PROJECT REVIEW COMMENT MATRIX

- REVIEWER: Include as much information needed to indicate what is required. Include code reference when applicable.
- APPLICANT: Include as much information needed to clearly respond to each comment. Please include sheet number or reference to where item can be found along with explanation of how the plans were revised. Please do not say "comment noted or acknowledged" without providing an explanation; doing so may delay resubmittal
- All information requested must be submitted within 180 days from the date of this letter or the application will lapse. An extension of time can be requested prior to expiration. When the information requested is received, review of your proposal will continue. Additional information may be requested through further review of the project.

PROJECT NAME: Deskins Grand Mount Preliminary Plat & SEPA

PROJECT NUMBER: 2021106455 SITE ADDRESS: 6411 198th Ave SW

TAX PARCEL #: 51300100000

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CONTACT: Lacy Garner, 360-485-8272, lacy.garner@co.thurston.wa.us

PROJECT REVIEW STATUS: Review of the above referenced application is paused, pending resubmittal of all required items as listed below.

DATE ISSUED: 8/30/22

ITEM	REVISION / NOTE / COMMENT	DETAILS Provide Code Reference – Item(s) that need to be corrected.	APPLICANT RESPONSE:
1) Site Plans	Revisions needed	The following information is required per the Division of Land Supplemental and Site Plan Checklist in the Division of Land Application. The following items were checked by the applicant as provided but could not be found and/or were not complete on the provided Site Plan:	3b. This can be provided on the plans. FYI the existing building is approximately 14' tall. Is this something you can just
		3.b. The height of all existing structuresThis is still not shown on the preliminary map, as required per the application checklist.3.d. All proposed and existing building setback lines sufficiently accurate to ensure	mark on the plans instead of requiring another full resubmittal prior to hearings examiner?
		compliance with setback requirements. Lot 1 is not showing and does not appear to have the ability to meet the Front Yard 20' right-of-way setback requirement per TCC 20.07.030.	3d. The owner paid fees and Fuller Designs was told if any more was
		The variance application provided is the incorrect application needed for this request, and the required fee wasn't submitted with this application.	necessary it would be invoiced. Can you show me where it was invoiced and if
		Additionally, an Administrative Variance cannot apply to this request because the request is beyond the threshold of an Administrative Variance to All Yard Requirements TCC 20.07.050 (2.a.) which states: A reduction in yard requirements shall be permitted after department review and approval when:	so how much? This can be paid ASAP.

2.a. Such a variance for a structure, including a porch, deck or stairway over thirty inches above grade, will not reduce any required yard by more than fifty percent and no roof overhang will extend more than thirty-three percent into the reduced setback.

Per TCC 20.07.030, the minimum yards required for building setbacks for this corner lot are 20' from ROW of 198th Way SW and 10' from the flanking ROW of the proposed private road.

Per TCC 18.08.250, the definition of Right of Way is the area between boundary lines of a street, alley, or easement.

The existing house is already encroaching into the flanking ROW easement; therefore, it cannot meet the 10' yard setback from this easement and the request is over a 100% reduction, which doesn't meet the Administrative Variance requirements of TCC 20.07.050.

If you wish to submit a Variance application to be determined by the Hearing Examiner, which is the only other Variance request option, that is a separate application (attached) and fee. The 2022 base fee is currently \$4,456 + \$1,000 for the Hearing Examiner. Fees are subject to change. You could possibly apply for this variance and have the hearing for it at the same time as your Preliminary Plat hearing and avoid the double Hearing Examiner fee.

However, please reference TCC 20.52 for all the requirements needed to qualify for the granting of a variance by the hearing examiner. This project is going to have a difficult time meeting these requirements, particularly item 20.52.020 (3.) which says you must show, "That the special conditions and circumstances are not the result of the actions of the applicant".

Note that per TCC 20.07.040 (3.) that the ordinary projection of sills, cornices, eaves, rain gutters, bay windows, garden windows, canopies and ornamental features may project a distance not to exceed two feet into the required yard.

3.e. The location of all existing and proposed on-site sewage systems, water lines, wells, etc. – These items were not provided for the existing house.

The only existing septic system component that I see called out on the map is the drain field. Where is the tank to be removed?

There is no well closer to the house than the one shown to be abandoned? Where is the associated waterline to be abandoned?

We discussed multiple times which variance application sheet was needed. If you need it on a different form please provide as the form was not attached.

The variance is still appropriate. The existing building was not built by the applicant, and we are trying to work around existing conditions.

The existing building is only 1.86' from the back of proposed walk. We are trying to keep the building as currently constructed but reduce the easement to the back of walk. The hearings examiner is not subject to TCC 20.07.040(3).

There are options to perhaps cut off a portion of the existing building if needed however we would like to avoid that if possible.

3e.The tank was not located on the survey and records research did not reveal where the tank is. We searched for it onsite but was unable to locate it. The intent is to remove it. I suspect we will find it during construction. We

3.l. Setback distance measurements from all property lines (or road access easements) to all existing and proposed buildings.

Comment somewhat resolved pending possible variance request.

3.0 Directions to the site.

This is still not shown on the preliminary map, as required per the checklist.

