

Humboldt County Planning Department
3015 H Street
Eureka, CA 95501
County of Humboldt Planning <planningbuilding@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Re: Henderson subdivision application

Dear Sir or Madam,

My name is Michael Morrison. My wife and I previously owned 1450 Anvick Road (APN 500-141-045). We purchased the property from John McHugh in 1985.

The parcel was one of two from land initially owned by Michael McHugh and his wife, later inherited by John and his sister, Eileen Henderson. As I understood it, the McHugh property was split into two parcels for inheritance: one accessed by Golf Course Road and the other by Anvick Road. Eileen took ownership of the Golf Course parcel, and John the Anvick parcel we later purchased. The Golf Course parcel is the subject property that Eileen and her husband want to split.

Having a homesite with a view was essential to us, but John's parcel initially lacked one. However, there was a suitable view-site right on the property line separating the two parcels, and Eileen agreed to do a lot line adjustment to add that site from her Golf Course parcel to John's Anvick parcel. We bought the property based on that agreement, and she followed through with it.

During the purchase process and afterward, I discussed with the Hendersons the potential for further subdivision. The discussions typically focused on two main themes.

The first was that the Hendersons always planned to subdivide and sell their front pasture. It originally was a lawful, separate parcel when John and Eileen's parents purchased the property. That was, for example, to be the college fund for their son.

The second was to jointly subdivide our two parcels into four when public water and sewer would be available. This would have been permitted under the 2.5-acre minimum of the zoning regulations applicable to the property at that time. I recall seeing and discussing proposed maps, though no application had been filed for subdivision by the time we sold the property in 2016.

I am confident that Eileen would not have agreed to the lot line adjustment if it affected selling their front pasture. The future sale of that property was of priority importance to the

Henderson family. I recall them saying that they were told that the piece could be separated from their home site.

I am offering this information for the Planning Commission's record, with the purpose of testimony regarding the property's history.

Respectfully,

Michael Morrison



8/4/25

To: Planning Commission,

Concerns regarding the Henderson Parcel Map Subdivision Project PLN-2025-19178:

The proposed subdivision would allow for two dwellings on one parcel that is well below 2.5 acres. Since there would be no water and sewer hookup to City of Arcata, this would impact surrounding property in the way of another well and sewer systems for possibly two dwellings. It is of concern that this would impact the water table and leach fields on the surrounding areas.

The fact that a subdivision of less than five acres is not permitted should be considered a reason for denial of the subdivision.

The planning commission would be well within compliance of community and general plans to deny the subdivision.

As a neighbor in the area I support the denial of the subdivision.

RE: Henderson Subdivision

Planning Commissioners:

For your consideration of this subdivision, I wish to provide the following information related to actions taken by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors when approving and adopting the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) ordinance.

The ordinance was approved by the Commission and subsequently adopted by the Board after modifying the draft ordinance submitted by the Planning Department. The modification deleted an exclusion recommended by the Planning Department that would have specifically required “ADUs on lots located within the Jacoby Creek area (to) comply with the 5-acre minimum density limits as provided in the Jacoby Creek Community Plan.”

The relevancy of that action to the subdivision relates to a directive given to the Planning Department by the Board of Supervisors to initiate amendment of the Jacoby Creek Community Plan.

I am concerned in that I see that the Planning Department is telling the Planning Commission that the directive only addresses ADU restrictions, not subdivisions.

I was active in and followed the ordinance's public review and hearings. My purpose was to address the ADU restriction proposed by Planning's recommended exclusion. But my recollection of the hearings is that the related discussions was mostly about subdivisions.

Most notably, the Planning Department's defense for recommending the exclusion was solely to maintain consistency with the restrictions on subdivisions and ADUs. I remember this because my primary challenge was to overcome the widespread confusion regarding the distinction between permitting ADUs and permitting subdivisions.

I also recall feeling relief when Planning's proposed exclusion of Jacoby Creek was removed for the simple reason that if a proposed project—whether an ADU, subdivision, or other, with or without sewer and/or water service— meets all health and safety requirements without waivers, then no additional restrictions should apply.

