

From: [Meynell, Karen](#)
To: [Dunn, Jacob](#); [McClenagan, Laura](#)
Subject: FW: Holgersen Minor subdivision
Date: Tuesday, April 26, 2022 3:15:01 PM

FYI

From: KFadd <kimfaddler@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2022 3:05 PM
To: Werner, Christine <cwerner@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Meynell, Karen <KMeynell@co.humboldt.ca.us>
Subject: Fwd: Holgersen Minor subdivision

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

Greetings,

I would like to notify the building and planning department of Eureka, California in the county of HUMBOLDT of my objection to the Holgersen subdivision project you are reviewing. It feels as if this projects has taken place outside the brown act since the things have been moving forward without the neighbors knowledge even though it affects us all.

#1

My first notice is to alert the planning department that the plans submitted may be using the chain link and wire fence separating the yards as the property line.
THE FENCE ALONG THE WEST SIDE IS NOT THE PROPERTY LINE. My father placed the fence well into our yard because the neighbor wanted to be able to access trees and shrubs for pruning. In 2018 there was a surveyor on the property that my father spoke with who confirmed in conversation that the fence and a structure were at least 5 feet onto our side of the PL. this survey was never recorded!

#2

The data and observation will show this project will cause severe damage and flooding to surrounding property and specifically those around the storm water detention trench, including my location directly west of the planned buildings APN 015-152-028.

THE STORM WATER RUN OFF IS NOT ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED WHEN IT IS DIRECTED TO SHEET FLOW ONTO NEIGHBORING PROPERTY.

See the photo of discussion stating no impact on neighboring properties. It states "public works has suggested this be an answer for the drainage problem". My property is NOT available for his drainage solution. My back property is used frequently for family gatherings, and that is where I live. Until I can construct an ADU of my own, I sleep in the back yard, as do all my visitors since our

house at 3395 Edgewood only has one bedroom. His construction plans would damage my current living situation and any future plans to put in my permanent ADU because he wants his sheet flow to come onto my property. Much of the surrounding properties deal with standing water issues after heavy Humboldt rain, and we certainly can not accommodate the sheet flow from mr Holgersens property after he builds duplex's.

The project has asked surrounding neighbors for drainage easements and been denied multiple times over the years, so they suggest a detention trench 86' long. This is still expected to overflow as the engineer references it flooding so the new construction should be 12" above grade instead of 6" (See storm water detention system preliminary drainage report paragraph 2) Picture an 86 foot moat five feet from your space? This type of storm water collection isn't normally located this close to multi family housing and your neighbors fences and yards as sink holes are a side effect. It requires vigilance to prevent drownings, as you can look at the statistics from any "safe kids" organization or area that has open water trench's or aqueducts. Keep in mind this is not a detention "pond" this is a 86' trench. This is an unacceptable risk. I have 10 grandchildren and huge family and we use my yard. The children camp and stay in the back close to where he wants to put this dangerous trench of water.

3). He is asking for reduction in set backs and road width. The proposed building has 23.5 foot tall buildings right next to my property line (the real property line)I am asking for an official solar study since this will cause a severe impact on the amount of sunlight surrounding homes receive. My lot is 64 foot wide and now there will be 24 foot tall duplexes that create walls within 5 feet of my property every part of our yards will be in the shadow of these structures. There will be no privacy and limited sun. My parents mature fruit trees and fledgling redwoods will be shaded and canning and drying fruit will be affected. A 24 foot wall will tower over my greenhouse putting it in complete shade.

4.

Fire hazard.

By allowing a 24 foot home so close to my existing wood greenhouse, see photo, the smallest fire will certainly spread to my greenhouse and then my home. On top of this, allow a variance in the road width affects fire vehicle access

I see a report from cal fire, what about the local Humboldt fire station? That is who would be called to put out a structure fire. Multi family housing ALWAYS causes higher call volume for police, fire and ambulance and now you are considering a narrower access road and he wants it to be a DIRT road, all of which will affect access. As a retired Fire inspector I find the request for a the reduction in the access road width alarming to say the least. You will have the tallest, largest buildings around our neighborhood, considered the highest risk occupancy due to multifamily dwellings and you want to allow limits on fire truck access?

5.

Added traffic and parking. There is only a small section of the project that has street frontage. The rest is open for the two driveways/road entrances. There is not enough parking in the subdivision, as you can see, so all of the additional cars from the 9 units will be need to park on the street in front of the neighbors homes.

This plan will have a very direct, negative impact on surrounding property with flooding. It will affect my ability to use and enjoy my property. My parents have lived on Edgewood for 53 years and deserve to have a little spot of sun when they sit on their porch instead of a 24 foot wall. I feel my parents have been treated as if they don't exist because they are older and nice, and definitely given no voice while this will impact this property more than anyone. I am the legal owner and my parents do have a voice with me.

I am not against building, I am not against development on this property, but not while it damages mine.

