

**From:** [Debra Topham](#)  
**To:** [Ramos, Ricky](#)  
**Cc:** ["Anabel Estrada"; 2dianeripley@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** RE: REQUEST FOR MEETING POSTPONEMENT: Comments to draft-mitigation-negative-declaration of Proposed Olson Residential Townhomes Project  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 3, 2022 12:05:12 PM  
**Importance:** High

---

Thank you, Mr. Ramos.

May I clarify that the Tamarack Village HOA is once every other month commencing with the ODD months. Therefore, May 10, 2022 is the next meeting of homeowners and board of director.

Please communicate to the City Planning Commission our desire to participate in due public processes.

Debra Topham  
17893 Maggie Ln  
Huntington Beach, CA 92647  
E: [debra@topham.com](mailto:debra@topham.com)  
C: 714.642.5100

-----Original Message-----

From: Ramos, Ricky <[rrios@surfcity-hb.org](mailto:rrios@surfcity-hb.org)>  
Sent: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 8:48 AM  
To: Debra Topham <[debra@topham.com](mailto:debra@topham.com)>  
Cc: 'Anabel Estrada' <[anabel@tritzpm.com](mailto:anabel@tritzpm.com)>; [2dianeripley@gmail.com](mailto:2dianeripley@gmail.com)  
Subject: RE: REQUEST FOR MEETING POSTPONEMENT: Comments to draft-mitigation-negative-declaration of Proposed Olson Residential Townhomes Project

Hi Debra - I will attach your email below to the Planning Commission staff report for their consideration. It will be up to them.

-----Original Message-----

From: Debra Topham <[debra@topham.com](mailto:debra@topham.com)>  
Sent: Monday, May 2, 2022 4:09 PM  
To: Ramos, Ricky <[rrios@surfcity-hb.org](mailto:rrios@surfcity-hb.org)>  
Cc: 'Anabel Estrada' <[anabel@tritzpm.com](mailto:anabel@tritzpm.com)>; [2dianeripley@gmail.com](mailto:2dianeripley@gmail.com)  
Subject: REQUEST FOR MEETING POSTPONEMENT: Comments to draft-mitigation-negative-declaration of Proposed Olson Residential Townhomes Project  
Importance: High

Dear Mr. Ramos,

Cc: Tamarack Village HOA Board of Directors contact (via Anabel Estrada Tritz Project Management) Adding Diane Ripley to this email request, too.

This email is a formal request for a 30-day postponement of the Public Hearing before the Planning Commission regarding the Olson Residential Townhomes Project at the corner of Talbert and Newland.

I received my notice in the mail on Saturday, April 30, 2022 for the upcoming meeting originally scheduled for 6pm May 10, 2022 in City Council Chambers. The post-mark on the envelope was April 27, 2022. Our community of 101 residential units has not been provided sufficient time to consider

all aspects of the planning documents posted nor have we heard back from the public relations contact, Diane Ripley, who just visited us April 29-30, 2022 with news about project changes.

Furthermore, the 6pm May 10, 2022 public hearing directly conflicts with the next official meeting of Tamarack Village Board of Directors. The HOA meeting for May 10th will be the first meeting since Tamarack Village residents were provided access to the drafted mitigation report for the townhomes project. The HOA Board of Directors meetings are over other month. I do not want to miss out on the events presented before the HOA Board of Directors nor do I want to miss the public hearing where much will be covered.

Please provide me and my fellow residents this accommodation.

Debra Topham  
17893 Maggie Ln  
Huntington Beach, CA 92647  
E: [debra@topham.com](mailto:debra@topham.com)  
C: 714.642.5100

-----Original Message-----

From: Ramos, Ricky <[rmos@surfcity-hb.org](mailto:rmos@surfcity-hb.org)>  
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 8:25 AM  
To: Debra Topham <[debra@topham.com](mailto:debra@topham.com)>  
Cc: 'Anabel Estrada' <[anabel@tritzpm.com](mailto:anabel@tritzpm.com)>  
Subject: RE: Comments to draft-mitigation-negative-declaration of Proposed Olson Residential Townhomes Project

Hi Debra. I received your comments below. Thank you.

