”** Wisdom suggests that such determinations need to be made BEFORE the 4-story unit is allowed, not AFTER such a use is permitted and construction is imminent.

I am serious about inviting the Fire Marshall and his hook and ladder truck capable of reaching a 49’ 10” rooftop to see how that will work in the space provided in the site plan. In the interest of transparency, it would be a good idea to invite some of the neighbors who might share my concerns over safety to be there on site to see how that experiment for safety turns out. We would welcome the invitation. Reducing the height of the proposed 4-story building to 3 stories remedies a host of concerning issues.

Now, let’s discuss density from the Fresno Unified School District’s perspective. In the FUSD’s comments on this Project, an interesting fact emerges. When you read the full text of that response, you will see that the District was very concerned about school crowding, which goes to the density issue. More importantly, the District’s review and comments regarding the Project of June 3, 2021, was based solely on the developer’s and the City’s submittal to FUSD of an apartment complex plan that was limited to “a new 3-story” apartment complex, not a 4th story plan. The District did not evaluate or comment on a Project that called for higher density and included the heretofore undisclosed 4-story building when the District offered its comments. Transparency is key in the review of a Project like this. The District was only shown a 3-story plan, not a 4 story plan. Any approval by the City should be based on the information that the City and the Developer provided to the District, not one that was later “upsized” without notice to the District or others who looked at plans 3 years ago.

Finally, let’s look at the comment letter submitted by the Fresno Irrigation District dated June 16, 2021. FID raised 2 issues and concerns. First, after explaining the confluence and layouts of various underground canals/pipelines proximate to the Project, FID noted in two separate portions of their response letter to the 2021 Project plans, stated:

“Should this project include any street and/or utility improvements along Herndon Avenue, Marks Avenue, Valentine Avenue, Brawley Avenue, or in the vicinity of this pipeline (Bullard # 124), FID requires it review and approve all plans.”

---and---

“Should this project include any street and/or utility improvements along Herndon Avenue, Valentine Avenue, or in the vicinity of this Canal (*H-Ditch # 128*), FID requires it review and approve all plans.”

The City’s Public Works Department issued its Conditions of Approval for this Project dated 6/23/2021 (*which likely only evaluated a 3 story proposal, not a 4 story proposal as the 6/23/2021 response from the City’s department seems to be contemporaneous with the plans submitted to and reviewed by the Fresno Unified School District with a response date just 2 days earlier, June 21, 2021*) which City of Fresno Public Works Department stated: **‘Herndon Avenue: 6-Lane Expressway’** (*Provide the following as notes on the site plan.*) 1. Construction Requirements: a. If not existing, install landscaping per the Fresno General Plan, the City of Fresno Public Works Standards, and the Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 1000 for Class I Bikeways (Bike Paths). Contact Hilary Kimber at hilary.kimber@fresno.gov . There is also work on Valentine, the “former” name of the street on the entire western frontage of the Project.

Obviously, the City’s Public Works Department mandated that the foregoing language be put on the Project Plans for this work along the **Herndon Avenue: 6-Lane Expressway**, which in order to comply with FID’s requirements that Project plans be resubmitted to FID if Herndon Avenue work is anticipated, is required.

Secondarily, from FID’s response, FID advised the City:

“FID is concerned that the proposed development may negatively impact local groundwater supplies. The area is currently open land with minimal to no water use, supplemented by groundwater pumping. Under current circumstances the project area is experiencing a modest but continuing groundwater overdraft. Should the proposed development result in a conversion from imported surface water to groundwater, this deficit will increase. **FID recommends the City of Fresno require the proposed development balance anticipated groundwater use with sufficient recharge of imported surface water in order to preclude increasing the area’s existing groundwater overdraft problem.**”

In another section of its comment letter, after explaining California’s Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) and its requirements, FID went on to explain to the City that SGMA called for the formation of local groundwater sustainability agencies (GSAs) that must assess conditions in their local water basins and adopt locally-based management plans. FID and the City of Fresno are members of the North Kings Groundwater Sustainability Agency which will manage the groundwater basin within the FID service area. With that introduction, FID then stated:

“This area is completely reliant on groundwater pumping and SGMA will impact all users of groundwater and those who rely on it. The City of Fresno should consider the impacts of the development on the City’s ability to comply with requirements of SGMA.”

