

From: [Lacy Garner](#)
To: [Polly Stoker](#)
Subject: FW: Deskins developer position regarding staff report
Date: Tuesday, April 25, 2023 3:15:59 PM
Attachments: [2021106455 Prelim Plat - Staff Report - FINAL DRAFT.pdf](#)

As requested by Examiner Rice, please see below sent with the attached. I thought the applicant was going to submit this to Examiner Rice so I didn't bring it up.

Thank you!

Lacy Garner (she / her) | [Associate Planner](#)
Thurston County Community Planning & Economic Development
 3000 Pacific Ave SE, Suite 100, Olympia, Washington 98502
Desk (360) 786-5580 | **Mobile** (360) 790-7154 | **Fax** (360) 754-2939 | **TDD** (800) 833-6388
lacy.garner@co.thurston.wa.us | www.thurstoncountybdc.com

This communication is a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Washington State Public Records Act, RCW 42.56.

NOTICE

The Planning Services Division will be providing assistance in the Building Development Center between 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. Monday through Friday. This temporary schedule is in place until further notice. Please visit www.thurstoncountybdc.com for up to date information, hours of operation, and services provided remotely.

From: Aaron Fuller <afuller@fullerdesigns.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2023 12:52 AM
To: Lacy Garner <lacy.garner@co.thurston.wa.us>
Cc: Cassie Fuller <cfuller@fullerdesigns.org>; ryan@nfrrealty.com; amy@arwlandscapedesign.com
Subject: Deskins developer position regarding staff report

Lacey,

I know this is short notice but the wanted to follow up with our position on the issues identified in the staff report. We agree with most aspects. Below is a bullet point discussion. Items are listed in line with the staff report on the project attached. Please feel free to forward to the HE but I will also bring a copy and discuss each item in the hearing.

CPED Department Analysis

- A. Density – Concur
- B. Design standards
 - 1-4 – Concur
 - 5. Yes this the variance we are requesting for reduced setback, reduced, right of way, and reduced cross section to 6-A standard. It appears attachment J-J distorted a bit in the transition but this adequately meets the intent.
 - 6. Maximum Coverage by Hard Surface - Each individual lot is not proposed to be built on at this time. Each lot meets the size criteria listed in items 1-4 above. Typical knowledge is implied that a lot meeting minimum size requirements is able to meet hard surface requirements when built on. Each individual lot will be required to submit their own home

placement plan and will be further evaluated against this requirement at the time building and driveways are actually proposed/permitted. To humor this request for a fourth time I offer the following:

- In the drainage calculations 2000sf of new impervious area was assumed for each proposed lot (12000sf for 6 lots) to be directed towards the communal drainage system. This assumption was provided in the initial submittal and used for sizing the main drainage facility under the proposed private roadway. This was also discussed in each matrix response.
- Roof area typically is not directed towards the common drainage facilities but is rather infiltrated in a downspout roof drain system in the back yard area. Only the driveway and parking areas are directed towards the common drainage facilities. As such we feel that 2000sf of “future” impervious area per individual lot is conservative and appropriate for design of the common stormwater systems.
- Each lot is approximately 75’ wide by 115’ deep (8625sf). 60% of the lot area is 5175sf. Rudy lane will take up 25’ of the depth of the lot (1875sf of private road area per lot). This would leave the maximum “future” impervious area allowed (roof and driveway) to be 3300sf. This means that each lot could build up to 3300sf of new impervious area (roof, driveway, and parking) without exceeding the 60% rule discussed in TCC 20.07. Also 2000sf of the impervious area would be allowed to drain into the common stormwater system.
- The building envelope shown on the plans is approximately 65’ wide by 50’ deep (3250sf). This means the entire building envelope could be impervious area and the 60% threshold would not be exceeded.
- The long term intent is for homes to be built in these lots which the footprint size is commensurate with the existing home on lot 1. This existing home is 1600sf and the driveway is approximately 400sf. With 2000sf of new future impervious area, each lot would be roughly 45% impervious (includes private road) which is well shy of the 60% threshold.