3. p. Vicinity sketch, at a scale of not less than three inches to the mile, indicating the boundary lines and names of adjacent developments, streets and boundary lines of adjacent parcels, and the relationship of the proposed development to major roads and highways, schools, parks, shopping centers and similar facilities.

No boundary lines of adjacent parcels or adjacent developments with names are shown.

5.w. All proposed landscaping, including location and type. Per TCC 20.15.060 – Design standards for (R 3-6/1) zoning refer to TCC 20.45 for Landscaping and Screening regulations, which requires a Landscaping Plan be submitted and reviewed per those regulations. A Landscaping Plan was not submitted by this project.

The Landscape Plan provided does not follow all of the cited TCC 20.45.020 General requirements: TCC 20.45.020:

- (1.b.) The existing and proposed parking spaces, or other vehicular use area, access aisles, and driveways;
- (1.c.) A narrative description and timeline detailing the site preparation, installation, and maintenance measures necessary for the long-term survival and health of the plants.

Please ensure and show that the Vision Clearance Triangle is being adhered to per TCC 20.07.070.

7. The number of square feet covered by each existing and proposed building, total square feet in graveled, paved or covered surfaces, whether covered by buildings, driveways, parking lots or any other structure, and the total number of square feet in the entire subject parcel or parcels.

All of this information is required to be shown on the preliminary map. Note all Design standards per TCC 20.15.060 must be adhered to, including 60% maximum coverage by hard surfaces per lot.

can show an approximate location onsite if that will work? Is this something that can just be marked on the plans instead of a full resubmittal?

Yes, the onsite water well is at the far west side of the property is the only well onsite. The onsite water line was not located however the intent is to be removed or abandoned. I can fake in a line and call it out for abandonment if that will work? Is this something that can just be hand marked on the current plans?

- 3.I. I'm not sure how to address this. Its not really a comment.
- 3.o. The directions are shown in map form in 2 places on the civil plans. There seems to be no requirement to write out the full directions to the site in the checklist.
- 3.p The development names of the surrounding areas were shown on the vicinity map. Great wolf lodge, Talking Cedar, Maple Lane, etc.. Also many of the adjacent parcels were shown on all

			the plan sheets. I'm not sure how much more information you need here. See page 2 of the plans. All surrounding properties were shown with parcel numbers and owner information.
			5.w So there are no buildings being proposed and no requirement for open space. Previously we were required to provide a landscaping plan but I'm unsure why. I think we should reduce the landscaping to only the front lot with the existing building and the east property boundary. Future single-family homes should provide their own LS plans. The vision triangle and other changes can be addressed as a condition of approval in your recommendation letter to the hearings examiner.
			7. This was provided in the basin map on page 73 of the drainage report. I can transfer this information to the cover sheet of the civil plans if you wish. Could we just mark this on the plans?
2) Landscaping Plan	Submittal needed	Per TCC 20.15.060 – Design standards for (R 3-6/1) zoning refer to TCC 20.45 for Landscaping and Screening regulations, which requires a Landscaping Plan be submitted and reviewed per those regulations. A Landscaping Plan was not submitted by this project.	I'm not sure how to further answer this comment.

	See Landscape Plan comments and additional needs above.				
Other county departments					
Thurston County Water Resources Engineer CONTACT: Torren Valdez, 360-489-4375, torren.valdez@co.thurston.wa.us					

+ attachments

March 8, 2022

Samantha San Souci 1101 Kresky Avenue Centralia, WA 98532

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plat Review - Public Works Utilities

New Commercial Warehouse Building with loading docks

Project # 2021106455- Parcel No. 51300100000,

6411 198th Ave SW, Rochester, WA 98579

Dear Samantha San Souci,

The following information is regarding water & sewer services being proposed for Thurston County Project # 2021106455 – Parcel No. 51300100000, 6411 198th Avenue SW, Rochester, WA 98579. The proposed project is to divide the current lot into 8 lots with seven new and one existing single-family residences. All new construction within the Grand Mound Utility Local Improvement District (ULID) is required to connect to the Grand Mound water and sewer system. The following provides a general overview of what will be required to receive water and sewer service based on the site plan submitted.

- This project is subject to general facilities charges (GFCs), plan review fees, and inspection
 fees. All applicable fees must be paid prior to receiving services. See attached fee estimate
 for itemized costs. Actual fees will be determined at the time the permit application is
 made.
- 2. The GFCs will be assessed based on the scheduled rate for eight single family residences. Each lot will be assessed one equivalent residential unit (ERU).
- There is an 8-inch watermain along the northern boundary of the current parcel. There is
 also a vacuum sewer collection line along the northern boundary of the current parcel.
 Any existing infrastructure on the property must be brought up to current standards.
- 4. An 8-inch watermain extends south from 198th Avenue SW and down Tamarack Drive SW, before turning to the west along 200th Avenue SW. The proposal to loop this 8-inch watermain along the private road, before connecting to the watermain along 198th Avenue SW, seems acceptable.
- Applicant must submit an Application for Utilities Service with the building permit application for each of the eight lots. A copy of the Application for Utilities Service is provided as an attachment.

