

**From:** [Robert Gundlach](#)  
**To:** [Sonja Cady](#)  
**Subject:** Public hearing Project #2023100649  
**Date:** Monday, April 22, 2024 9:57:55 AM

---

There are some serious concerns about the proposed 34 home development at 2000 24<sup>th</sup> Ave NW. Firstly, there is confusion and concern about the hearing content. The notice we received stated the applicant Tamara Brathovde and Jeffrey Schwab were requesting single family homes and townhomes in the development. And they wanted to cut about an acre of trees in the critical wetland area and to narrow the wetland buffer to 30 feet. This is from the 3/15/2024 Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance. RJ Development now owns the property not Schwab. They should have been listed as the applicant. In early April, RJ Development submitted new plans again, for the development. They removed the request to have a 30-foot buffer and removed any townhomes in the project. The City of Olympia was not notified in a timely manner to review the proposed changes. They got them less than a week prior to the hearing. What is on the agenda for the hearing? How are we to look into any new proposals if we are not provided with the correct requests? Seems honesty and integrity are being ignored.

I see the new plans are now showing an almost ½ acre retention pond being dug into the wetland with an access road to the pond. Why is this an issue now? It wasn't included in either of the previous designs. This is directly adjacent to our property. What study has been done that makes certain that storm water and run off especially in a very heavy rainstorm or 100-year storm, will not overflow into any surrounding properties? Digging a deep pond will have a huge impact on the existing critical wetland and wildlife habitat of over 60 species of birds and animals including frogs and salamanders. To build an access road, many existing 100-foot tall trees would have to be removed from City property. Particularly along a 30 foot, unmaintained /unopened parcel adjacent to our property. Cutting these trees would remove a protective buffer we have against strong windstorms. The root systems of the remaining trees would be disturbed and could easily blow over onto neighboring properties possibly causing personal injury and damage. The trees help to maintain the wetland by absorbing lots of water. They also absorb lots of carbon. I believe it is Thurston County's mission to create a community that promotes health, commerce and environmental protection with transparency and accountability. Destroying a critical wetland and wildlife habitat ,cutting down an acre of trees does not seem environmentally protective to me.

Petitions were sent in regarding this development addressing several serious issues. One of them being access to the new development from Milroy street. The street is a dead end with only one way in and out of the property. At one point on Milroy the street is only 15 feet wide

with a large cedar tree next to the road and an open ditch of water from the wetland on the other side. This is a one lane bottle neck with no sidewalks. The new development of 34 large, 4 to 5 bedroom homes, would add about another 85 to 90 cars to the area that already has about 50 cars. That would generate about 500 to 600 trips a day, not including deliveries, commercial vehicles, visitors.

4 to 5 bedroom homes means large families. The children have to walk along Milroy through the bottleneck to catch a bus or walk to school. This is an extreme hazard that could lead to someone getting injured or worse. Who would be sued for the negligence of not making the developer widen Milroy street and put in sidewalks. Caleb Perkins, project Manager wrote to me saying that he will have a speed bump put in near the tree. That is not a solution, and it is not working with neighbors making sure people feel heard and valued.

Are the homes proposed actually "affordable"? What will be the price points? It feels like the project is being shoved through in the interest of time and profit and using the guise of being affordable seems disingenuous. I am not anti-development but given that the access will not be improved and remain dangerous, the disruption and destruction of at least part of the wetland and habitat, this location is just not appropriate for this kind of development.

Please email me that you have received this correspondence.

Thank you,  
Robert Gundlach