However, what stands out most in my memory is the sense of justification in my participation, because I felt both the Commission and the Board wanted to rectify the underlying problem by updating the Jacoby Creek Community Plan to allow projects when required services were unavailable, but health and safety standards were met.

My point is that it is unrealistic to suggest that the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors directed an update to the Jacoby Creek Community Plan solely to address ADUs, without considering subdivisions or other development affected by the requirement for services when the requirement cannot be met.

What I heard was that the Plan's 5-acre limitation is erroneous and needs to be corrected.

With respect,

Jason Valentin



8/2/2025

RLN-2025-19178

To whom it may concern.

I am strongly opposed to the split of APN 500-141-045, 500-201-003. (Henderson, Parcel Map Subdivision), 1933 Golf Course Rd, Bayside, CA 95524.

As a close neighbor, said split would adversely affect my neighbors and myself and is against 5 Acre minimum for county law.

Water is scarce as we run out of water mid-summer due to overpopulation. Property is used by deer, bear, cougars, foxes and other wildlife as a safe passage. This could push wild life into street and cause harm to people and animals, noise, privacy and pollution are of strong concern.

Please deny illegal split
Thank you, Neighbor

From: [Brett Marth](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: Henderson Parcel Map Subdivision, PLN-2025-19178
Date: Monday, August 04, 2025 3:54:15 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an EXTERNAL source. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Good afternoon, we are writing in support of the Henderson subdivision. We own the neighboring property to the north (1450 Anvick Rd, APN 500-141-046).

We strongly oppose enforcing outdated Jacoby Creek Community Plan policies that require public water and sewer for parcels under 5 acres, even though the plan allows a density of 2.5 to 5 acres. The City will not provide the services and has no plan to provide the services, and the requirement cannot be fulfilled. The Planning Department's continued enforcement of these policies—particularly given the County's discretion under the "Errors in the Plan" provision of the General Plan not to enforce them—is unwarranted, as no other properties in the neighborhood are eligible for subdivision under the current zoning regulations.

We also support granting the zoning variance that is needed to approve the subdivision.

As we understand, a zoning variance would be appropriate when special circumstances limit a property's use compared to neighboring properties. Here, the special circumstances concern property ownership.

The Hendersons' property is 4.6 acres in size, and our property is 6.6 acres. Together they total 11.2 acres.

The Hendersons want to split their 4.6-acre property into parcels of 3.2 and 1.4 acres. But this does not meet the current zoning requirement for a minimum of 5 acres for splitting into an average parcel size of 2.5 acres, so the variance is needed.

We intend someday to split our property into two parcels averaging 3.3 acres. This meets the zoning requirements, and no variance would be needed to do it.

Aside from granting the variance, there are only two possible options for splitting the Hendersons' property: merging it with ours or adjusting the lot line between the two properties.

A merger would eliminate the need for a variance to subdivide the combined 11.2-acre property into four parcels averaging 2.8 acres each. The parcel configuration currently proposed by the Hendersons would be permissible under existing

regulations. But merging the two properties is not going to happen.

A lot line adjustment would also eliminate the need for a variance. Transferring at least 0.4 acres from our property to the Hendersons would ensure they reach the 5.0-acre requirement. This would allow them to restore the original 1.4-acre front parcel, leaving a remaining parcel of at least 3.6 acres, ensuring an average parcel size of 2.5 acres or more.

However, that option is not viable, as we will not agree to it because there is no logical way to configure the adjusted lot lines.

More importantly, there is no rational reason for requiring merger or lot line adjustment. Both proposed Henderson parcels meet water and wastewater requirements without waivers, and their layout fits the existing neighborhood. This remains unchanged whether the subdivision is approved by merging the properties, adjusting lot lines, or granting the variance.

The only conceivable reason for not granting the variance is for strict adherence to ownership requirements in subdivisions. In this sense, an owner of both properties A and B is able to subdivide the land, whereas an owner of only property B cannot.

