



## COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Carolina Mejia, District One  
 Gary Edwards, District Two  
 Tye Menser, District Three  
 Wayne Fournier, District Four  
 Emily Clouse, District Five

**COMMUNITY PLANNING &  
 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

*Creating Solutions for Our Future*

Joshua Cummings, Director

## **MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Thurston County Hearing Examiner

**FROM:** CPED – Kraig Chalem, Senior Planner

**DATE:** April 23, 2024

**SUBJECT:** Errata Sheet for Project #2023100649; West Olympia Plat

The intent of this memorandum is to call out typos, corrections, and provide other appropriate information for consideration of the Thurston County Hearing Examiner.

### **A. Hearing Examiner Staff Report (Exhibit #1)**

Staff report is missing page numbers two through sixteen and staff analysis pares thirteen through sixteen due to a formatting error after importing comments from others and the online code from a working draft to the final document. Staff only realized the major defect in the staff report when writing this errata sheet. This makes completing the errata before the hearing prohibitive and appears to defeat the purpose. Staff requests to resubmit pages two through sixteen.

### **B. Revised Variance Requests – April 2024 (Attachment y and z) – See Page #19 then #22**

- The staff comment on pg. 19 should be struck and staff comment on pg. 22 should be replaced with:

Staff Comment: Standards for the Olympia UGA must be applied. The variance request should be modified to address, OMC - 18.040.080(G)(4), which states, “Narrow Lots. The length of the primary structure on a lot of forty feet or less in width shall not exceed three times the structure's width or seventy feet, whichever is less...”. Twenty-eight of the proposed lots are approximately forty feet in width by one hundred feet deep and showing twenty foot front and rear yard setbacks along with five foot setbacks on the sides. The building envelope would allow thirty feet for a structures width and the length being three times or sixty feet. Granting of a variance would result in a single structure of seventy feet.

**C. Forest Land Conversion 17.25.400 – See Page #21**

- Where it is written under “D. Conversion standards.” The Staff Recommendation should read, The requirements of Title 24 are not met.
- The staff comments under (5.)(a.) should read, “The applicant is including the 5% in the open space tract.
- Staff comment under (e.) should read, “county staff has not accepted or recommended approval of any critical area mitigation.

**D. COMMENTING AGENCIES – See Page #23**

- Where it is written, “School Impacts” should refer to Olympia School District, not North Thurston School.
- Where it is written, “Public Comment” “outside agency” should be struck.

**E. CRITICAL AREA ORDINANCE – Chapter 24 (Attachment o1) - See Page #27**

- Where it says, “Additional information pending and will be updated prior to hearing.” Should be replaced with:

The recently submitted critical area report was turned in on April 8, 2024 (Attachment v), and County staff initiated a quick review turnaround, providing comments by April 11, 2024, thus there was no delay in this most recent review. No prior critical area report had been accepted, and County staff have made similar revision requests during the review time period, please see attached email chronology. Elements within this latest report were never included in any of the prior reports, such as the proposed “temporary impact area”, and the new restoration mitigation plan for this new impact area. These are newly proposed impacts and mitigation, and they are now being reviewed to the current code. As you have referenced the standard wetland buffer table in the email below (Attachment t1), you will note the minimum allowance for buffer reduction as the “buffer width with mitigation”. This is what is considered the administrative buffer reduction. When I refer to the “inner” buffer area, it is the area of intrusion further into the wetland buffer than what would be administratively allowed. The maximum allowed reduction using buffer averaging for the wetlands is based on the code within TCC 24.30.060 (B), specifically 7.) “The reconfigured buffer shall be no less than one hundred feet wide at any point, or no less than seventy-five percent of the standard buffer, whichever is more. The reconfigured buffer shall contain the same square footage as the standard buffer. It shall not exceed one hundred percent of square footage of the standard buffer, as modified pursuant to TCC 24.30.050(B) or 24.30.055, without the landowner's consent.”

Since we cannot “reduce” a wetland buffer for the plat development, the offsite wetland buffer must be represented as the standard wetland buffer, unless it is to be reconfigured. Per TCC 24.30.045: “Table 24.30-1 identifies the standard buffer widths. Buffer widths are specified for both water quality and habitat protection. The widest of the applicable buffers under habitat and water quality applies.” Therefore, the minimum buffer required for the offsite wetland is 100 feet.

Finally, the proposed impact area within the inner wetland buffer area is for the development of the plat. Impacts within the inner portion of the wetland buffer, beyond what can be administratively allowed through buffer reconfiguration, are not permitted for the plat.

- This section should also add and reference Attachment t1 in the section heading.

**F. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROJECT CONDITIONS (Attachment r1) - See Page #31**

Where it says, “Additional information pending and will be updated prior to hearing.” Should be replaced with:

CONDITIONS FOR FINAL SUBDIVISION APPROVAL:

1. There shall be no sanitary sewer lines located within 50 feet of any existing well.
2. There shall be no stormwater infiltration within 100 feet of any existing well.
3. All existing off-site wells within 200-feet of the property must be identified and accurately shown

on the final map with their associated 100-foot sanitary control radii.

4. Restrictive covenants are required for any off-site well located within 100 feet of the project site. Covenants must be submitted to Environmental Health for review prior to being recorded with the Thurston County Auditor's Office. The covenants must be referenced on the final map.
5. The Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) must be updated to reflect the current project description. The applicant must provide the proposed method of distribution of the IPMP to future homeowners within the subdivision. This is typically done by incorporating a copy of the accepted IPMP into the subdivision CC&Rs. Other methods may be allowed provided they assure future property owners will receive a copy of the IPMP at the time of sale.
6. City of Olympia water and sewer utilities must be extended through the subdivision prior to final approval. Confirmation of final water and sewer construction approval from the City of Olympia must be submitted to Environmental Health.

**G. CITY OF OLYMPIA REQUIREMENTS (Attachment S1) - See Page #32**

The following condition is to be added under "Streets and Alleys (2.040.B.3):"

5. To accommodate frontage improvements along 24th Avenue a dedication of a minimum of 11 feet of right of way is required. The ROW dedication will need to be on the final plat map or can be recorded separately, after city review and approval, and referenced with the AFN on the final plat map.