

Paul Holm
05/28/08

**Vineyard Oaks Issues – Callstoga Planning Commission Hearing 5/28/08
Paul Holm 2551 Grant Street**

As of the last Commission Hearing, I still have the following unanswered questions:

First, a procedural question → its my understanding that a full transcript of the last Planning Commission meeting is not available? When will that be available and shouldn't it have been available before this meeting, if the Commission is intending to vote on this matter?

I. Drainage/Environmental Impact?

1. Where is the outlet/drain being placed:

- a. under the bridge or
- b. the wing wall?

AND what will it look like ... especially if visible from my home?

I still haven't heard an answer to why the City told me the outlet couldn't be on the East side of the stone bridge because it would damage the bridge.

How can the same outlet/amount of water can be in the middle or West side of the bridge and not damage the delicate creek banks and trees?

2. How can the project be approved without the City knowing before hand:

- a. where the drain/outlet will be and
- b. what environmental impact it will have on the environment and on properties down stream?

Why isn't the developer being required to show the actual environmental impact – and impact on my property – based on these two outlet options – vs. the average increase in water flow?

- What is the impact on the banks, trees and spawning fish in the creek?

- What about impact on heritage oak and cottonwoods which already have exposed roots?

3. It seems that a full and current EIR should be done once the final drainage plan is clear.

- a. Without knowing where and how the outlet for 32 acre feet of water is, how can you determine the impact?

4. As a better solution: Why isn't the 1992 drainage plan being used – It seems less environmentally dangerous?

II. What evidence is there that the drainage plan won't damage my property?

1. My property is bordered by Garnett Creek and it currently already has:
 - a. Flooding problems – sand bag many years
 - b. Serious erosion problems – property gets run off across it from Grant
 - c. There are low lying areas where water runs up and floods each year.
2. The developers' own consultant suggested that the developer build something to protect my property – I've heard nothing about mitigation?
3. I understand the current study by the developer did not look at the actual data (site map) of my property, rather at government averages and estimates for the larger area.

The actual topography of my property is quite different from the averaged data in the study – Given that my property is so low lying and has erosion and flooding issues already how can the City allow the developer to rely on such data, when it is clear there is already a water issue on my property?

There are significant natural impediments on both sides of Garnett Creek. To what extent were those actual and real impediments considered in the 1) Engineering Report or 2) Short Circuited EIR?

III. Equal Application of the Law

1. Haven't heard why the City required me to lower my barn/new construction to a peak of 21'8" (lower than existing buildings on my property) while allowing the developer to build 18 plus new structures with peaks up to 35'?
2. When I put up small earthen berms, the City would not let me proceed – for nearly a year – until the actual runoff from the berms was determined and the impact on the creek – the run off from my berms is miniscule compared to the amount of water being discussed here.

I do not understand why the developer isn't being required to show actual impact – on the environment and private property – when I was required to do so for a much, much smaller project?

I respectfully request that the developer be required to do:

A full EIR based on the actual drainage plan and taking into account impact on the low lying areas where the water is planned to come into the creek.