Attachment 12

Town of Loomis

April 10, 2017

3665 Taylor Road

Loomis, CA 95650

Attn: Robert King, Town Planner

RE: The Grove Subdivision Development

RECEIVED

APR 11 2017

TOWN OF LOOMIS

I am appealing the decision of the planning commission board to grant the Grove project permission to move forward. See following concerned not addressed adequately. These actions by the Town of Loomis may have effect to my property values and access via No Name Lane.

1. The parcel is being graded to drain all water onto No Name and we're concerned the retention is ill equipped to handle heavy rains. Based on the math from USGS website https://water.usgs.gov/edu/activity-howmuchrain.php 10 acres receiving 1 inch of rain produces 36,302 cubic feet of water. Page 68 of the declaration states the retention pond is designed to hold 27,756 cubic feet of water. It also states in the event of a 10 or 100 yr. flood, the discharge from the pond would be no greater than 2 cfs. The Meredith Engineering report states approximately 20 cfs of water draining from 3 separate areas on the parcel now which will be consolidated to 1 collection area. If the pond is at capacity and it receives heavy rains, how can the pond have an inflow of 20 cfs, but limit the water to 2 cfs on the outflow? With out overfilling????

2. Who is responsible for the water once it drains from development onto the private drive of No Name? The concern is water causing flooding and erosion of the ditch/road which residents of No Name Rd. constantly have to take maintain. Why should we have to take the time and or pay for someone else's water after they develop a project? Can the water be tied into the city's existing storm drains? Below are several ideas for fixing ditch/ road issues.

a. We ask that the culvert be relocated to left side of road. As of now, the water from the pond passes through a 12 inch pipe buried under No Name Rd. and runs down the ditch into the creek. If developer trenches and puts in a pipe to drain the new development, it will greatly reduce the chances of the current ditch from eroding and flooding the road like it currently does. See proof in pictures below that water from field flows over road in heavy rain.

Bill Wenzel
5100 No Name Lane
Loomis CA, 95650

The Grove – Response to Appeal

Planning Commission Decision Appeal by Bill Wenzel, dated April 10, 2017

Mr. Wenzel appealed the decision of the Planning Commission for The Grove project. Mr. Wenzel's appeal identified three issues regarding drainage, indicating that the issues were not addressed adequately and that the actions by the Town may affect his property values and access via No Name Lane. A response to each issue raised by Mr. Wenzel is provided below.

Drainage

Mr. Wenzel indicated that the parcel is being graded to drain all water to No Name Lane and identified concern that the retention basin is ill-equipped to handle heavy rain. Mr. Wenzel indicated that 10 acres receiving one inch of rain produces 36,302 cubic feet of water. Mr. Wenzel questioned how the pond could have an inflow of 20 cfs but limit the water to 2 cfs at the outflow without overfilling.

Design flows from the Placer County Flood Control Manual are derived from historical rainfall data. The peak flow rate of 20.56 cubic feet per second is the highest flow rate that is expected and is not an average flow rate. Flow rates peak and then taper off over the defined duration that studied when analyzing the size of the retention basin pursuant to Town and NPDES requirements.

The proposed detention basins have been evaluated and sized using the County's depth/duration design charts that have been created using historical rainfall data and is designed to hold up to the volume of storm water from a 100yr storm event while limiting the flows discharged to No Name Road to less than existing conditions. The Preliminary Storm Drainage Report (Meredith Engineering, 2017) provides calculations that demonstrate the discharge to each basin and the discharge from the basin for 10-year and 100-year storm conditions over a 24-hour period.

The proposed project has also been reconfigured to reduce the project area draining to No Name Road. The previous proposal collected the onsite drainage from the project site and conveyed it to a retention basin at the northwest corner, which then discharged to No Name Road. The proposed drainage for the project, as revised, will be distributed to three discharge locations which match the existing drainage discharge points of the property. The project now proposes three drainage shed areas. Shed 1 would drain 3.9 acres to a basin at the northwest corner and then discharge storm water to No Name Road. Shed 2 would collect drainage from a 3.7-acre area and routed the drainage to a retention basin at the southeast corner and then discharge to a ditch along Humphrey Road. Shed 3 will collect drainage from 1.4 acres in rear yard ditches, which will discharge at the southwest corner.

As described in the Addendum, which was prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA to address changes to the project, the project would result in reduced discharge at all three existing discharge points. The table below identifies existing conditions, drainage discharge from the original project design, and discharge from the modified project design. As shown in the following table, discharge would be reduced at all three discharge areas under both 10-year and 100-year storm events.

DRAINAGE FLOWS AT SHED DISCHARGE POINTS

LOCATION	EXISTING CONDITIONS (PRE-DEVELOPMENT)		ORIGINAL PROJECT (POST-DEVELOPMENT)		MODIFIED PROJECT (POST-DEVELOPMENT)	
	10-YEAR STORM EVENT	100-YEAR STORM EVENT	10-YEAR STORM EVENT	10-YEAR STORM EVENT	10-YEAR STORM EVENT	10-YEAR STORM EVENT
Shed A/1	2.7 cfs	6.87 cfs	2.0 cfs	2.0 cfs	2.0 cfs	2.0 cfs
Shed B/2	4.47 cfs	11.08 cfs	0 cfs	0 cfs	1.8 cfs	3.7 cfs
Shed C/3	2.05 cfs	2.61 cfs	0 cfs	0 cfs	2.0 cfs	2.0 cfs

SOURCE: MEREDITH ENGINEERING, 2016; MEREDITH ENGINEERING, 2017

Maintenance and Responsibility

Mr. Wenzell asks who is responsible for the water once it drains from the project onto the private No Name Lane, indicating that there is concern that water is causing flooding and erosion.

The volume of the proposed basin for Shed 1 has been designed to accommodate the runoff from the 100-year storm event and reduce the flow rate of drainage discharged to No Name Road to less than existing conditions. As shown in the table above, the discharge to No Name Lane would be reduced from 2.7 cfs to 2.0 cfs under a 10-year storm event and from 6.87 cfs to 2.0 cfs under a 100-year storm event. The proposed project would decrease drainage conditions to No Name Lane in comparison to existing conditions.

Regarding responsibility, the Placer County Stormwater Management Manual states "the downstream property owner is obligated to accept and make provision for those waters which are the natural flow from the land above and allows for the reasonable increase in drainage runoff by paving or construction of other impervious surfaces." As previously described, the proposed project will result in a decrease in flows to No Name Lane.

Culvert Location

Mr. Wenzell requests that the culvert be relocated to the left side of No Name Lane, indicating that would reduce the changes of the current ditch from eroding and flooding the road like it currently does. Mr. Wenzell provides photos of the overflow.

As previously described, Placer County Stormwater Management Manual states "the downstream property owner is obligated to accept and make provision for those waters which are the natural flow from the land above and allows for the reasonable increase in drainage runoff by paving or construction of other impervious surfaces." The proposed project will result in a decrease in flows to No Name Lane when compared to existing conditions and no improvements to No Name Lane are proposed as part of the project.