

City of Brea

APPEAL APPLICATION

Note: An appeal must be filed within ten days of the action being appealed.

Filing Fee: \$ 50 - Brea Residents

\$375 - Any others - Deposit against hourly charge of Adopted Hourly Rates

APPELLANT: Name: Bev Perry
Address: 2241 Shadetree Circle, Brea, CA 92821
Telephone: (714) 671-1446

ACTION BEING APPEALED: (Case No.: Property Location: Deciding Body)

Please see attached sheet.

DATE OF ACTION BEING APPEALED: July 2, 2008

SPECIFIC BASIS FOR THIS APPEAL:

Please see attached sheet.
Also, please see Exhibit 1 for names of co-appellants.

DATED: 7/2/08 SIGNATURE: Bev Perry

Please return this application to the Office of the City Clerk.

+++++

CITY USE ONLY

FEES PAID
DATE REC'D.

HEARING DATE

ACTION BEING APPEALED: Planning Commission Approvals for Canyon Crest Project: Certification of Environmental Impact Statement No. EIR 02-01; Approval of Development Review No. DR 08-01; Approval of Vesting Tentative Map No. TT 15956.

SPECIFIC BASIS FOR THIS APPEAL:

- 1) The Planning Commission incorrectly found that the Canyon Crest Project (the "Project") will provide benefits to Brea that outweigh its significant environmental impacts. In fact, what little benefit the Project would provide is overshadowed by its substantial impacts. The Planning Commission should have recognized this and rejected the Project.
- 2) The Project must be consistent with the Brea General Plan, the Carbon Canyon Specific Plan, and Brea's Hillside Management Ordinance as they stood in 2000. It is, however, inconsistent with all three, and therefore the Planning Commission should not have approved the Project.
- 3) The EIR contained numerous flaws, including but not limited to the following: 1) The EIR's discussion of the Project's contribution to climate change provided no real analysis or mitigation; 2) The EIR failed to recognize the Project's inconsistency with applicable land use plans and ordinances; 3) The EIR improperly relies on deferred analysis and mitigation to reduce several environmental impacts to less than significant levels. In light of these flaws, the EIR was inadequate, and the Planning Commission should neither have certified the EIR nor approved the Project.