-----Original Message-----

From: Debra Topham <[debra@topham.com](mailto:debra@topham.com)>  
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 2:40 AM  
To: Ramos, Ricky <[rmos@surfcity-hb.org](mailto:rmos@surfcity-hb.org)>  
Cc: 'Anabel Estrada' <[anabel@tritzpm.com](mailto:anabel@tritzpm.com)>  
Subject: Comments to draft-mitigation-negative-declaration of Proposed Olson Residential Townhomes Project  
Importance: High

Dear Mr. Ramos and Huntington Beach City Planning Commission,  
Cc: Tritz Property Management Services to communicate to the Board of Directors for Tamarack Village HOA.

I am a homeowner of 17893 Maggie Lane, Huntington Beach, CA 92647 and my condominium in Tamarack Village will be facing the proposed townhome project.

My comments relate to the Proposed Olson Townhomes Location: 8371-8461 Talbert Ave. (northwest corner at Newland St.) scheduled for opening 2024.  
<https://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/government/departments/planning/major/major-projects-view.cfm?ID=1111>

The Drafted Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 21-003 must not be accepted as drafted and the project must not move forward as proposed. Further designs and studies must be submitted to the city planning commission to provide safe conditions for existing residents and those the project

purports to house. The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (March 2022) for Olson Townhomes-Planning Application No. 2021-0084 falls short in the following areas:

- a) Page 5 incorrectly characterizes the land use north of the project as "single family residential, residential low density" when my condominium is part of the 101-unit Tamarack Village. The other two corners of the major traffic intersection of Talbert and Newland are ALSO multi-family townhouses as you clearly have pictured on page 19 of 196. This falsely presents the project's impact on noise, air-flow, infrastructure, traffic and city resources. Further on page 34 of 196 the report falsely suggests this project will be "less than significant" on urbanization as mentioned is for the replacement of three existing farm-houses with the open-air landscaping. This project will create HIGH intensity dwellings both visually and by human occupancy. I request that the planning commission reject the 3-story design for only 2-story height limitations to not over-power the existing community. Page 39 of 196 shows the street sign of Jalm and fails to represent the beginning of our 101-unit multi-family complex. Without this representation, the city planning commission cannot make a fair decision on population and community density.
- b) The engineering company did not address the traffic impediments in Appendix I that is clearly a selling point on page 14 of the drafted report regarding "Site Access and Circulation. Vehicular access to the Project Site would be gained by two gated driveways." Elsewhere in the document, Newland is designated as the "main access" when it will be much safer to designate Talbert (even if it is a one-directional entrance).
- c) Page 16 of the drafted report does not state who will be responsible for significant interruptions and inconveniences to our existing homes as well as costly changes to Off-Site Improvements. The off-site civil work would consist of a water main connection in Newland Street, a sewer main connection and new utility access hole in Newland Street, conversion of existing driveways to curb and gutter at Talbert Avenue, a new driveway at Newland Street, a new driveway at Talbert Avenue, and the relocation of a storm drain catch basin at Talbert Avenue. What guarantees do we homeowners have that our access through Jalm and Stymie streets will not be impeded by this project?
- d) Page 49 of 196 does not address the emissions that will be created due to construction and re-paving of Newland and Talbert when sewer and drainage is upgraded to support the extra 34 units. SCAQMD's regional emissions thresholds have not been added to this report (as far as I could observe).
- e) Page 54 of 196 does not address how we as local residents within 200 feet of the site will be notified and protected during the asbestos abatement period. The developers have reports indicating the dangerous substance is present and it is an air-borne hazard! At what monetary rate will we be compensated for and re-located temporarily to avoid exposure to this carcinogen and others (like arsenic and lead in Table 8) for the 10 days of the abatement while the existing structures are leveled and cleared? Will the developers pay for our temporary hotel accommodations, food, and services during the 10 days? On page 94 & 95 of 196 the detection of lead is not expressed clearly-is this in line with California Prop 65 as an amount per kilogram of body weight or per kilogram of soil? The levels may be lower than US EPA but not California's office of environmental health.

f) Beginning on Page 111 of 196 displays in Table 10 incompletely state the conditions of this project:

Goal LU-1 D. Proposal falsely characterizes the surrounding community and fails to ensure the scale of the new project is in line with the existing residential structures that include multi-family units of two-stories and one-story.

