

COMMUNICATION MATRIX

Project Number: 2023102411Date:SepterProject Name: Aurora Oaks PRDTax Parcel:

 Date:
 September 13, 2023

 Tax Parcel:
 12625113901

Subject: Review Comments (1st round)

Directions:

- Each department's reviewer comments are summarized within their own section below.
- Use the APPLICANT RESPONSE column on the far right column of the matrix to provide the following:
 - <u>A complete and clear response to each comment</u>. Avoid writing "noted, or acknowledged" without providing an explanation.
 - When applicable, include reference to a page number and/or where an item can be found on the map or in a submittal document.
- The reviewer's contact information can be found in the green heading above the comment. Please contact the reviewer directly for questions related to a specific comment.
- After all items outlined in the matrix have been addressed:
 - 1. Submit all requested items and copies to the Building Development Center. Incomplete submittals will not be accepted
 - 2. Include one (1) copy of this Communication Matrix with your Applicant Response column completed

Additional Information

- All requested information and number of copies must be submitted as one submittal within 180 days from the date of this matrix or the application will lapse.
- An extension of time may be requested in writing prior to the expiration.
- Additional information may be requested through further review of the project

| Department: Community Planning and Economic Development (CPED) Reviewer: | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--|---|
| ITEM | REVISION / NOTE / COMMENT | DETAILS | APPLICANT RESPONSE |
| 1) Narrative | Required | Could you provide more information in your narrative as to what specific standards the project is requesting flexibility on via the PRD process. It would be beneficial to the hearing examiner to understand why a PRD was chosen for this project. Is it primarily flexibility with lot size or are there other examples / issues? | The site has a large Oak Grove that represents nearly 14.5% of the site. The underlying zoning requires a 10% open space and minimum lot sizes. The PRD allows for flexibility in the lots sizes, below the underlying zoning requirements which is not only preferred with the development goals, but also maintains the density with the 30% open space requirement of a PRD. |

Thurston County Community Planning and Economic Development (CPED) 3000 Pacific Ave SE, Ste. 100, Olympia WA 98501 (360) 786-5490/FAX (360) 754-2939 TDD (360) 754-2933 Website: <u>www.thurstoncountybdc.com</u>

Communication Matrix Project # 2023102411 Aurora Oaks Date: September 11, 2023 Page 2 of 4

| 2) Narrative, PRD Code | Required | Go through PRD code and in particular TCC 21.60.140 and address the Design standards section by section and provide responses to these criteria in order to provide a more complete narrative of the project. | Responses to each design requirement have been provided in Attachment 1 of the Revised Cover Letter/project narrative. |
|---------------------------|----------|--|--|
| 3) Narrative | Required | The narrative pg. 4, discusses walking trails. This would be a nice addition to the project but I'm not seeing any designated trails on the map. Where would these trails be? Also, it is mentioned that the pedestrian friendly design helps residents access nearby lakes. Please explain in detail what is meant and specifically how and where residents would access lakes by foot or bike. Are there other trails near the site leading to nearby lakes or are there nearby public access points to lakes close enough to walk to? Please provide more detail on what is being provided by the project in terms of pedestrian friendly design, access to lakes etc. | The project could have internal walking trails located within the incompatible use buffer, but we want to hear from the public and adjacent property owners on this issue at the hearing. This reference relative to access to lakes has been removed from the Cover Letter/project narrative. |
| 4) PRD Code | Required | Specific questions:TCC 21.60.140 – Design StandardsA.2. What complimentary structures are being provided? Is thisinformation somewhere in the application materials and are there siteplans showing the general types of structures to be provided, i.e.playground, big toy, picnic cover, benches etc. Are any suchstructures proposed? Please provide details.How does the project address the common open space design criteriasubsection A.4. (see comment 2. above) | A play structure is provided north of lot 1 and benches are provided in each of the large open space areas, as identified in the Preliminary Landscape Plans 9/21/2023. Responses to each design requirement have been provided in Attachment 1 of the Revised Cover Letter/project narrative |
| 5) PRD Code | Required | Explain how TCC 21.60.140(6) with regards to private open space is being addressed. Please provide an example of how this is to be accomplished with a proposed or theoretical lot. Show and explain how you plan on meeting this standard. | The development provides a minimum of three hundred square feet of private open space having a minimum of fifteen feet width for each single-family residence as demonstrated in the typical lot details located on sheet C2.5 of the Preliminary Plat plans. |
| 6) Addressing | Note | See link for addressing assignments - https://weblink.co.thurston.wa.us/dspublic/0/doc/16666328/Page1.as px | Noted. |

