

From: Tim Smith
To: [Keith Stahley](#)
Cc: [Todd Cunningham](#)
Subject: RE: WLCH
Date: Friday, March 04, 2016 11:47:00 AM

Keith,

I believe the paved parking area recently established adjacent to Muirhead Avenue on the north side of the site IS NOT an approved feature of the Woodard Lane Co-Housing project. My opinion is based on the following information:

- Findings #12 and #13 of the HEX decision on the PRD application adopted by the City Council on July 22, 2008 specifically address parking for the project. The vehicular entrance to the proposal is from Woodard Avenue, on the south boundary of the site. The findings state “as shown on the site plan, the parking area for cars is located at the Woodard entrance, contiguous to the Woodard Street right-of-way, and does not extend into the area of the residences. Aside from emergency vehicles and perhaps necessary deliveries, no cars would be allowed in the area of the residences.” The findings further state that “the applicant describes the parking area as containing 29 spaces on 10,915 square feet. With the removal of the shop, two spaces would be added for a total of 31. The Department believes that this will supply sufficient parking for 21 units. Id. Two handicapped parking spaces are proposed.”
- An amendment to the PRD was approved by the City in 2013 to increase density and does not further address parking.
- The site plans included in both decisions (original and amendment) do not show the parking area in question. The only document that shows this parking area is a preliminary drawing of the site submitted by the applicant to the City on February 9, 2016. This preliminary drawing has not been approved by the City. In fact, the drawing was not even a requirement of the City. The drawing relates to establishing the cohousing as condominiums.
- Also worth noting, in the 2008 decision the HEX denied an applicant request for a variance from landscaping requirements to allow parking spaces adjacent to the Woodard Avenue right-of-way. Now we have a the paved area on the north side of the property that does not contain any landscaping between the pavement and the adjacent Muirhead Avenue, which is not consistent with the City’s landscaping requirement.

Please let me know how we wish to proceed. It’s clear that the project was designed with parking on the south side only. Based on Debra’s email below, residents are now using the new onsite paved area and the Muirhead right of way to the north for parking. It’s my understanding that code enforcement was initiated but upon their review of the preliminary drawing discussed above, no corrective action was taken.

A question that has come up is that can the area in question be returned to gravel and be allowed to

be used for loading/unloading only. Please let me know when you have some time to discuss.

-Tim

Tim Smith, AICP | Principal Planner

City of Olympia Community Planning & Development
P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967
(360) 570-3915
tsmith@ci.olympia.wa.us

From: Todd Cunningham
Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2016 8:01 AM
To: Tim Smith; Keith Stahley
Subject: RE: WLCH

I've been dealing with this for a week now with an investment of at least a couple of hours investigating the site conditions, reviewing the file and following up with planning staff and the complainant. I've contacted Debra twice and provided explanation for her but she is not accepting of what I am finding via my conversations with Catherine as the project planner. Debra believes that the hearing examiner has stipulated something very different than what is out there, specifically no parking at this location via a ruling from the hearing examiner. I was told by Catherine that there is no ruling in the file, it doesn't say they cannot park on the Muirhead Avenue side as I was skeptical about this answer I asked her to investigate further based on the Hearing Examiners report of April 17, 2008; Catherine indicated she would get back to me today after speaking with you Tim.

Attached are the pictures I've taken of the area that was paved; the paving is on their property not on Muirhead Avenue; I will presume at this point that Tim is handling this and I am now out of the loop unless directed otherwise.

TC

From: Tim Smith
Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2016 7:41 AM
To: Keith Stahley
Cc: Todd Cunningham
Subject: RE: WLCH

I'll follow-up on this.

From: Keith Stahley

Sent: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 5:26 PM
To: Tim Smith
Subject: FW: WLCH

I'll need you to take a look at this one and make sure we've got it right.

From: Debra VanTuinen [<mailto:dvantuinen@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 01, 2016 5:25 PM
To: Todd Cunningham; Jason Whalen; Keith Stahley; Rob Bly; Cindy Weitekamp; Sandi
Subject: WLCH

Todd,

Catherine is mistaken. Here is what the hearing examiner ruled.

Compliance Issue Two: – Parking: As questioned by the Examiner, Woodard Lane Co Housing residents park their cars next to their residencies on Muirhead and block the turnaround at the end of Muirhead that has been used by the neighbors to get to their homes, UPS, Fed Ex and emergency vehicles, for over 30 years. This is in direct violation of Thomas Bjorgen, the original Hearing Examiner's report April 17th 2008 page 6. Number 12. "The vehicular entrance to the proposal is from Woodard Avenue, on the south boundary of the site. As shown on the site plan, the parking area for cars is located at the Woodard entrance, contiguous to the Woodard Street right-of-way, and does not extend into the area of the residences. Aside from emergency vehicles and perhaps necessary deliveries, no cars would be allowed in the area of the residences."

This new Hearing Examiner did not change this ruling.

Not sure how she interrupts this ruling and says that parking is allowed? Maybe you should help her understand this ruling and how to follow the rules and codes that have been established. We as the surrounding neighbors would greatly appreciate any wisdom you can give her.

You said in your email that the parking they are putting in has not been approved yet, however it will be approved as soon as they review it. This is how WLCH works and Catherine allows them to do things after they do them. Not compliant behavior in with WLCH or the city planner assigned to make sure they comply with his rulings.

We were hoping that you would be able to help them read the codes and understand that the hearing examiners rulings are to be upheld.

We look forward to your thoughts on this.

Sincerely,
Debra and neighbors

From: [Debra Van Tuinen](#)
To: [Tim Smith](#)
Subject: Thank you for meeting
Date: Tuesday, March 08, 2016 5:33:31 PM
Attachments: [IMG_3442.JPG](#)
[IMG_3535.JPG](#)
[IMG_3539.JPG](#)
[IMG_3540.JPG](#)
[IMG_3544.JPG](#)

Tim,

Thank you for meeting with Bob and me today. We appreciate you taking time out of your day to talk with us. I also appreciate that you took the time to read the file and the hearing examiner's ruling, and came to the same conclusion I did regarding the parking. I know my neighbors on Thomas Street will be pleased to hear that you will be asking the developer to remove the parking pad within the turnaround at the end of Muirhead Street.

You mentioned that the developer would like to retain a portion of the asphalt that they installed as a bike path to a lower bike storage area. You stated that you have not yet ruled on whether to allow the path. I've included a couple photos that show the path that they installed does not appear to be directed to anything that resembles a bike storage area.

In fact it goes down hill and dead ends into the building and concrete walkway that connects to the front of the building. If the desire access to the lower area for bike storage, it appears that the best access and safest route to their bike storage area would be from the existing concrete path at the front of the building.

However you decide, it is imperative that this area will not be mis-identified as an area for parking, now or anytime in the future.

As we discussed we are also anxious to have the missing parking signs on both Thomas and Muirhead Streets. We believe this is essential to maintaining safe traffic in our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Debra and neighbors



Sent from my iPad

Nancy Lenzi

From: Debra Van Tuinen <dvantuinen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 08, 2016 5:33 PM
To: Tim Smith
Subject: Thank you for meeting

Tim,

Thank you for meeting with Bob and me today. We appreciate you taking time out of your day to talk with us. I also appreciate that you took the time to read the file and the hearing examiner's ruling, and came to the same conclusion I did regarding the parking. I know my neighbors on Thomas Street will be pleased to hear that you will be asking the developer to remove the parking pad within the turn-around at the end of Muirhead Street.

You mentioned that the developer would like to retain a portion of the asphalt that they installed as a bike path to a lower bike storage area. You stated that you have not yet ruled on whether to allow the path. I've included a couple photos that show the path that they installed does not appear to be directed to anything that resembles a bike storage area.

In fact it goes down hill and dead ends into the building and concrete walkway that connects to the front of the building. If the desire access to the lower area for bike storage, it appears that the best access and safest route to their bike storage area would be from the existing concrete path at the front of the building.

However you decide, it is imperative that this area will not be mis-identified as an area for parking, now or anytime in the future.

As we discussed we are also anxious to have the missing parking signs on both Thomas and Muirhead Streets. We believe this is essential to maintaining safe traffic in our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Debra and neighbors







Sent from my iPad

From: [LIV MONROE](#)
To: [Tim Smith](#)
Cc: [Catherine McCoy](#)
Subject: Re: Woodard Lane cohousing back top
Date: Wednesday, March 09, 2016 12:51:46 PM

Hi Tim,

This is a heads up that the Woodard Lane Cohousing owners are not in agreement with the email I sent you (attached below) proposing plan 1 of removing part of the blacktop. Jim Anest, a home owner here, left a message for Leonard Bauer to call back. We would like to talk with those involved in resolving this issue before Jim Leaves town next Tuesday night.