Please note that Samantha Sansouci is now replaced with Cassie Fuller as the point of contact on the project.

There is a reference to a commercial warehouse in your letter's title. This appears to be a hold over from another project. No warehouse or structures are proposed to be built as part of this application.

Items 1-7 in your letter are advisory and will be complied with at building permit time. For now, I would like to proceed with land use and subdivision only.

- 8. Pages 9-12 of the submitted plans appear to meet the checklist. If additional information is needed, we can finalize during the civil approval process.
- Details showing the cleanout is shown on page
 of the civil plans previously submitted

10-11 noted

12 The new easement shown is a private road easement for the residents

6. Applicant must submit an Application to Establish Utilities Account with their building Lacy Garner (lacy.garner@co.thurston.wa.us) is signed in ences before service begins. A copy or the application to Establish of the application to Establish Utilities Account with their building lack of the application to Establish Utilities Account with their building lack of the application to Establish Utilities Account with their building lack of the application to Establish Utilities Account with their building lack of the application to Establish Utilities Account with their building lack of the application to Establish Utilities Account with their building lack of the application to Establish Utilities Account with their building lack of the application to Establish Utilities Account with their building lack of the application to Establish Utilities Account with their building lack of the application to Establish Utilities Account is provided as an attachment.

- Applicant must submit an Engineered Water and Sewer Plan that includes all items listed in the Engineered Plan Standard Items Checklist. A copy of the Engineered Plan Standard Items Checklist is provided as an attachment.
- 8. All proposed plans, construction methods, and construction materials must conform to the Thurston County Water and Sewer Development Standards. A copy of the current Water and Sewer Development Standards can be found on the Public Works' Website (https://www.co.thurston.wa.us/publicworks/delectus.html). Please update all water and sewer details in the site plans to be consistent with the current Development Standards.
- A cleanout shall be installed on all side sewers at the property line and near each of the residences.
- The existing well must be decommissioned following the standards established by the Washington State Department of Ecology.
- 11. A Bill of Sale must be submitted and accepted by the Public Works Director for any improvements to be owned and maintained by Thurston County. These improvements include meter boxes, buffer tanks, water mains, and sewer mains.
- 12. Utility easements must be granted to Thurston County for the water and sewer mains extending along the proposed private road. Easements shall be granted to Thurston County in accordance with Section 2.130 of the Development Standards for Water and Sewer Systems.

If you have questions regarding water and sewer service as you work through the application process, please call 360.867.2088 or email at torren.valdez@co.thurston.wa.us.

Sincerely,

Torren Valdez
Water Resources Utility Planner
Technical Services Group
Water Resources Division

Attachments:

Utility Connection Fee Estimate Application for Utility Service Application to Establish a Utilities Account Water and Sewer Plan Standard Items Checklist and a utility easement for the county.

PROJECT NAME: Deskin Grand Mound Preliminary Plat

PROJECT NUMBER: 2021106455

PUBLIC HEALTH CONTACT: Dawn Peebles, dawn.peebles@co.thurston.wa.us, 360-867-2650

ITEM	REVISION / NOTE / COMMENT	DETAILS	Provide Code Reference – Item(s) that need to be corrected.	APPLICANT RESPONSE:
1) Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP)	Revised Plan	A revised IMP Plan must be submitted addressing the following: The plan is written entirely as guidance, which is applicable to the eventual lot owners to follow, although it does not discuss the specific IPM measures expected in the Arborist notes on the landscape design. The notes on the landscape design should be incorporated into the IPM Plan. Example: This plan describes the IPM practices that will be taken during the initial development and the remainder of the plan is guidance for future lot owners to follow. There will be 86% native plants installed using a mix of trees, shrubs and groundcover. An automated irrigation system is to be installed with a rain gauge so that it can set to deliver up to 1" of water [EH Policy #ONST.97.POL.805]		I believe the intent of the IPMP is to be a guidance to the eventual property owners. You use the word "should" in the comment but don't quote a municipal code as a basis of the comment. Is this opinion or is this a valid comment? If you could be clear as to why the IPMP is code deficient I can further address this comment. I believe this can be a condition of approval if there is an actual deficiency in the current IPMP

PROJECT NAME: Deskin Grand Mound Site

PROJECT NUMBER: 2021106455

PUBLIC WORKS CONTACT: Arthur Saint Arthur.saint@co.thurston.wa.us

TODEIC WORKS CONTACT. Althur Saint @Co.thurston.wa.us					
	ITEM	REVISION / NOTE /	DETAILS	Provide Code Reference – Item(s) that need to be corrected.	APPLICANT RESPONSE:
		COMMENT			
1) F	Frontage	Grind and overlay	The frontage improvements to 198 th will require a grind and overlay to centerline.		Noted, This can be a
					condition of approval and
					the plan notes can be
					adjusted in the civil
					approval stage.
2) I	Internal Road	Private road section	It is acceptable to public w	orks to reduce the road widths to the dimensions proposed. The setback to	Noted and thank you.
		variance	the existing structure will n	eed to be reviewed by the planning department, the Public Works review	
			does not address setbacks	8.	