

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
No. 2**

For Planning Commission Agenda of:
December 5, 2019
Item No. E-7

Re: Applicant: Diane Lavelle-Usrey
 Case Number: PLN-2018-15181
 APN: 510-231-027

Attached is an email providing responses to comments received by Bryan Atkinson (email also included) regarding the proposed subdivision.

Estlow, Trevor

From: Estlow, Trevor
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2019 4:05 PM
To: Bryan Atkinson
Subject: RE: Ursery Subdivision Comment

Hi Bryan-

We are extending the comment period to December 4th – you should receive a revised notice in the mail.

The right-of-way width exception is for the interior road serving the subdivision. This road is proposed to be 24-foot wide including two travel lanes, a parking lane as well as curb, gutters and sidewalk. This reduction is supported by Public Works as it only serves 5 lots and dead-ends at Hiller Park. Along the frontage of the parcel, Eucalyptus will be improved to 24-foot wide including two travel lanes, a parking lane as well as curb, gutters and sidewalk.

Regarding Daffodil, it is improved to a minimum Road Category 4 standard. According to the County Subdivision Regulations, this road can accommodate upwards of 100+ parcels (approximately 800 vehicle trips per day). This subdivision will not exceed the carrying capacity of the road.

As far as the waste treatment, I found a plot plan for the old mobile home that was recently removed but the house pre-dates our records. At this point, occupation of that residence will require approval from Environmental Health which would likely require connection to the sanitary sewer system.

Let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks.

-Trevor

From: Bryan Atkinson <bryanpaul707@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2019 1:45 PM
To: Estlow, Trevor <TEstlow@co.humboldt.ca.us>
Subject: Ursery Subdivision Comment

Hello Trevor,

I hope you are well.

I am a neighbor of the Urseys and I have concerns with the project.

I wanted to ask if there has been an extension to the public comment period due to the late noticing? I know your department works very hard on these projects, to ensure all applicable county, state and federal laws and regulations are followed.

In brief (if comment period extended i can provide more substantial comment) I have a couple questions about the proposed project. I do not understand why the project would qualify for the road width exemption. If you can provide documentation of why the project qualifies that would be appreciated. I believe there may have been incorrect interpretations of traffic on Eucalyptus road provided to your department.

I live at the intersection of Daffodil Road and Eucalyptus Road at 900 Eucalyptus Road (APN 510-231-017). This intersection has much greater traffic than would be expected based on the number of houses it services. Nearby Bolier Road is a dirt road and though recently regraded many residents of Bolier and the neighboring streets access their properties using Eucalyptus Road. As daffodil is paved and faster to travel on and does not create dust. In addition the intersection of Daffodil and Eucalyptus road (very near the entrance to the proposed subdivision) is used multiple times a day as a turnaround for school buses that service the neighborhood. There are also multiple RVs and "soccer moms" that end up driving down Daffodil in error in belief it will connect to Hiller road and Hiller Park.

I believe that a reduced road width is uncalled. The current traffic is substantial for the small intersection. Further development on neighboring parcels in addition to the proposed subdivision will cause increased traffic. There are many large parcels in my neighborhood with potential for development and it seems imprudent to allow a decreased road width. There have been houses recently added to APN 510-371-010 or near there.

I also have concern with the access road width to the new parcels. I would appreciate any evidence as to why the exemption might be approved.

My other concern is that I have heard (unsubstantiated) from others in the neighborhood that there was never a waste treatment system associated with the home at the south end of the current lot. That home was built prior to McKinleyville having a coordinated wastewater treatment system or plan. It is my understanding that sewage from the home may have been simply pumped to a low spot on the property which is not covered in California Blackberry plants. Is this something that you have looked into, or can document proper disposal of human waste associated with that residence in the past?

Again I appreciate your effort on this project. I look forward to your reply.

Thank you
Bryan Atkinson