Communication Matrix Project # 2023102411 Aurora Oaks Date: September 11, 2023 Page 3 of 4

| Department: Thurston County Assessor Office | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|
| Reviewer: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ITEM | REVISION / NOTE | DETAILS | APPLICANT RESPONSE | |
| | / COMMENT | DETAILS | | |
| 1) | N/A | | | |
| , | | | | |
| Department: 1 | hurston County Audit | or's | | |
| Reviewer: | | | | |
| ITEM | REVISION / NOTE | DETAILS | APPLICANT RESPONSE | |
| | / COMMENT | DETAILS | | |
| 1) | N/A | | | |
| · | | | | |
| Outside Agencies Contact information included below | | | | |
| 1) Dept of | | Forwarded previously | Noted. No comments requiring revisions for | |
| Ecology | | | preliminary plat and will be incorporated into the | |
| | | | final design and Construction Engineering plans. | |
| DAHP | Information | See link for DAHP concurrence - | Noted. No comments requiring revisions. | |
| | | https://weblink.co.thurston.wa.us/dspublic/0/doc/16625938/Page1.aspx | | |

PUBLIC HEALTH, ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DIVSION PROJECT REVIEW COMMENTS

| PROJECT NAME: Aurora Oaks PRD | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| PROJECT NUMBER: 2023102411 | | | | |
| PUBLIC HEALTH COI | NTACT: Dawn Peeb | les <u>dawn.peebles@co</u> | o <u>.thurston.wa.us</u> 360-867-2650 | |
| ITEM | REVISION / | DETAILS | Provide Code Reference – Item(s) that need to be corrected. | APPLICANT RESPONSE: |
| | NOTE / | | | |
| | COMMENT | | | |
| 1) Integrated Pest Management | Revised Plan | A revised IMP Plan m attached. | ust be submitted addressing the comments added to the document. Please see | The comments were minor and all comments |
| Plan (IPMP) | | [EH Policy #ONST.9 | 97.POL.805] | have been addressed and a Revised IPMP has been resubmitted. |

Communication Matrix Project # 2023102411 Aurora Oaks Date: September 11, 2023 Page 4 of 4

Public Works comments

| PROJECT NAME: Aurora Oaks | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--|--|
| PROJECT NUMBER: 2023102411 | | | |
| CONTACT: Arthur Saint arthur.saint@co.thurston.wa.us | | | |
| ITEM | REVISION / NOTE / | DETAILS Provide Code Reference – Item(s) that need to | APPLICANT RESPONSE: |
| | COMMENT | be corrected. | |
| 1) Drainage | Comment | Please see Drainage scoping response which can be viewed at: <u>https://weblink.co.thurston.wa.us/dspublic/0/doc/16740640/Page1.as</u> | The Drainage Scoping Letter does not identify any deficiencies or anticipated issues associated with the current preliminary design. As such, the applicant has no issues with these comments being included as SEPA conditions. The project meets all requirements and will provide all required material with the final drainage report submitted with the Construction Engineering plans. |
| 2) Traffic | Comment | The intersection of Kagy and Mullen is shown to have a below acceptable level of service with this project. It is required to be improved by another project. Should that project fail to move forward this project would need to install those improvements. Additionally, will the proposed improvements provide acceptable level of service when this project is also added. | Page 20 of the submitted TIA states that the intersection will operate at an acceptable level of service with the completion of intersection improvements by the Manor House development. Should those improvements not be complete prior to the Aurora Oaks project, these improvements should be a condition of Aurora Oaks. |

q:\scott mc\2023102411.aurora oaks prd\2023102411 auroraoaksprd.matrix1.sm.docx