Liv Monroe 360-357-4503

> On Mar 7, 2016, at 8:48 PM, LIV MONROE <livmonroe@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> Dear Tim,

>

> As discussed in our phone conversation this afternoon, I am attaching a drawing of the area off Muirhead that we back topped. You will see a 5' wide bike path that curves down to a door under the east half of building D where there is a bike storage basement. I am requesting that we retain the path down and a walking path from the top of the bike path to the sidewalk that enters our community and forms the circle in the middle before heading out the south end to the parking lot.

>

> We had expected to be able to continue parking in this driveway on this north end of our property as we have since we moved in almost 6 years ago when a City official told us we could. He told us we were not allowed to park on Muirhead and we have not. We have only parked on our property, not on the City right of way, and only where it does not block access to any neighbors' property.

>

> Now we are very close to completion of this building project and do not wish to take the time needed for hearings and decisions to request an amendment to the site plan. We expect to look into this at some later date. For now we are willing to not park here. We could install "no parking" signs or "loading zone only" if that worked for the City. And if necessary we could make the area not available for parking.

>

> I believe that by removing the asphalt the area would still be just as available for parking as it is now. Because of this, wanting to conserve natural resources, wanting a more lasting surface at the end of the turn around, and in the hopes that we may be allowed at a future date to park there I suggest that we place posts across the asphalt such that bikers, walkers, and a ride on lawn mower that would be stored in the bike storage area could get through easily and yet cars couldn't park there. See the green squares on that attached plan.

>

> Thanks for considering this and getting back to us as soon as possible.

>

> Sincerely, Liv Monroe 360-357-4503

>

> <Woodard Lane black top.pdf>

>

>

From: [LIV MONROE](#)
To: [Tim Smith](#)
Cc: [Catherine McCoy](#)
Subject: Re: Woodard Lane cohousing black top parking and bike path
Date: Friday, March 11, 2016 1:49:50 PM

Dear Tim,

I just want to put this in writing. We intend to comply as stated in your email below. We are doing this so the project can move forward and excited/anxious folks can move in.

Our preference would have been that we put posts into the asphalt so parking could not happen there until a decision could go through the proper channels of the City and that in the meantime we could move in. We had made this proposal and only heard back that we need to remove all asphalt if we want to possibly move in on schedule. We would have liked at least acknowledgement that our proposal was heard.

The handicapped woman who lives here and the elder persons moving in, particularly the 84 year old in building D by the turnaround, would have appreciated a loading/unloading space there that is walker friendly. It would have been a great benefit to them to be able to get out of a car on the turn around and without a curb get onto the paved sidewalk that goes through the community . Now the turn around will be a rough rutted surface (as it has always been) with a curb between the turnaround and sidewalk. The handicapped woman who lives in building E, right by this entry to our community, is too unstable to use this entry as it has been and will be again soon.

It is more important and less expense for us to take out the asphalt and proceed to distributing the homes to the potential owners than to go through the amendment process now. So we will remove the asphalt.

I also want to express that it is emotionally painful for us to be wasting natural resources and energy. In this same line of thinking it is painful for me to have the City spend its human resources and my tax payer's money dealing with an issue like this in the way we believe it was headed had we continued to pursue it at this time. I felt a very welcome relief after telling you on the phone that we had decided to remove the asphalt. Relief that both you and I wouldn't need to deal with this intensely over the next several months.

Thanks for reading this, no response is necessary. You can get back to the pile of work calling you.

Sincerely, Liv Monroe

On Mar 11, 2016, at 9:08 AM, Tim Smith <tsmith@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Liv,

It was nice to speak with you yesterday afternoon. Based on our conversation, it's my understanding that all asphalt pavement will be removed (path and parking area including pavement in turnaround) within the next week or so. A pedestrian/bike path comprised of woodchips will be provided in the location shown on the drawing you provided to me on March 10. As I noted in my 3/9 email, the asphalt parking area will need to be restored and/or devices installed to prevent vehicles from accessing and parking in this area in the future. This could include signage. I am concerned that if vehicles are still able to access that area, it will continue to be a problem in the future.

Please work with Catherine on a revised BSP drawing. The BSP can go to Council for final action once the above items are completed and all other project-related issues are completed as determined by Catherine.

Thank you for your assistance in resolving this matter. Please contact me with any questions.

-Tim

From: LIV MONROE [<mailto:livmonroe@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 12:39 PM
To: Tim Smith
Subject: Re: Woodard Lane cohousing black top parking and bike path

Hi Tim,

Given your latest reply clarifying that choosing option 2 would cause significant delay, we have decided to go with what I had originally expressed to you. We will have the asphalt removed and restore the property to what it was before.

For clarity I want to be sure that you are requiring us to remove ALL the asphalt including the part that is on the gravel turnaround not just what is "west of the turnaround" as stated. Please advise if this is correct or not. We would happily leave in place the asphalt that is on the turnaround since turning wheels tear up the ground easily. Note that a few weeks before putting the asphalt down the City of Olympia had required our builder to put gravel down on all of our side of the turnaround, wherever the construction vehicles were tearing up the ground.

I am including a drawing below so you can understand my questions. It shows a possible location of wood chips, not a specific plan. Please advise if you see anything unacceptable.

I will turn into Catherine McCoy the final binding site plan with the asphalt eliminated from the plan so it can continue through the approval process as outlined by her. By choosing the option below we are meeting all of your requirements and are back on track for completing this project. Is that correct?

- 1) Remove all asphalt pavement north of Building D and west of the gravel turnaround. This includes the

parking area and bike path to the bike storage area in the basement of Unit D. This area will need to be restored and/or devices installed to prevent vehicles from accessing and parking in this area west of the gravel turnaround. A surfacing alternative for a bike/pedestrian pathway that staff will support without an amendment to the PRD is one comprised of wood chips or similar material that is not an impervious surface such as concrete, gravel or asphalt.

Please let me know if I am misunderstanding anything expected here. You can call me at 360-357-4503. I am willing to stop by your office when convenient if there are any ambiguities.

Liv Monroe

On Mar 10, 2016, at 8:18 AM, Tim Smith
<tsmith@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Liv,

Just to be clear, the binding site plan is the final step of the process. The PRD amendment must be processed first. This will cause a significant delay to completing the BSP. Catherine's timeline does not account for a PRD amendment.

-Tim

From: LIV MONROE [<mailto:livmonroe@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, March 09, 2016 9:24 PM
To: Tim Smith
Cc: Catherine McCoy
Subject: Re: Woodard Lane cohousing black top parking and bike path

Dear Tim,

We have decided to choose the second option for resolving this matter as follows:

- 2) Apply for an Planned Residential Development (PRD) amendment that incorporates the subject bike path and parking area. The amendment would require a public hearing with the Hearing Examiner and be processed in the same manner as the previous PRD amendment application.

Consistent with your letter we expect there will be no delays on the part of the City of Olympia in approving the binding site plan, in the time frame that Catherine McCoy has outlined, two weeks from our submission.

As prearranged I intend to submit the BSP final copy to Catherine this week. I can turn it in with the blacktop included or I can have the surveyor remove the blacktop on the plan. Please advise asap.

Sincerely, Liv Monroe

On Mar 9, 2016, at 2:47 PM, Tim Smith
<tsmith@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Liv,

Staff reviewed your proposal for the asphalt bike path and parking area recently installed on the north side of Unit D of the Woodard Lane Co-Housing project. These two site features would be allowed if consistent with the Planned Residential Development (PRD) project application approved by the Hearing Examiner. Planning staff reviewed the file and determined that the asphalt bike path and parking area are not approved elements. This determination is based on the following information:

- Findings #12 and #13 of the Hearing Examiner's decision on the PRD application adopted by the City Council on July 22, 2008 specifically address parking for the project. The vehicular entrance to the proposal is from Woodard Avenue, on the south boundary of the site. The findings state "as shown on the site plan, the parking area for cars is located at the Woodard entrance, contiguous to the Woodard Street right-of-way, and does not extend into the area of the residences. Aside from emergency vehicles and perhaps necessary deliveries, no cars would be allowed in the area of the residences." The findings further state that "the applicant describes the parking area as containing 29 spaces on 10,915 square feet. With the removal of the shop, two spaces would be added for a total of 31. The Department believes that this will supply sufficient parking for 21 units. Id. Two handicapped parking spaces are proposed."