C. Additional Standards

1. Concur
2. Concur – The landscaping plan is being revised and is intended to be submitted prior to construction approval.
3. Concur
4. Concur
5. Item B.6 above identifies the impervious area assumed for drainage design and shows that all items can be met. Also no parking is being proposed on lots 2-7. At time of building approval/permitting the building, driveway, and parking areas will need to be reviewed and approved for each lot. Typically 1 parking space is provided inside the building footprint in the garage area. The other parking space is provided in front of the garage in the driveway. There is enough space in the front building setback and the garage areas to provide adequate parking however until individual lot buildout is proposed no parking is intended. This process is for subdivision not individual lot buildout.
6. Landscaping and screening
 - 20.45.020 – This is just a reference to the code. The proposed parking, road, and

driveway has been shown. There is no driveways, parking, or buildings proposed on lots 2-7. While the long term use is intended to be single family residential we anticipate landscape plans be prepared for each individual lot. We do not currently know when the each lot will be built out. As such installation and buildout timeline is not known and cannot be accurately written into a narrative. Again we are not proposing buildout of lots 2-7. This process is for subdivision only at this time.

- 20.45.060 – I do agree that this property is proposing lots that are less than 50% of the lots to the west and south. As such this property does meet the definition of an incompatible use. However item 2.a and 2.b were left out of the Applicability section when this code was quoted. TCC20.45.060.2.b does identify that individual single family residences are exempt from this section. This project's intended long term use is single family residences. As such this buffer is not required and the section is not applicable.

D. Variances - Concur

E. Variances – Concur

F. Critical Areas Ordinance – We concur that no mitigating measures are needed. We intend to update the landscape plan prior to landscape approval. As said above, the impervious surface limits should be evaluated with each lot at building permit review time. Currently lots 2-7 propose roughly 21% impervious coverage with the private road.

G. Concur

E,F,G, and H. Numbering appears to be out of order but we concur

Department recommendations for conditions

1 through 41 – We concur for the most part. Much of these conditions are generic in nature, are a cut and paste from earlier comments. Most items are already shown on the current plans. Also there are some grammatical errors which should not be conditions of approval like items 30 and 32 referring to attachments which will not be provided. Also items 27 and 30 refer to 8 lots when there are only 7. While we don't specifically object to these generic items I suggest going through each item carefully to identify if really needed.

- Please note that while this project is greater than 1 acre it is not intending to discharge stormwater to “surface waters” of the state. This project intends to infiltrate stormwater to groundwater. As such condition 4 is not applicable and a construction Stormwater General Permit from the DOE is not needed or intended to be procured.

Item 42 – As discussed above, the lots meet minimum size requirements and are therefore credited to be able to meet future impervious coverage thresholds. This condition should be removed.

Item 42 and 44 – Concur

Item 45 – We intend to provide a landscaping plan for lot 1 which will maintain its existing structure. This landscaping plan will show the vision triangle as discussed and be in compliance with 20.45.020. We request that individual landscaping plans for lots 2-7 be deferred until building permit review time and not be a condition of final plat approval.

Item 46 – Concur with the exception of all landscaping . As discussed above we intend to install landscaping around lot 1 with the existing residence. Eventual landowners should be

allowed to develop their own landscaping plans.
Items 47 and 48 – Concur.

I discussed this a few times in the comment responses and the emails attached to the staff report. I believe there is some items getting really ahead of the process here. Our intent is to build the major improvements like roads and utilities then sell building ready lots to the public. The eventual property owner can establish the final aesthetics of the individual lot like building placement, landscaping, parking arrangements, and building size. Over analyzing these items prior to this point is folly and doomed to be redone if not liked by the end user. As such we request common sense be applied to the conditions of approval.

Thanks.

Aaron Fuller P.E., President



FULLER DESIGNS

1101 Kresky Ave.

Centralia, WA 98531

Office: 360-807-4420