Goal LU-3 Project design will impede access to neighboring Jalm street and single-family homes and multi-family condominiums as well as limit ease of commutes through intersection of Talbert and Newland Goal LU-4 A and D: No other structures are three-stories tall so this project fails to conform to the City's planning goals. The construction of an 8foot fence topped by another 6 foot fence is a greater height than any other barrier in the vicinity.

Goal CIRC-1c B-G: Project traffic study in Appendix I (or H)? is a Complete failure to conform to city's goals by allowing property access off Newland, hindering traffic flow from Newland to Talbert because of "gate access", suggesting there is parking on Newland when that is not possible on the block where this land is located. Both ingress/egress must be from Talbert to avoid traffic calamities. There is NO LOGICAL WAY FOR THE MAIN ENTRANCE WITH A GATE TO BE OFF NEWLAND WITHOUT SEVERE CONSEQUENCES TO TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIANS. Just review the past two years of serious traffic accident reports that closed the Talbert and Newland intersection for a day-as it currently exists!

Goal CIRC-1c H. The commission traffic report conveniently did NOT explore any interruptions to our condominium complex nor the other two complexes at the same intersection.

Goal ERC-13 has nothing to do with Moderate-income homeowners and their ability to access or not access rooftop solar systems. What is the message the developers are offering in this section?

Goal N-4 What penalties will be applied to the developer if they do not complete the project by 2024 and we are exposed to undue construction noise and stress for longer periods of time? Where are penalties if the developer begins work prior to 7am and continues past 10pm? There are no consequences listed in Appendix H.

Goal PSI-9 This is missing the designation that new connections to water and sewer are required including interruptions to the roadways on Newland and Talbert. No mention of the party that will bear the costs? Will this be the City of HB? Will the developers pay for extra vermin control once the 2.1 acres are disrupting their homes (and likely move to our community)?

2013-2021 Housing Element Goal 1 and Goal 6 Brags that there will be rooftop solar PV systems to comply with the Green Building initiatives but this fails to address the ADDITIONAL HEIGHT that will be added to the three-story buildings! This is not incongruence with the surrounding residential structures and multi-family units. Is the quoted 35 foot high buildings including these rooftop installations?

g) Pages 148 to 153 of 196 Transportation (part of 4.17) failed to take more than one day's measurements in September 2021 while COVID pandemic was restraining travels of most citizens. Table 16 has numerous values that are missing and marked as "not available" or "deficient operation". This element of the report reinforces that an incomplete traffic study was conducted by the developers' consultants. The traffic study poorly calculates the number

of persons living in 3-bedroom and 4-bedroom townhomes as 2.3 when it is more likely double or triple that number of inhabitants and their trips. The emergency access is not clearly marked (or consistently marked) on the proposed project Appendices and there is no physical possibility a full-sized fire truck or ladder truck can enter off of Newland -the designated "main entrance" especially when there will be two lanes of traffic in the southbound lanes! The fire department must be presented more reasonable circumstances and an accurate traffic report with dimensions of the surrounding area.

\* \* \* \*

Additional Appendices submitted by the Olson Urban Housing, LLC in defense of the draft-mitigated-negative-declaration require much closer scrutiny before finalizing and accepting the project proposals! This project is not congruent with the surrounding structures and offers less safety to our community.

1. I do not agree with the conclusions submitted with Appendices I Traffic Impact Study particularly regarding the proposed entrance and exits on Newland and the number of trips generated by the project.

. Page 4-1 of the report only plans for "low rise" units when this project clearly includes two story and three story townhomes as presented in Appendix J. Therefore, the projected trip generation data is inappropriate, under-reported, and must be resubmitted with more realistic data.