- An amendment to the PRD was approved by the City in 2013 to increase density and does not further address parking.
- The site plans included in both decisions (original and amendment) do not show the parking area or bike path in question. The only document that shows these features are a preliminary drawing of the site submitted by the applicant to the City on February 9, 2016. The drawing relates to establishing the cohousing as condominiums. This preliminary drawing has not been approved by the City.

Two options for resolving this matter are outlined below. Either option must be completed within thirty (30) days. Final binding site plan approval for the project will not be granted until this matter is resolved.

- 1) Remove all asphalt pavement north of Building D and west of the gravel turnaround. This includes the parking area and bike path to the bike storage area in the basement of Unit D. This area will need to be restored and/or devices installed to prevent vehicles from accessing and parking in this area west of the gravel turnaround. A surfacing alternative for a bike/pedestrian pathway that staff will support without an amendment to the PRD is one comprised of wood chips or similar material that is not an impervious surface such as concrete, gravel or asphalt.
- 2) Apply for an Planned Residential Development (PRD) amendment that incorporates the subject bike path and parking area. The amendment would require a public hearing with the Hearing Examiner and be processed in the same manner as the previous PRD amendment application.

Please contact me with any questions.

Tim Smith, AICP | Principal Planner

City of Olympia Community Planning & Development
P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-

1967
(360) 570-3915
tsmith@ci.olympia.wa.us

From: LIV MONROE [<mailto:livmonroe@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, March 07, 2016 8:49 PM
To: Tim Smith
Cc: Catherine McCoy
Subject: Woodard Lane cohousing back top

Dear Tim,

As discussed in our phone conversation this afternoon, I am attaching a drawing of the area off Muirhead that we back topped. You will see a 5' wide bike path that curves down to a door under the east half of building D where there is a bike storage basement. I am requesting that we retain the path down and a walking path from the top of the bike path to the sidewalk that enters our community and forms the circle in the middle before heading out the south end to the parking lot.

We had expected to be able to continue parking in this driveway on this north end of our property as we have since we moved in almost 6 years ago when a City official told us we could. He told us we were not allowed to park on Muirhead and we have not. We have only parked on our property, not on the City right of way, and only where it does not block access to any neighbors' property.

Now we are very close to completion of this building project and do not wish to take the time needed for hearings and decisions to request an amendment to the site plan. We expect to look into this at some later date. For now we are willing to not park here. We could install "no parking" signs or "loading zone only" if that worked for the City. And if necessary we could make the area not available for parking.

I believe that by removing the asphalt the area would still be just as available for parking as it is now. Because of this, wanting to conserve natural resources, wanting a more lasting surface at the end of the turn around, and in the hopes that we may be allowed at a future date to park there I suggest that we place posts across the asphalt such that bikers, walkers, and a ride on lawn mower that would be stored in the bike storage area could get through easily and yet cars couldn't park there. See the green squares on that attached plan.

Thanks for considering this and getting back to us as soon as possible.

Sincerely, Liv Monroe 360-357-4503

From: [LIV MONROE](#)
To: [Keith Stahley](#); [Catherine McCoy](#); [Leonard Bauer](#); [Tim Smith](#)
Subject: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration
Date: Friday, March 18, 2016 12:38:05 AM
Attachments: [3-17-16 WLCH letter_City Council asphalt.docx](#)

Dear Keith, Leonard, Tim and Catherine,

Attached is a letter I am emailing to each of the City Council Members. In the name of transparency and the desire to work together, I am sending you a copy. I hope to send 3 additional photos that were too large to send with this email.

You don't need to respond and you are welcome to call or email me.

Sincerely, Liv Monroe 360-357-4503

From: [Debra VanTuinen](#)
To: [Tim Smith](#)
Cc: [Bob Coble](#)
Subject: parking
Date: Thursday, March 17, 2016 4:32:50 PM

Tim,

I appreciate that the asphalt parking pad is going to be taken out by WLCH and the if there is a bike path to the bike storage area it would be in wood chips. The idea of putting a barricade to indicate there is to be no parking is a good idea and will help lighten the load of the parking enforcement .

Today someone from WLCH parked on Muirhead St. next to my house and closer to their place instead of in their designated parking place in the parking lot. This should be addressed now before it becomes a continued and bigger problem. I think this is a good time to replace the no parking signs that were installed and required by the city (fire department, garbage, school buses) when they allowed our developer to narrow the all streets in our development to make room for more houses. I am wondering if you talked to someone about replacing the no parking signs on Muirhead and Thomas that have fallen down or would you like me to? I think most of the ones on Rogers and East Muirhead past Thomas are still standing. I you want me to pursue it then could you please let me know who I should talk to. I am assuming the Fire Chief?

Thank you for your time and help on this.

Debra

From: [LIV MONROE](#)
To: [Cheryl Selby](#); [Nathaniel Jones](#); [Jessica Bateman](#); [Clark Gilman](#); [Julie Hankins](#); [Jim Cooper](#); [Jeannine Roe](#)
Cc: [Keith Stahley](#); [Leonard Bauer](#); [Tim Smith](#); [Catherine McCoy](#)
Subject: photos from Woodard Lane Cohousing
Date: Friday, March 18, 2016 1:02:56 AM
Attachments: [PastedGraphic-4.pdf](#)
[PastedGraphic-5.pdf](#)
[PastedGraphic-6.pdf](#)

Dear Council Members,

Here are three more photos showing the asphalt in question at Woodard Lane Cohousing.

Thanks for your consideration.
Liv Monroe

Bike path to basement bike storage behind white door just beyond center of building.

Asphalt abutting sidewalk to homes and extending into part of the turnaround that is on our property.
House on other side of Muirhead in the distance

Asphalt pad in our half of the turnaround that connects the bike path, going down to the right, and the sidewalk within our community. Photo taken from Muirhead.







From: [LIV MONROE](#)
To: [Keith Stahley](#); [Catherine McCoy](#); [Leonard Bauer](#); [Tim Smith](#)
Subject: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration
Date: Friday, March 18, 2016 12:38:05 AM
Attachments: [3-17-16 WLCH letter_City Council asphalt.docx](#)

Dear Keith, Leonard, Tim and Catherine,

Attached is a letter I am emailing to each of the City Council Members. In the name of transparency and the desire to work together, I am sending you a copy. I hope to send 3 additional photos that were too large to send with this email.

You don't need to respond and you are welcome to call or email me.

Sincerely, Liv Monroe 360-357-4503

March 17, 2016

Dear Council Member,

I am a resident and on the development team living in and building Woodard Lane Cohousing at 1620 Woodard Ave NW Olympia, 98502. After working with the City since 2005 to build this Planned Residential Development (PRD) which meets and exceeds many of the City's Comprehensive Plan goals, the last two buildings, comprising 6 homes and a Common House, will be completed in the next 1-2 months. I think we have worked very well together in spite of the difficulties of our uniqueness and not fitting easily into the normal old rules.

The topic of this email is that Olympia City Planning is requiring us to remove an asphalt bike path/walkway that runs from our sidewalk to our bike storage area, and provides a handicapped pick-up and drop-off area adjacent our community pedestrian walkway. The only other choice we were given was to initiate the process to amend the PRD and delay our new members' moving in for months. This choice is more costly and unacceptable to us so we have reluctantly chosen to remove the asphalt.

We are bringing this to your attention now because we think you might appreciate the opportunity and have the ability to offer another option. The suggestion we offered was for us to place posts or some barrier in the asphalt to prevent parking for now, continue the process towards moving in on schedule, and apply for an amendment to the PRD which would leave it to the Hearings Examiner to determine whether or not we can keep the asphalt, park in that location, provide handicapped pick-up and drop-off, and determine what kinds of surface we can apply to the bicycle/walking path. This could be done in an unrushed complete manner. I'm sure there are other good solutions. Perhaps you have the authority, ideas, and interest to change the course of action in a way that serves both the City and us. If not we will do as we agreed and remove the asphalt.

We plan to attend next Tuesday's Council Meeting, 22nd of March 2016, and sign in to speak during "Public Communication." If no better possibility is presented we have arranged for a crew to remove the asphalt as I told Tim Smith, City Planner, we would do.

I am sending this to each City Council Member, and cc'ing Keith Stahley, Leonard Bauer, Tim Smith, Catherine McCoy and our Woodard Lane Cohousing community.

The following paragraphs explain more details of the situation.