The Fresno Irrigation District’s response letter voiced 2 concerns: (1) that before any approval was issued for the Project that hasd any work suggested on the 6-lane Herndon Expressway or on Valentine , that all plans be submitted by the City/Developer to FID as **“FID requires it review and approve all plans;”** and, (2) **“FID recommends the City of Fresno require the proposed development balance anticipated groundwater use with sufficient recharge of imported surface water in order to preclude increasing the area’s existing groundwater overdraft problem.”**

The approval documents issued by the City in its approval of the application for which this letter is an appeal, the City states at **PART B (Other Agency Comments and Conditions)** the following:

“7. Irrigation District: Comply with all of the requirements included within the attached FID memorandum dated June 16, 2021.”

The undersigned is not confident that either of these 2 requirements have been met, to wit: (a) City of Fresno require the proposed development balance anticipated groundwater use with sufficient recharge of imported surface water in order to preclude increasing the area’s existing groundwater overdraft problem; and, (b) FID requires it review and approve all plans that call for work on Herndon and Valenine Avenue, as noted in the City’s Public Work required language noted above in its conditions of approval. I believe that the City is addressing SGMA but I have been unable to find evidence that the Project’s required work along the old Valenine Ave., (now Prospect) and Herndon have resulted in plans and specifications be sent to and approved by FID, as required by the City.

Conclusion

We are not opposed to the Project. We believe that with a few adjustments, as noted herein, this Project will be a great asset to the community and meet the expectations for which rules like # 7 & 8 were crafted. However, safety is first. To achieve it, options and alternatives need to be seriously considered and applied given the challenges of safe access to and from school, densities that match street widths; and, heights that don’t compromise safety for residents in a higher-than-manageable/necessary 4-story residential wood framed building.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to share our concerns with you in the genuine hope that we can all be proud of a Project in our neighborhood that represents the best of what is asked of us in complying with safe land use decisions and concerns for our soon to be neighbors.



Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Boswell *Shirley Boswell*

Jeff and Shirley Boswell

John George

From: Sue Ewert <slewert2@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 4, 2024 6:54 PM
To: John George
Cc: Robert Holt
Subject: APPEALING PERMIT APPLICATION NO. P21-00989

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments

Hello, I've lived in the neighborhood for 10 years. I don't know what happened to the projected commercial plans for this piece of land, which seems would fit better into the neighborhood.

That being said, I wouldn't oppose a smaller project, but it's a small plot of land right next to an elementary school. A 4-story, 82 unit seems excessive for that land. Unfortunately in this day and age with so much violence, it seems that a 4-story building next to a school is just dangerous. Also, it could make the children subjects of voyeurism. If it were smaller and only one or 2 stories, I doubt you'd have a much opposition.

Other issues include traffic issues (only 2 ways in and out of the area), parking with a high density building and also increased crime which unfortunately always follows the transient nature of high density rental properties.

This is a well established neighborhood of single family housing with lots of older homeowners. I think this is just too large a project for that space. As I said earlier if it were one or 2 stories with fewer units, I think that would fit into his neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Sue Ewert
3605 W. Fremont Avenue
Fresno, CA 93711

John George

From: Lucine <flyhye98@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 4, 2024 7:30 PM
To: John George
Cc: Robert Holt
Subject: Notice of Action Granting Development Permit Application No. P21-00989-APPEAL

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments

Dear Sirs,

I am a citizen of Fresno District 2. I live in the surrounding neighborhood to this development and I am in opposition to the granting of this development permit for the following reasons:

Zoning: Up until recently this area was zoned for low density housing. A special deal was made by a mayor who is no longer serving, to turn this into high density housing. The backroom deal that was made and the agreement with the developer fell through. At that time the zoning should have been reverted back to its original zoning. Why are we making another special permit? This should remain single family housing or low density family housing in this area.

Appearance:

It appears to be (3) 3 story bldgs and (1) 4 story bldg, one community bldg, one swimming pool and a dog park area with 154 parking spaces. This type of development does not fit in this neighborhood.

The 4 story bldg will be put along the South Side of the property which will make it tower over the roadway. Multistory (more than 2 story) Bldgs are not in this neighborhood. The nearest is on 7047 N West Ave, Fresno, CA 93711, where it backs up to a shopping center and actually blends in. There are no other 3 or 4 story bldgs anywhere in miles. This will stick out like a sore thumb. There is a larger lot next to the Springhill Suites by Marriott (N Fresno and Herndon) that would be a much better fit for this type of complex. It will fit in with the other larger than 2 story bldgs that already exist in the area.

This does not even take into account the airport nearby, which this could affect the traffic patterns for take offs and landing.

Inline image

Map of the surrounding area that show there are no >2 story bldgs in the area.

Inline image

Map showing the lot next to the Springhill Suites by Marriott (N Fresno and Herndon) that would be a much better fit for this type of complex. Note the multiple >2 story bldgs in the surrounding area as well as existing housing.