. Page 3-1 of the report failed to consider the traffic patterns in and out of Jalm, a cul-de-sac road that intersections Newland. Jalm provides a singular entrance to the Tamarack Village Homeowners who live off Pollard and Hawes as well as single family homes on Jalm. This short-coming in the report contributes significant bias in the Traffic Study and warrants a reconfiguration of the traffic pattern so the new project will only enter and exit from Talbert Avenue (never from Newland that borders the eastern side of the project).

. Page 3-1 reported one weekday in September 2021 which is barely into the traffic recovery patterns following the COVID pandemic. This further under-reports the traffic impact of the project scheduled to open 2024.

. The traffic study failed to demonstrate major retail area near the proposed project. The drawings failed to note the stop-light at the entrance to the Walmart and retail shopping center nor did the study consider the increase in retail-related traffic congestion.

. The study failed to note the emergency vehicle usage by fire and ambulance on Talbert which leads to the City of Huntington Beach hospital. Without proper turning lanes for the northbound Newland traffic flow, cars will back up into the intersection of Talbert and Newland potentially interfere with critical emergency services or create unnecessary gridlock. Keep in mind, the report did not explore that vehicles turning left into the proposed project will be allowed to hold up northbound traffic on Newland during on and off peak times! The consultants did not look at the existing markings on the road to see that Newland does not permit a left turn at the proposed entrance! That Newland location is currently a turning lane into the westbound Talbert. The northbound vehicles would be waiting for the southbound three-lanes of traffic to clear creating a nightmare of congestion as well as create traffic violations.

. The study failed to note that Talbert is a major thoroughfare to the southbound 405-freeway used extensively by the petroleum hauling semi-trucks that leave the processing facility at Gothard and Talbert.

2. I was not able to view impact reports that addressed Spectrum-Time Warner

Cable services to the project. Page 161 of 196 mentions Spectrum but there is no assessment by that company I could view. Where is the consideration for additional demands on internet and cable services to the project? What infrastructure is in place to maintain this essential service, particularly for those of us who work from home? What part of Appendix H and the Noise-Impact-Analysis addresses concerns that construction might interfere with internet and cable connections?

3. I disagree with the Appendix J assessment for sufficient parking spaces with this project. I have never parked my vehicle in a 0.5 space and would like to know how this is physically possible. This unrealistic report must be corrected to reflect only whole numbers for parking spaces per unit and per total project. I do not want to compete with the guests of these townhome units for spaces on the tiny cul-de-sac of Jalm that is already impacted. The townhomes must have only assigned, whole spaces to be a realistic report of the environmental impact. The study does not address if the townhomes will have driveways to accommodate more parked vehicles than the 2 garages that are currently designed with each unit. How can 16 guest parking spots accommodate 34 units?

4. I disagree with the design of 3-story units for the community aesthetics. This aspect of the plan must be rejected and limited to two-story units. No other multi-unit complexes that face Newland and Talbert are three-stories and this will affect the view and property value of my one-story condominium. Combined with an 8-foot wall and topped with a 6-foot fence, there is nothing appealing about my future views to the south!!! I'm sure the future homeowners will be happier because the developers offer on page 13 "The side of the residential units face the bio-swale feature and Talbert Avenue with no wall in order to maintain openness to the neighborhood and avoid a walled-off appearance."

5. I insist on a more stringent review of the Appendix A, Appendix I and Appendix J for consistency of the entrances and fire lanes. Appendix A shows a vehicular gate which will DRASTICALLY impede traffic flow in and out of Newland and NONE of this is mentioned in Appendix I regarding traffic impact. Appendix A indicates a 20 foot wide fire lane; Appendix J indicates on page 3 of 20 there is no fire access road. What is true?

Thank you for acknowledging my email and I look forward to your committee's work to redesign the project and to address my significant concerns!

Debra Topham  
17893 Maggie Ln  
Huntington Beach, CA 92647  
E: <mailto:debra@topham.com>  
C: 714.642.5100