The Reason for the two Options

I believe the City of Olympia Planning departments options for us are based on they're interpretation of the Hearing Examiner's report dated April 17, 2008, #12 page 6 of 27. They interpret it to say that parking is not allowed anywhere on the property other than the parking lot at the south end of the property (away from the residences). I read it to mean that no cars be allowed near the residences in the circle upon which the homes front. At that time a fire truck circle was intended where the walking path circle now exists. This was changed and the fire trucks now have a hydrant that can access all of the buildings. We are willing to prevent parking on the asphalt at this time until we can resolve this parking

issue. We would like to do this without removing the asphalt.

Parking

After moving into our homes in April 2010 we asked City Planning if we are allowed to park in the half of the turnaround that is out of the Muirhead Right of Way and within our private property. The verbal response we received was “yes” and it was verbally agreed that it was the City’s responsibility to inform our neighbor, Debra Vantuinen, who had complained about our parking there. Subsequently, that neighbor set out two cones along Muirhead and her property, one being a few feet east of our joint property line, with a sign between them saying “driveway.” I took this to mean that she wanted a driveway like ours on her property and therefore she thought it was okay to have and use a driveway. We have been parking in our driveway for almost 6 years with no complaints about it that I know of. No neighbors need to drive around the turn around to access their property. We don’t mind if they do but to my knowledge this seldom happens.

Bike Path

Asking us to remove the 5’ wide by 48’ long asphalt path down a slope from Muirhead to our basement bike storage area and replacing it with wood chips neither encourages bike usage nor safety. Not providing a safe access to our community basement seems irresponsible to us. The lawn mower and other work and recreational equipment will also be taken to and from this storage. We have several members who use bicycles as their main form of transportation; some don’t own cars. We designed our bike storage for more bikes than the number of members in our community. We do not understand the City’s reasoning for removal of the asphalt and replacing it with wood chips that rain will wash down the slope, be more difficult to remove the slippery wet fallen leaves and require much more maintenance. Where this path levels off there is an additional 40’ across the flat asphalt to where it attaches smoothly to our sidewalk. I do not believe it is the City’s intention to deprive home owners of a safe walkway between their homes and their vehicle storage. We would at least like the opportunity to have our case heard and decided before removing the asphalt.

Potential Handicapped Usage

The handicapped woman who lives here and the elder persons moving in, particularly the 85 year old man in building D by the turnaround, would appreciate and use a loading/unloading area next to their homes that is walker friendly. It would have been a great benefit to them to be able to get out of a car on the turn around and without a curb get onto the paved sidewalk that goes through the community. Now the turn around will be a rough rutted surface (as it has always been) with a curb between the turnaround and sidewalk. The handicapped woman who lives in building E, right by this entry to our community, is too unstable to use this entry as it has been and will be again soon.

It is more important and less costly (in money, emotions, time, and energy) for us to take out the asphalt and proceed to distributing the homes to the owners than to go through the amendment process before moving in. Just for your information, the asphalt cost was \$3500 and the removal cost will be \$1000 for a total of \$8000 if we remove and later, after a hearing, are allowed to reinstall it. I believe unnecessary expenses like this and others the City required of us over the years is a big reason why quality developers are deterred

from building in Olympia. City Planners have worked hard with us to create this community; and they have spoken proudly of our development. We hope you will choose to serve the City's vision by supporting us as best you can.

Thanks for taking the time to read this. Call or email me with any questions or comments.

Sincerely, Liv Monroe [360-357-4503](tel:360-357-4503)

A picture is worth a thousand words so I am including some photos below.



Bike path from above, flat asphalt pad to sidewalk and on turn around, and and View of Murihead behind trees with orange fences and also in upper right corner.

From: [Keith Stahley](#)
To: [Tim Smith](#)
Cc: [Steve Hall](#)
Subject: RE: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration for print only
Date: Friday, March 18, 2016 3:51:29 PM

Thanks Tim

From: Tim Smith
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2016 3:19 PM
To: Keith Stahley
Subject: FW: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration for print only

FYI: Debra knows about Liv's communication to Council and will likely be there next Tuesday.

From: Debra VanTuinen [<mailto:dvantuinen@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2016 12:47 PM
To: Tim Smith
Subject: Fw: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration for print only

Heads up they want to fight it and have another hearing examiner. They are not use to getting their way. Lucky for me our new mayor, Cheryl is a very good friend of mine... so she sent this over.

On Friday, March 18, 2016 11:20 AM, Cheryl Comcast <c-selby@comcast.net> wrote:

Cheryl Selby
360.970.6611

Sent from my iPhone so any typos are due to the tiny buttons.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Cheryl Selby <cselby@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Date: March 18, 2016 at 9:15:27 AM PDT
To: "c-selby@comcast.net" <c-selby@comcast.net>
Subject: Fwd: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration for print only

Cheryl Selby
360.970.6611

Sent from my iPhone so any typos are due to the tiny buttons.

Begin forwarded message:

From: LIV MONROE <livmonroe@gmail.com>
Date: March 18, 2016 at 1:04:23 AM PDT
To: <cselby@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration

Dear Council Member and Mayor Cheryl Selby,

Attached is a letter requesting your attention before the March 22 Council Meeting.

I hope to email three more photos in a second email since they were too big to send all together.

Sincere Thanks,
Liv Monroe, constituent and resident of Woodard Lane Cohousing
360-357-4503

From: [Debra VanTuinen](#)
To: [Tim Smith](#)
Subject: Fw: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration for print only
Date: Friday, March 18, 2016 12:47:02 PM

Heads up they want to fight it and have another hearing examiner. They are not use to getting their way. Lucky for me our new mayor, Cheryl is a very good friend of mine... so she sent this over.

On Friday, March 18, 2016 11:20 AM, Cheryl Comcast <c-selby@comcast.net> wrote:

Cheryl Selby
360.970.6611

Sent from my iPhone so any typos are due to the tiny buttons.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Cheryl Selby <c-selby@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Date: March 18, 2016 at 9:15:27 AM PDT
To: "c-selby@comcast.net" <c-selby@comcast.net>
Subject: Fwd: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration for print only

Cheryl Selby
360.970.6611

Sent from my iPhone so any typos are due to the tiny buttons.

Begin forwarded message:

From: LIV MONROE <livmonroe@gmail.com>
Date: March 18, 2016 at 1:04:23 AM PDT
To: <c-selby@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration

Dear Council Member and Mayor Cheryl Selby,

Attached is a letter requesting your attention before the March 22 Council Meeting.

I hope to email three more photos in a second email since they were too big to send all together.

Sincere Thanks,

Liv Monroe, constituent and resident of Woodard

Lane Cohousing

360-357-4503

From: [Debra VanTuinen](#)
To: [Tim Smith](#)
Subject: Re: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration for print only
Date: Friday, March 18, 2016 5:48:08 PM

Thanks!!

Have a great weekend!

The new owner of the house at the end of Muirhead at the end of the turn around is great...he is fixing up the house and landscaping. The house has been vacant for the last 4-5 years.

Debra

On Friday, March 18, 2016 5:00 PM, Tim Smith <tsmith@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Thanks, Debra. This is a code compliance issue and staff is prepared to discuss at the Council meeting if the issue is raised. I haven't had the chance to address your other email but will follow-up next week.

-Tim

From: Debra VanTuinen [<mailto:dvantuinen@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2016 12:47 PM
To: Tim Smith
Subject: Fw: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration for print only

Heads up they want to fight it and have another hearing examiner. They are not use to getting their way. Lucky for me our new mayor, Cheryl is a very good friend of mine... so she sent this over.

On Friday, March 18, 2016 11:20 AM, Cheryl Comcast <c-selby@comcast.net> wrote:

Cheryl Selby
360.970.6611

Sent from my iPhone so any typos are due to the tiny buttons.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Cheryl Selby <c-selby@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Date: March 18, 2016 at 9:15:27 AM PDT
To: "c-selby@comcast.net" <c-selby@comcast.net>

Subject: Fwd: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration for print only

Cheryl Selby
360.970.6611

Sent from my iPhone so any typos are due to the tiny buttons.

Begin forwarded message:

From: LIV MONROE <livmonroe@gmail.com>
Date: March 18, 2016 at 1:04:23 AM PDT
To: <cselby@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration

Dear Council Member and Mayor Cheryl Selby,

Attached is a letter requesting your attention before the March 22 Council Meeting.

I hope to email three more photos in a second email since they were too big to send all together.