Parking:

This is to be a 82 unit complex. There will not be enough parking for 2 cars per unit, let alone two families per unit with multiple vehicles... As you know most families have more than one vehicle.

Multiple families in one unit will have multiple vehicles will be more vehicles. There will also need to be people who work here, so some of the parking spaces are to be used by staff (5-10 staff spots).

This does not take into account visitors. With 82 units you can expect 20-50% of them will have visitors. Where are these 16-40 cars supposed to park? When there is not enough parking in the complex where do you think that these vehicles will park? In the neighboring streets. This will now impact other families in the surrounding areas.

More vehicles parked on the streets brings more opportunity for theft from said vehicles, as they are not under watchful eyes of the owners.

Traffic:

There will be only one vehicle entrance on Prospect Dr. which is already a badly designed interchange.

The only way onto N Valentine is to utilize the round about. The traffic during school time drop off and pick up will be a nightmare on/off Herndon. The light at Herndon is already bad without a lot of traffic from the side streets. The wait times alone The wait times alone will back up the neighborhood. The only way from N Valentine is to make a right hand turn onto N Prospect. There are lots of back ups on N.

Valentine already due to the design of the intersection. It will only get worse, increasing the wait times. The park and tennis courts are well used, especially on the weekends when there various sports (i.e soccer and or baseball) being played. Often times people will park along the street which is already not allowed, as the parking area is limited.

The addition of 82-164 or more permanent vehicles to this intersection and street will make this area backed up with traffic, if not on North Prospect then backed up onto the Herndon "expressway" creating a safety hazard and possibly more accidents by slow vehicles in the right lane.

Inline image

Safety:

As you can see from the picture above, there is an elementary school adjacent to the proposed complex. With 3 & 4 story Bldgs. on the proposed complex there will lots of windows from which people can look out and watch the students when they are arriving, on recess,

at lunch, or when they are leaving from the school grounds. This does not even account for the park next door where the kids play soccer on the weekends. There is also the housing complex built next door, which the Houses on the west-side will now have people able to look not only into their windows but also into their backyards. This creates a lack of privacy and security for those families.

Crime:

With 82 new families moving in, I am sure that a portion of this will need to be section & housing.

While I am not opposed to giving those people who need low income housing a break, it should be done in the correct neighborhoods. This is a middle to upper scale neighborhood, as you can see from the housing prices in the area.

Inline image

Map showing housing prices in the nearby areas.

Not only will this bring the local housing prices down, but it will bring in people who are not as wealthy as those in the area, and may cause some of those to misappropriate things from others as they think that they can afford to have things taken from them. More traffic will also bring more opportunity for theft in the area.

Natural feature:

The Forkner Alluvial Canal runs right through the property. How is the foundation of a 3 or 4 story bldg not going to affect this underground canal? If they do build this and we have a high water volume year, how are they going to protect this from not causing an issue with the building if the canal breeches, floods or overflows its capacity? If they nick the piping or damage it this could cause a sinkhole during a high flow year.

Inline image

Thank you for hearing me out and seriously considering the removal of this special permit.

Lucine

John George

From: travelinswimmer@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, April 7, 2024 6:00 PM
To: John George; Robert Holt
Subject: FW: P21-00989 Notice of Action (Herndon and Prospect)

Importance: High

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments

Dear John and Robert:

My Wife, Janet L. Nichols and I are filing an appeal to the project, FW: P21-00989 Notice of Action (Herndon and Prospect). Please count this as two appeals.

The reasons for our appeals are that this project is totally inappropriate for the location. The reasons it is inappropriate are:

1. The density is too high. It is approximately 10x denser as the surrounding neighborhoods. Our neighborhood has 1 living unit per half acre, while this project has 22.16 dwelling units per acre.
2. The height is 4 stories whereas the next tallest project in the neighborhood is 2 stories. There are no 4 story housing projects anywhere in NW Fresno
3. There is not enough parking, the amount of parking needed is underestimated and there will be overflow parking on the surrounding streets and in the small park located just to the north of the project.
4. Prospect, Fir, Valentine and Herndon Avenues will be negatively impacted with increased traffic. The traffic circle on Prospect will be backed up during peak traffic times.
5. Forkner (AKA Tatarian) Elementary School will be negatively impacted with a large influx of students from this project.
6. High Density Apartments are not consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods and will negatively impact the home values of existing residents.

We are not against apartments, we are just against *high-density* apartments. There are other apartment complexes in the area that fit very well into the overall scheme of the surrounding neighborhoods (The Beechwood Apartments on Beechwood and Country Club Apartments on Fir)

Scott and Janet Nichols,
EMAIL: travelinswimmer@gmail.com