The regulation is being applied unfairly here. Denying this variance due to ownership, without further justification, serves no public benefit. The focus should be on whether the restriction is necessary, not on who owns the property.

No real problems have been identified with granting the variance, so there is no reason to deny it, which would prevent approval of the subdivision.

We encourage approval of the subdivision. There is no valid justification for denial, and doing so would be unjust.

Respectfully,
Brett Marth
Thyme Frances

Sent from my iPhone

RE: Henderson Parcel Map Subdivision

Members of the Humboldt County Planning Commission.

We have interest in the Henderson Subdivision and advocate for its approval. We wish to comment on what we believe is a misrepresentation of facts.

The average resulting lot size of the proposed subdivision is 2.3 acres.

The Hendersons showed us a map that has been provided to you, with figures showing current parcel development in what we locals call the Golf Course Road Neighborhood, covering all the unincorporated properties between Arcata and Baywood Golf Course, served by Golf Course Road. The Henderson property and its northern neighbor, together 11.2 acres, are the neighborhood's largest and only subdividable parcels. The average parcel size in the neighborhood is 1.8 acres excluding the two properties, and 2.1 acres including them.

But the Planning Department says the Hendersons' are wrong. The staff report informs the Planning Commission that the real average parcel size in the area is between 2.45 and 2.48 acres, which is larger than the proposed subdivision's 2.3-acre average parcels. And, Planning says, in addition to the Henderson property and its northern neighbor, there are other properties in the area larger than 2.5 acres. For these reasons, Planning argues, the Hendersons are not being denied privileges available to other property owners in the area and therefore do not qualify for a variance.

To support its argument, the Planning Department provided in its staff report a map of its study area, with the implication that it is the same area referenced by the Hendersons.

This is a misrepresentation of the Hendersons' arguments. The Hendersons' figures applied solely to the Golf Course Road Neighborhood and not to "the area" as reported by the Planning Department. The neighborhood is just one portion of the much broader area referenced by Planning. And it happens to be the only portion of Planning's study area that is not within the City's Service Area and is outside the County Water District. Not only will water and sewer services never be made available to the neighborhood, but the services will not be needed or wanted.

The first map on the attached page is the Golf Course Road Neighborhood referenced by the Hendersons. The second map is "the area" referenced by the Planning Department, on which we overlaid the neighborhood.

The Hendersons' description of the Golf Course Road Neighborhood is accurate, as the area is fully developed except for the Henderson property and its adjacent parcel to the north. Splitting these two properties would constitute infill within an otherwise established suburban neighborhood.

In contrast, the expanded section added by the Planning Department is still rural in character, with numerous underdeveloped large parcels. Of greater importance, the additional section lies within the County Water District, in contrast to the Golf Course Road Neighborhood, which is neither part of the County Water District nor currently included in the City's Service Area.

So, of course the Hendersons' property is comparable to those underdeveloped large parcels in the additional section referenced by the Planning Department.

Although not intended by the Planning Department, the contrast supports approval of the subdivision. Planning's parcel-size assessment of "the area" clearly shows that the Golf Course Road Neighborhood is a distinct pocket community separate from other unincorporated lands in Planning's study area. Public water and sewer services are currently unavailable to this pocket community, and the City has no plans to extend the services. As the neighborhood consists of established residential estates on large, self-sustaining lots, public services are unnecessary and not suitable for the area.

The current Jacoby Creek Community Plan—even though it allows residential-estate development at a density of 2.5 to 5 acres for the Golf Course Road Neighborhood—is flawed due to its impractical and unachievable policies requiring public water and sewer for parcels under 5 acres. The services are not and will not be available, and there is no need for them. Those impractical and unachievable policies should not serve as grounds for withholding approval of the subdivision.

There is no legitimate reason or purpose to not approve the subdivision.

Thank you for considering our input.

Respectfully.

Pete and Sue Oringer

Maps attached