Sincere Thanks,
Liv Monroe, constituent and resident of Woodard Lane Cohousing
360-357-4503

From: [Sandi](#)
To: [Cheryl Selby](#); [Tim Smith](#); [Steve Hall](#); [Jason Whalen](#); [Bob Coble](#)
Cc: [Debra](#); [Cindy](#); [Bly, Rob](#)
Subject: [BULK] WOODARD LANE CO HOUSING
Date: Sunday, March 20, 2016 3:02:57 PM
Importance: Low

We live at 1511 Thomas St NW and have lived here going on 16 years,
We are concerned with what has happened and is happening still with the
Woodard Lane Co Housing Development directly behind our houses.

In regards to the parking:

Compliance Issue Two: Parking- that Woodard Lane Co Housing
residents are parking their cars next to their residences on Muirhead,
which is in direct violation of Thomas Bjorgen, the original examiner from
2008. The vehicle entrance to the proposal is from Woodard Avenue and
the designated parking area, and does not extend into the area of the
residences. By WLCH putting in the parking pad on Muirhead without
approval, violates the city code, as no parking was to be on Muirhead, yet
WLCH knew this was not allowed and ignored the plan.

As a resident of this community, we now have 3 story buildings, which do
not appear to look like homes, which look down on the 1-2 story houses
around WLCH. If it weren't for the trees behind our one story home, we
would have them looking directly into our home thru our skylights! By
having 3 story homes looking over our existing homes, our property
values are being devalued, which we have cause for concern. If the city
has passed codes and requirements for builders/building and they are
ignored, something has to change. We citizens living on Thomas St, with
WLCH directly behind our homes, have to abide by the codes and
requirements, therefore, WLCH should also have to abide by these
rulings.

Our vibrant community of neighbors on Thomas St have been greatly
affected after this development continued to change from cottage houses
to huge 3 story buildings. Many were so frustrated with the city staff in
charge of this project, who continued to allow these changes which
violated the hearing examiners ruling, city codes and the comprehensive
plan. WLCH have not been required to landscape and as that further
devalued our homes, the majority of home owners living next to this
project moved away and are renting their homes. Debra closed her
gallery by the market and moved to Portland for 3 years to get away from
what was happening. Now WLCH is asking for more only after they didn't
get away with installing an asphalt parking area without approval.

Sincerely,

Carl and Sandi Huston

From: [Debra VanTuinen](#)
To: [Bob Coble](#); [Sandi](#); [Cindy Weitekamp](#); [Cheryl Selby](#); [Dawn Hooper](#); [Jason Whalen](#)
Cc: [Tim Smith](#); [Steve Hall](#)
Subject: Fw: Fwd: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration for print only
Date: Sunday, March 20, 2016 10:01:33 AM
Attachments: [3-17-16 WLCH letter City Council asphalt.docx](#)
[IMG_3101.jpg](#)

Steve,

Your letter to Liv and WLCH was spot on. Thank you for your wisdom on this and seeing the whole picture.

WLCH has pushed the limits in the past resulting in huge buildings with three floors looming over the neighbors in their 1-2 story home. It shows how they have asked for more in the past and avoided the hearing examiners limits of 1-2 story and also how they have ignored the city's comprehensive plan which requires new developments enhance and fit into the surrounding neighborhood.

This letter from Liv so has many statements that are not true. The most important one:
No complaints in 6 years? Seriously?? The neighborhood has fought them on this issue since they started building. Tom Hill stood on my back yard and said that they would not be able to park on the turn around and use Muirhead. To enforce it at that time he made all the builders move their cars to the parking lot to access the development. The hearing examiner's ruling was written clearly to avoid any confusion. The neighborhood fought them when they started parking and blocking the turnaround and using Muirhead with many letters and emails and meetings with city staff.

Note: WLCH put this asphalt parking pad in without approval...and now have to pay the costs. Yes, they got called on this one...guess they were feeling above the law as they have ignored so many other codes and rulings and gotten away with it. They should be fined for this behavior.

I have never seen a handicapped car in the turnaround. Young renters park there day and night completely blocking the turn around and access to the sidewalk. A handicapped person will be able to be dropped off much easier with the sidewalk access open. This new owner might consider buying and living closer to his handicapped parking spot next to the new building off the parking lot with a level concrete sidewalks to access his home. These sidewalks are designed to safely access all the buildings. A picture is worth a thousand words. Look at the asphalt bike path going down hill into the side of the building...Looks dangerous and it would be a liability if approved. It actually looks more dangerous in person.

Sincerely,
Debra

Cheryl Selby
360.970.6611

Sent from my iPhone so any typos are due to the tiny buttons.

Begin forwarded message:

From: LIV MONROE <livmonroe@gmail.com>
Date: March 18, 2016 at 1:04:23 AM PDT
To: <cselby@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration

Dear Council Member and Mayor Cheryl Selby,

Attached is a letter requesting your attention before the March 22 Council Meeting.

I hope to email three more photos in a second email since they were too big to send all together.

Sincere Thanks,

Liv Monroe, constituent and resident of Woodard Lane
Cohousing
360-357-4503

March 17, 2016

Dear Council Member,

I am a resident and on the development team living in and building Woodard Lane Cohousing at 1620 Woodard Ave NW Olympia, 98502. After working with the City since 2005 to build this Planned Residential Development (PRD) which meets and exceeds many of the City's Comprehensive Plan goals, the last two buildings, comprising 6 homes and a Common House, will be completed in the next 1-2 months. I think we have worked very well together in spite of the difficulties of our uniqueness and not fitting easily into the normal old rules.

The topic of this email is that Olympia City Planning is requiring us to remove an asphalt bike path/walkway that runs from our sidewalk to our bike storage area, and provides a handicapped pick-up and drop-off area adjacent our community pedestrian walkway. The only other choice we were given was to initiate the process to amend the PRD and delay our new members' moving in for months. This choice is more costly and unacceptable to us so we have reluctantly chosen to remove the asphalt.

We are bringing this to your attention now because we think you might appreciate the opportunity and have the ability to offer another option. The suggestion we offered was for us to place posts or some barrier in the asphalt to prevent parking for now, continue the process towards moving in on schedule, and apply for an amendment to the PRD which would leave it to the Hearings Examiner to determine whether or not we can keep the asphalt, park in that location, provide handicapped pick-up and drop-off, and determine what kinds of surface we can apply to the bicycle/walking path. This could be done in an unrushed complete manner. I'm sure there are other good solutions. Perhaps you have the authority, ideas, and interest to change the course of action in a way that serves both the City and us. If not we will do as we agreed and remove the asphalt.

We plan to attend next Tuesday's Council Meeting, 22nd of March 2016, and sign in to speak during "Public Communication." If no better possibility is presented we have arranged for a crew to remove the asphalt as I told Tim Smith, City Planner, we would do.

I am sending this to each City Council Member, and cc'ing Keith Stahley, Leonard Bauer, Tim Smith, Catherine McCoy and our Woodard Lane Cohousing community.

The following paragraphs explain more details of the situation.

The Reason for the two Options

I believe the City of Olympia Planning departments options for us are based on they're interpretation of the Hearing Examiner's report dated April 17, 2008, #12 page 6 of 27. They interpret it to say that parking is not allowed anywhere on the property other than the parking lot at the south end of the property (away from the residences). I read it to mean that no cars be allowed near the residences in the circle upon which the homes front. At that time a fire truck circle was intended where the walking path circle now exists. This was changed and the fire trucks now have a hydrant that can access all of the buildings. We are willing to prevent parking on the asphalt at this time until we can resolve this parking

issue. We would like to do this without removing the asphalt.

Parking

After moving into our homes in April 2010 we asked City Planning if we are allowed to park in the half of the turnaround that is out of the Muirhead Right of Way and within our private property. The verbal response we received was “yes” and it was verbally agreed that it was the City’s responsibility to inform our neighbor, Debra Vantuinen, who had complained about our parking there. Subsequently, that neighbor set out two cones along Muirhead and her property, one being a few feet east of our joint property line, with a sign between them saying “driveway.” I took this to mean that she wanted a driveway like ours on her property and therefore she thought it was okay to have and use a driveway. We have been parking in our driveway for almost 6 years with no complaints about it that I know of. No neighbors need to drive around the turn around to access their property. We don’t mind if they do but to my knowledge this seldom happens.

