

Dock, Joel

From: David A Dries <davidadries@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2019 3:01 PM
To: Dock, Joel
Cc: Tony Kelly; Joey Ashby; Bartley, Ashley; David Mindel
Subject: 18zone1071, 6875 S Hurstbourne Pkwy (Public Hearing 8-1-2019)

CAUTION: This email came from outside of Louisville Metro. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe

Joel,

As an upstream property owner, I have supported this rezoning request and for 10 months have been trying to help ensure that sanitary sewer elevations and capacity work in the future for all the properties in the upstream watershed including my property.

The Applicant and MSD have both been responsive to me (although not 100% in agreement), and I trust that my concerns will be handled satisfactorily by the Applicant and by MSD in the future. I may be looking for too much detail now, but I do have a concern and a request for this rezoning case.

On Tuesday of this week, I received two sanitary sewer profile sheets prepared by Qk4:

- **The Qk4 Sheet 1 Alternative looks fine to me, and appears beneficial to all properties.** The proposed sanitary sewer on Sheet 1 in both scenarios (that is, red and blue lines) indicates an approximate sanitary sewer invert elevation of 607 at the east property line, with an approximate existing ground elevation of 612 at the same location at the east property line.
- **The Qk4 Sheet 2 Alternative is not understandable to me, and is not acceptable to me.** For the same location at the east property line in both scenarios (that is, red and blue lines), Qk4 Sheet 2 shows about 11 to 12 feet of fill in the stream valley with an approximate sewer invert elevation of 618 at the east property line (instead of an approximate sewer invert elevation of 607 as shown on Sheet 1), and an approximate proposed ground elevation of 624 at the east property line (instead of an approximate existing ground elevation of 612). Note that the low point on my 17-acre property has an existing ground elevation of approximately 623, and is located about 750 feet upstream from the Applicant's east property line.

My concern and request are:

- **Concern.** I am surprised that a sewer profile sheet provided during the week of the Planning Commission public hearing would show approximately 12 feet of fill at the east property line (as shown on Sheet 2), with the proposed sanitary sewer shown located approximately 6 feet above the existing grade at the east property line.
- **My request** is to use Qk4 Sheet 1 as a guide, and set an approximate sanitary sewer invert elevation in the 607 range at the east property line, and not in the 618 elevation range (which is well above existing grade at the east property line) as shown on Qk4 Sheet 2?

Thanks for your consideration in keeping the proposed sanitary sewer at the east property line at a comparable elevation to the stream valley serving the upstream watershed (like Qk4 Sheet 1), and avoiding this elevation from unnecessarily being raised approximately 11 feet (like Qk4 Sheet 2) which could negatively affect all upstream properties.

David A. Dries
502.777.0700