Please accept this as my official complaint as the project known as Holgersen minor subdivision at 3409 Edgewood road will be harmful to my property at 3395 Edgewood Road, Eureka Calif. I request a copy be sent to mr Jacob Dunn. I will be sending my complaint to planning commission, and county representatives as well.

Thank you

Kimberley Kennemer Faddler



c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner, which would:			X	
(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			X	
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;			X	
(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			X	
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X

Discussion:

o.k. which is it 2 words (Retention / Detention) continually interchanged. Similar but not same

(a-e) Less than Significant, No Impact: The proposed subdivision is consistent with the planned economic development of the area, in terms of both the County's Economic Development Element and the recently adopted Humboldt County General Plan 2017. The project site is an area that relies upon the use of a community water and sewer source (provided by the Humboldt Community Services District). According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map, the project site is located outside the 100 - and 500- year floodplains. Further, the project site is not within a mapped dam or levee inundation area. The site sits at an approximate elevation of 100 feet and is outside the areas that are subject to tsunami run-up. The project was reviewed by Public Works, who has recommended as a condition of approval that the applicant consider applying for an exception request under County Code Section 325-9 to allow for a 30-foot wide right of way for the Unnamed Access Road and the applicant has submitted an exception request letter. The project proposal includes a retention system that would capture and retain storm water to prevent an increase in storm water runoff sheet flowing onto nearby properties, it will require regular monitoring and maintenance by lot owners. The Preliminary Drainage Report completed by Atlas Engineering states that the storm water retention system can be designed and installed to accommodate storm water runoff from the proposed development; the proposed system will detain runoff in excess of the 2-year pre-development peak flow rate for storm return periods of 100 years or less. Exception Request

The runoff calculations for the post-development condition used composite runoff coefficients of $C=0.22$ for Phase I and $C=.41$ for Phase II accounting for new construction and impervious surfaces; see attached calculations. Using a Rainfall Intensity of 3.74 (100-year storm, storm duration = 10 min.) and an area of 1.07 acres, the calculated post-development runoffs during a 100-year rainfall event were .89 cubic feet per second (ft^3/s) for Phase I and 1.66 cubic feet per second (ft^3/s) for Phase II. Drainage calculations are included in Attachment A.

Table 1 summarizes the flow rate for 2-year pre-development and 100-year post-development rainfall events and the change in runoff as a result of the proposed development for Phases I and II.

Table 1. Runoff Flow Rates for 2-Year Pre- and 100-Year Post Development Rainfall Events

Improvement	Area (Acres)	2-year Pre-Development Q (ft^3/s)	100-Year Post-Development Q (ft^3/s)	Change Q (ft^3/s)
Phase I	1.07	.457	.89	.43
Phase II	1.07	.457	1.66	1.20

Storm Water Detention System

Existing site conditions and the lack of nearby underground storm drainage infrastructure make a subterranean detention system with a metered outflow to existing drainage infrastructure impractical. Phase I is essentially a minor revision of access to the existing residence; therefore, no additional drainage infrastructure is required for Phase I. The full build-out of Phase II will alter much of the surface of the existing lot, and will require additional storm water detention features. Above ground drainage swales and a detention basin are suitable for this site and will provide both water quality control and flood control. A new detention basin shall be built on the north parcel, as shown on attached Sheet P1. Runoff from impervious areas on all parcels shall be routed to the basin via sheetflow. The basin shall be sized to contain the volume of runoff required to limit the offsite runoff to pre-development 2-year storm levels and will empty within 48 hours of a storm event. This runoff will be stored in the basin and will be released by infiltration into the soil. As shown in the attached calculations, the Skupien Method was used to determine the detention facility storage volume sufficient for containment of runoff generated by a 100-year post development storm event or less. The required detention system volume increased by a factor of safety of 1.4 is calculated to be 758 cubic feet based on a flow rate change of $1.20 \text{ ft}^3/\text{s}$ (Phase II, full build-out). An 86 foot long by 2 feet deep basin with 2.25:1 sides and a 1' wide bottom has the required capacity and allows for 6" of freeboard. Alternate basin shapes may be used with the approval of the engineer-of-record.

To prevent flooding, proposed finish floor elevations shall be a minimum of 12" above the high water level of the detention basin. Roof downspouts for the buildings on all parcels shall be routed to the detention basin by surface grading or by piping. Driveways, impervious surfaces, and landscaping areas shall also be graded to allow sheet flow to the basin where feasible.

As shown in the calculations, the proposed detention basin provides sufficient volume to contain the runoff from a 100-year, post-development rainfall event and will drain the stored runoff within 48 hours. The basin is sized to limit runoff created by the development of all parcels, but is sited on the northern parcel and will limit runoff off of this site. Therefore, the detention facilities as designed are feasible and meet Public Works criteria. The proposed improvements and storm water detention systems should be constructed in the approximate locations as shown on the submitted Tentative Map (see Attachment).