Bike Path

Asking us to remove the 5’ wide by 48’ long asphalt path down a slope from Muirhead to our basement bike storage area and replacing it with wood chips neither encourages bike usage nor safety. Not providing a safe access to our community basement seems irresponsible to us. The lawn mower and other work and recreational equipment will also be taken to and from this storage. We have several members who use bicycles as their main form of transportation; some don’t own cars. We designed our bike storage for more bikes than the number of members in our community. We do not understand the City’s reasoning for removal of the asphalt and replacing it with wood chips that rain will wash down the slope, be more difficult to remove the slippery wet fallen leaves and require much more maintenance. Where this path levels off there is an additional 40’ across the flat asphalt to where it attaches smoothly to our sidewalk. I do not believe it is the City’s intention to deprive home owners of a safe walkway between their homes and their vehicle storage. We would at least like the opportunity to have our case heard and decided before removing the asphalt.

Potential Handicapped Usage

The handicapped woman who lives here and the elder persons moving in, particularly the 85 year old man in building D by the turnaround, would appreciate and use a loading/unloading area next to their homes that is walker friendly. It would have been a great benefit to them to be able to get out of a car on the turn around and without a curb get onto the paved sidewalk that goes through the community. Now the turn around will be a rough rutted surface (as it has always been) with a curb between the turnaround and sidewalk. The handicapped woman who lives in building E, right by this entry to our community, is too unstable to use this entry as it has been and will be again soon.

It is more important and less costly (in money, emotions, time, and energy) for us to take out the asphalt and proceed to distributing the homes to the owners than to go through the amendment process before moving in. Just for your information, the asphalt cost was \$3500 and the removal cost will be \$1000 for a total of \$8000 if we remove and later, after a hearing, are allowed to reinstall it. I believe unnecessary expenses like this and others the City required of us over the years is a big reason why quality developers are deterred

from building in Olympia. City Planners have worked hard with us to create this community; and they have spoken proudly of our development. We hope you will choose to serve the City's vision by supporting us as best you can.

Thanks for taking the time to read this. Call or email me with any questions or comments.

Sincerely, Liv Monroe [360-357-4503](tel:360-357-4503)

A picture is worth a thousand words so I am including some photos below.



Bike path from above, flat asphalt pad to sidewalk and on turn around, and and View of Murihead behind trees with orange fences and also in upper right corner.



From: [Debra VanTuinen](#)
To: [Steve Hall](#)
Cc: [Cheryl Comcast](#); [Tim Smith](#); [Jason Whalen](#); [Bob Coble](#); [Dawn Hooper](#); [Cindy Weitekamp](#); [Sandi](#); [Rob Bly](#)
Subject: Re: Fwd: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration for print only
Date: Sunday, March 20, 2016 12:06:08 PM
Attachments: [3-17-16 WLCH letter City Council asphalt.docx](#)

A clarification of my last email. It was suppose to go to Steve Hall and cc the others. I also wanted to say that this isn't about who parks in those places but about but WLCH simply being compliant to the code and hearing examiners ruling of no parking.

Steve,

Your letter to Liv and WLCH was spot on. Thank you for your wisdom on this and seeing the whole picture.

WLCH has pushed the limits in the past resulting in huge buildings with three floors looming over the neighbors in their 1-2 story home. It shows how they have asked for more in the past and avoided the hearing examiners limits of 1-2 story and also how they have ignored the city's comprehensive plan which requires new developments enhance and fit into the surrounding neighborhood.

This letter from Liv so has many statements that are not true. The most important one: No complaints in 6 years? Seriously?? The neighborhood has fought them on this issue since they started building. Tom Hill stood on my back yard and said that they would not be able to park on the turn around and use Muirhead. To enforce it at that time he made all the builders move their cars to the parking lot to access the development. The hearing examiner's ruling was written clearly to avoid any confusion. The neighborhood fought them when they started parking and blocking the turnaround and using Muirhead with many letters and emails and meetings with city staff.

Note: WLCH put this asphalt parking pad in without approval...and now have to pay the costs. Yes, they got called on this one...guess they were feeling above the law as they have ignored so many other codes and rulings and gotten away with it. They should be fined for this behavior.

Sincerely,
Debra

Cheryl Selby
360.970.6611

Sent from my iPhone so any typos are due to the tiny buttons.

Begin forwarded message:

From: LIV MONROE <livmonroe@gmail.com>
Date: March 18, 2016 at 1:04:23 AM PDT
To: <cselby@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Woodard Lane Cohousing Request for Your Consideration

Dear Council Member and Mayor Cheryl Selby,

Attached is a letter requesting your attention before the March 22 Council Meeting.

I hope to email three more photos in a second email since they were too big to send all together.

Sincere Thanks,
Liv Monroe, constituent and resident of Woodard Lane
Cohousing
360-357-4503

March 17, 2016

Dear Council Member,

I am a resident and on the development team living in and building Woodard Lane Cohousing at 1620 Woodard Ave NW Olympia, 98502. After working with the City since 2005 to build this Planned Residential Development (PRD) which meets and exceeds many of the City's Comprehensive Plan goals, the last two buildings, comprising 6 homes and a Common House, will be completed in the next 1-2 months. I think we have worked very well together in spite of the difficulties of our uniqueness and not fitting easily into the normal old rules.

The topic of this email is that Olympia City Planning is requiring us to remove an asphalt bike path/walkway that runs from our sidewalk to our bike storage area, and provides a handicapped pick-up and drop-off area adjacent our community pedestrian walkway. The only other choice we were given was to initiate the process to amend the PRD and delay our new members' moving in for months. This choice is more costly and unacceptable to us so we have reluctantly chosen to remove the asphalt.

We are bringing this to your attention now because we think you might appreciate the opportunity and have the ability to offer another option. The suggestion we offered was for us to place posts or some barrier in the asphalt to prevent parking for now, continue the process towards moving in on schedule, and apply for an amendment to the PRD which would leave it to the Hearings Examiner to determine whether or not we can keep the asphalt, park in that location, provide handicapped pick-up and drop-off, and determine what kinds of surface we can apply to the bicycle/walking path. This could be done in an unrushed complete manner. I'm sure there are other good solutions. Perhaps you have the authority, ideas, and interest to change the course of action in a way that serves both the City and us. If not we will do as we agreed and remove the asphalt.

We plan to attend next Tuesday's Council Meeting, 22nd of March 2016, and sign in to speak during "Public Communication." If no better possibility is presented we have arranged for a crew to remove the asphalt as I told Tim Smith, City Planner, we would do.

I am sending this to each City Council Member, and cc'ing Keith Stahley, Leonard Bauer, Tim Smith, Catherine McCoy and our Woodard Lane Cohousing community.

The following paragraphs explain more details of the situation.

The Reason for the two Options

I believe the City of Olympia Planning departments options for us are based on they're interpretation of the Hearing Examiner's report dated April 17, 2008, #12 page 6 of 27. They interpret it to say that parking is not allowed anywhere on the property other than the parking lot at the south end of the property (away from the residences). I read it to mean that no cars be allowed near the residences in the circle upon which the homes front. At that time a fire truck circle was intended where the walking path circle now exists. This was changed and the fire trucks now have a hydrant that can access all of the buildings. We are willing to prevent parking on the asphalt at this time until we can resolve this parking

issue. We would like to do this without removing the asphalt.

Parking

After moving into our homes in April 2010 we asked City Planning if we are allowed to park in the half of the turnaround that is out of the Muirhead Right of Way and within our private property. The verbal response we received was “yes” and it was verbally agreed that it was the City’s responsibility to inform our neighbor, Debra Vantuinen, who had complained about our parking there. Subsequently, that neighbor set out two cones along Muirhead and her property, one being a few feet east of our joint property line, with a sign between them saying “driveway.” I took this to mean that she wanted a driveway like ours on her property and therefore she thought it was okay to have and use a driveway. We have been parking in our driveway for almost 6 years with no complaints about it that I know of. No neighbors need to drive around the turn around to access their property. We don’t mind if they do but to my knowledge this seldom happens.

Bike Path

Asking us to remove the 5’ wide by 48’ long asphalt path down a slope from Muirhead to our basement bike storage area and replacing it with wood chips neither encourages bike usage nor safety. Not providing a safe access to our community basement seems irresponsible to us. The lawn mower and other work and recreational equipment will also be taken to and from this storage. We have several members who use bicycles as their main form of transportation; some don’t own cars. We designed our bike storage for more bikes than the number of members in our community. We do not understand the City’s reasoning for removal of the asphalt and replacing it with wood chips that rain will wash down the slope, be more difficult to remove the slippery wet fallen leaves and require much more maintenance. Where this path levels off there is an additional 40’ across the flat asphalt to where it attaches smoothly to our sidewalk. I do not believe it is the City’s intention to deprive home owners of a safe walkway between their homes and their vehicle storage. We would at least like the opportunity to have our case heard and decided before removing the asphalt.

Potential Handicapped Usage

The handicapped woman who lives here and the elder persons moving in, particularly the 85 year old man in building D by the turnaround, would appreciate and use a loading/unloading area next to their homes that is walker friendly. It would have been a great benefit to them to be able to get out of a car on the turn around and without a curb get onto the paved sidewalk that goes through the community. Now the turn around will be a rough rutted surface (as it has always been) with a curb between the turnaround and sidewalk. The handicapped woman who lives in building E, right by this entry to our community, is too unstable to use this entry as it has been and will be again soon.

It is more important and less costly (in money, emotions, time, and energy) for us to take out the asphalt and proceed to distributing the homes to the owners than to go through the amendment process before moving in. Just for your information, the asphalt cost was \$3500 and the removal cost will be \$1000 for a total of \$8000 if we remove and later, after a hearing, are allowed to reinstall it. I believe unnecessary expenses like this and others the City required of us over the years is a big reason why quality developers are deterred

from building in Olympia. City Planners have worked hard with us to create this community; and they have spoken proudly of our development. We hope you will choose to serve the City's vision by supporting us as best you can.

Thanks for taking the time to read this. Call or email me with any questions or comments.

Sincerely, Liv Monroe [360-357-4503](tel:360-357-4503)

A picture is worth a thousand words so I am including some photos below.



Bike path from above, flat asphalt pad to sidewalk and on turn around, and and View of Murihead behind trees with orange fences and also in upper right corner.

March 17, 2016

Dear Council Member,

I am a resident and on the development team living in and building Woodard Lane Cohousing at 1620 Woodard Ave NW Olympia, 98502. After working with the City since 2005 to build this Planned Residential Development (PRD) which meets and exceeds many of the City's Comprehensive Plan goals, the last two buildings, comprising 6 homes and a Common House, will be completed in the next 1-2 months. I think we have worked very well together in spite of the difficulties of our uniqueness and not fitting easily into the normal old rules.

The topic of this email is that Olympia City Planning is requiring us to remove an asphalt bike path/walkway that runs from our sidewalk to our bike storage area, and provides a handicapped pick-up and drop-off area adjacent our community pedestrian walkway. The only other choice we were given was to initiate the process to amend the PRD and delay our new members' moving in for months. This choice is more costly and unacceptable to us so we have reluctantly chosen to remove the asphalt.

We are bringing this to your attention now because we think you might appreciate the opportunity and have the ability to offer another option. The suggestion we offered was for us to place posts or some barrier in the asphalt to prevent parking for now, continue the process towards moving in on schedule, and apply for an amendment to the PRD which would leave it to the Hearings Examiner to determine whether or not we can keep the asphalt, park in that location, provide handicapped pick-up and drop-off, and determine what kinds of surface we can apply to the bicycle/walking path. This could be done in an unrushed complete manner. I'm sure there are other good solutions. Perhaps you have the authority, ideas, and interest to change the course of action in a way that serves both the City and us. If not we will do as we agreed and remove the asphalt.

We plan to attend next Tuesday's Council Meeting, 22nd of March 2016, and sign in to speak during "Public Communication." If no better possibility is presented we have arranged for a crew to remove the asphalt as I told Tim Smith, City Planner, we would do.

I am sending this to each City Council Member, and cc'ing Keith Stahley, Leonard Bauer, Tim Smith, Catherine McCoy and our Woodard Lane Cohousing community.

The following paragraphs explain more details of the situation.

The Reason for the two Options

I believe the City of Olympia Planning departments options for us are based on they're interpretation of the Hearing Examiner's report dated April 17, 2008, #12 page 6 of 27. They interpret it to say that parking is not allowed anywhere on the property other than the parking lot at the south end of the property (away from the residences). I read it to mean that no cars be allowed near the residences in the circle upon which the homes front. At that time a fire truck circle was intended where the walking path circle now exists. This was changed and the fire trucks now have a hydrant that can access all of the buildings. We are willing to prevent parking on the asphalt at this time until we can resolve this parking

issue. We would like to do this without removing the asphalt.

Parking

After moving into our homes in April 2010 we asked City Planning if we are allowed to park in the half of the turnaround that is out of the Muirhead Right of Way and within our private property. The verbal response we received was “yes” and it was verbally agreed that it was the City’s responsibility to inform our neighbor, Debra Vantuinen, who had complained about our parking there. Subsequently, that neighbor set out two cones along Muirhead and her property, one being a few feet east of our joint property line, with a sign between them saying “driveway.” I took this to mean that she wanted a driveway like ours on her property and therefore she thought it was okay to have and use a driveway. We have been parking in our driveway for almost 6 years with no complaints about it that I know of. No neighbors need to drive around the turn around to access their property. We don’t mind if they do but to my knowledge this seldom happens.

Bike Path

Asking us to remove the 5’ wide by 48’ long asphalt path down a slope from Muirhead to our basement bike storage area and replacing it with wood chips neither encourages bike usage nor safety. Not providing a safe access to our community basement seems irresponsible to us. The lawn mower and other work and recreational equipment will also be taken to and from this storage. We have several members who use bicycles as their main form of transportation; some don’t own cars. We designed our bike storage for more bikes than the number of members in our community. We do not understand the City’s reasoning for removal of the asphalt and replacing it with wood chips that rain will wash down the slope, be more difficult to remove the slippery wet fallen leaves and require much more maintenance. Where this path levels off there is an additional 40’ across the flat asphalt to where it attaches smoothly to our sidewalk. I do not believe it is the City’s intention to deprive home owners of a safe walkway between their homes and their vehicle storage. We would at least like the opportunity to have our case heard and decided before removing the asphalt.

Potential Handicapped Usage

The handicapped woman who lives here and the elder persons moving in, particularly the 85 year old man in building D by the turnaround, would appreciate and use a loading/unloading area next to their homes that is walker friendly. It would have been a great benefit to them to be able to get out of a car on the turn around and without a curb get onto the paved sidewalk that goes through the community. Now the turn around will be a rough rutted surface (as it has always been) with a curb between the turnaround and sidewalk. The handicapped woman who lives in building E, right by this entry to our community, is too unstable to use this entry as it has been and will be again soon.

It is more important and less costly (in money, emotions, time, and energy) for us to take out the asphalt and proceed to distributing the homes to the owners than to go through the amendment process before moving in. Just for your information, the asphalt cost was \$3500 and the removal cost will be \$1000 for a total of \$8000 if we remove and later, after a hearing, are allowed to reinstall it. I believe unnecessary expenses like this and others the City required of us over the years is a big reason why quality developers are deterred

from building in Olympia. City Planners have worked hard with us to create this community; and they have spoken proudly of our development. We hope you will choose to serve the City's vision by supporting us as best you can.

Thanks for taking the time to read this. Call or email me with any questions or comments.

Sincerely, Liv Monroe [360-357-4503](tel:360-357-4503)

A picture is worth a thousand words so I am including some photos below.



Bike path from above, flat asphalt pad to sidewalk and on turn around, and and View of Murihead behind trees with orange fences and also in upper right corner.

From: [Leonard Bauer](#)
To: [Keith Stahley](#); [Tim Smith](#)
Subject: RE: Changes to the Woodard Lane Coop Housing
Date: Monday, March 21, 2016 11:20:15 AM

Steve also asked this morning that we copy councilmembers on the response, so that they are clear on what our communication is with the Woodard residents prior to their council meeting tomorrow night where they may get public comment on this topic.

Tim, it would probably be a good idea for you to do a draft response that Keith and I take a quick look at before it is sent out. Let's get the response sent today if at all possible. Thanks!

From: Keith Stahley
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2016 10:34 AM
To: Tim Smith
Cc: Leonard Bauer
Subject: FW: Changes to the Woodard Lane Coop Housing

Hi Tim,

Can you take the lead on responding to this one.

Thanks

Keith

From: Steve Hall
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2016 10:31 AM
To: Keith Stahley; Leonard Bauer; Tim Smith
Subject: FW: Changes to the Woodard Lane Coop Housing

Can you guys please respond to this.

Thanks

Steve

From: LIV MONROE [<mailto:livmonroe@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, March 19, 2016 12:49 PM
To: Steve Hall
Subject: Re: Changes to the Woodard Lane Coop Housing

Dear Steve,

Your reply has confirmed for me what I had believed, that only <formal consideration by the Hearing's Examiner> can resolve this. We will commit to taking this to the hearings examiner. Our request is about the timing of removal of the asphalt. I have been told that we cannot apply for an amendment to the PDR immediately without delaying the distribution of our new homes to the owners which in turn prevents them from moving in before the process is complete. I have also been told that it will take months. We would happily apply for an amendment with the examiner before the 30 days the City gave us and block off the ability to

park on the asphalt pad if one of the following were true:

1. The new owners are allowed to take ownership and move in as soon as the buildings are complete and pass inspection and that the city inspectors will complete the final inspections as soon as they would have if the application had not been made.
2. The new owners can, with or without city permission if it isn't needed, move in without taking ownership as soon as the buildings are complete as stated in #1 above and we proceed through the PRD amendment process until the Examiner has made a determination. Then we comply with the determination which may include removing the asphalt. In this case the legal owners of the homes would continue to be the LLCs that are building them until we have complied with the Hearing Determinations and the BSP and Condo Plans are approved by the City and filed with the County. After this is done legal transfer of title to the home owners can be made.
3. We apply for the PRD amendment this coming week. The city agrees to complete the process within a month (or some time we agree to) and then we comply with the Examiners determination.

Please let me know why these possibilities are not workable for the City. Also, let us know if they inspire other workable possibilities. I am particularly interested in #2 because I already understand some reasons #1 and #3 would not work for the City. I would be happy to come to your office to discuss this or receive a phone call at 360-357-4503. Email works too.

If we can't find a solution that includes our temporary retention of the asphalt would you please help me understand the problem of retaining an asphalt bicycle path from the bike storage area to the road and to our homes. We are trying to come up with a solution that is more green (encourages biking and to not remove asphalt before later replacement is ruled out), that allows for time to consider the whole picture including the impact on and desires of the two neighbors most impacted (Debra is perhaps third most impacted), and within the intention of the law.

Sincerely, Liv Monroe

On Mar 19, 2016, at 9:15 AM, Steve Hall <shall@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Hi Liv

Thanks for your note to the City Council and staff about your desire to change conditions of the Woodard Lane Coop Housing approval. I can understand your rationale for wanting to modify the City's Hearing's Examiner's condition for the development.

As you are aware the approval by the Examiner was based on neighborhood and Cop member input that lead to a very specific outcome for the Coop Housing expansion. Neither side got all they wanted in the final decision, but it is the current legal framework for the Coop and the neighborhood. I understand that some of what you

want to do may have actually been specifically prohibited by the examiner.

I want to be very clear that neither the City staff nor the City Council can change the conditions of approval for the project. If you wish to make changes, you will need to ask for formal consideration by the Hearing's Examiner. While this may seem like a burdensome process for you, this approach will ensure that all parties can be heard in the consideration of additional changes.

Steve Hall
City Manager

From: [Steve Hall](#)
To: [Keith Stahley](#); [Leonard Bauer](#); [Tim Smith](#)
Subject: FW: Changes to the Woodard Lane Coop Housing
Date: Monday, March 21, 2016 10:30:57 AM

Can you guys please respond to this.

Thanks

Steve

From: LIV MONROE [mailto:livmonroe@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 19, 2016 12:49 PM
To: Steve Hall
Subject: Re: Changes to the Woodard Lane Coop Housing

Dear Steve,

Your reply has confirmed for me what I had believed, that only <formal consideration by the Hearing's Examiner> can resolve this. We will commit to taking this to the hearings examiner. Our request is about the timing of removal of the asphalt. I have been told that we cannot apply for an amendment to the PDR immediately without delaying the distribution of our new homes to the owners which in turn prevents them from moving in before the process is complete. I have also been told that it will take months. We would happily apply for an amendment with the examiner before the 30 days the City gave us and block off the ability to park on the asphalt pad if one of the following were true:

1. The new owners are allowed to take ownership and move in as soon as the buildings are complete and pass inspection and that the city inspectors will complete the final inspections as soon as they would have if the application had not been made.
2. The new owners can, with or without city permission if it isn't needed, move in without taking ownership as soon as the buildings are complete as stated in #1 above and we proceed through the PRD amendment process until the Examiner has made a determination. Then we comply with the determination which may include removing the asphalt. In this case the legal owners of the homes would continue to be the LLCs that are building them until we have complied with the Hearing Determinations and the BSP and Condo Plans are approved by the City and filed with the County. After this is done legal transfer of title to the home owners can be made.
3. We apply for the PRD amendment this coming week. The city agrees to complete the process within a month (or some time we agree to) and then we comply with the Examiners determination.

Please let me know why these possibilities are not workable for the City. Also, let us know if they inspire other workable possibilities. I am particularly interested in #2 because I already understand some reasons #1 and #3 would not work for the City. I would be happy to come to your office to discuss this or receive a phone call at 360-357-4503. Email works too.

If we can't find a solution that includes our temporary retention of the asphalt would you please help me understand the problem of retaining an asphalt bicycle path from the bike storage area to the road and to our homes. We are trying to come up with a solution that is

more green (encourages biking and to not remove asphalt before later replacement is ruled out), that allows for time to consider the whole picture including the impact on and desires of the two neighbors most impacted (Debra is perhaps third most impacted), and within the intention of the law.

Sincerely, Liv Monroe

On Mar 19, 2016, at 9:15 AM, Steve Hall <shall@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Hi Liv

Thanks for your note to the City Council and staff about your desire to change conditions of the Woodard Lane Coop Housing approval. I can understand your rationale for wanting to modify the City's Hearing's Examiner's condition for the development.

As you are aware the approval by the Examiner was based on neighborhood and Cop member input that lead to a very specific outcome for the Coop Housing expansion. Neither side got all they wanted in the final decision, but it is the current legal framework for the Coop and the neighborhood. I understand that some of what you want to do may have actually been specifically prohibited by the examiner.

I want to be very clear that neither the City staff nor the City Council can change the conditions of approval for the project. If you wish to make changes, you will need to ask for formal consideration by the Hearing's Examiner. While this may seem like a burdensome process for you, this approach will ensure that all parties can be heard in the consideration of additional changes.

Steve Hall
City Manager

From: [Keith Stahley](#)
To: [Tim Smith](#)
Cc: [Leonard Bauer](#)
Subject: FW: Changes to the Woodard Lane Coop Housing
Date: Monday, March 21, 2016 10:34:03 AM

Hi Tim,

Can you take the lead on responding to this one.

Thanks

Keith

From: Steve Hall
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2016 10:31 AM
To: Keith Stahley; Leonard Bauer; Tim Smith
Subject: FW: Changes to the Woodard Lane Coop Housing

Can you guys please respond to this.

Thanks

Steve

From: LIV MONROE [<mailto:livmonroe@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, March 19, 2016 12:49 PM
To: Steve Hall
Subject: Re: Changes to the Woodard Lane Coop Housing

Dear Steve,

Your reply has confirmed for me what I had believed, that only <formal consideration by the Hearing's Examiner> can resolve this. We will commit to taking this to the hearings examiner. Our request is about the timing of removal of the asphalt. I have been told that we cannot apply for an amendment to the PDR immediately without delaying the distribution of our new homes to the owners which in turn prevents them from moving in before the process is complete. I have also been told that it will take months. We would happily apply for an amendment with the examiner before the 30 days the City gave us and block off the ability to park on the asphalt pad if one of the following were true:

1. The new owners are allowed to take ownership and move in as soon as the buildings are complete and pass inspection and that the city inspectors will complete the final inspections as soon as they would have if the application had not been made.
2. The new owners can, with or without city permission if it isn't needed, move in without taking ownership as soon as the buildings are complete as stated in #1 above and we proceed through the PRD amendment process until the Examiner has made a determination. Then we comply with the determination which may include removing the asphalt. In this case the legal owners of the homes would continue to be the LLCs that are building them until we have complied with the Hearing Determinations and the BSP and Condo Plans are approved by the City and filed with the County. After this is done legal transfer of title to the home owners

can be made.

3. We apply for the PRD amendment this coming week. The city agrees to complete the process within a month (or some time we agree to) and then we comply with the Examiners determination.

Please let me know why these possibilities are not workable for the City. Also, let us know if they inspire other workable possibilities. I am particularly interested in #2 because I already understand some reasons #1 and #3 would not work for the City. I would be happy to come to your office to discuss this or receive a phone call at 360-357-4503. Email works too.

If we can't find a solution that includes our temporary retention of the asphalt would you please help me understand the problem of retaining an asphalt bicycle path from the bike storage area to the road and to our homes. We are trying to come up with a solution that is more green (encourages biking and to not remove asphalt before later replacement is ruled out), that allows for time to consider the whole picture including the impact on and desires of the two neighbors most impacted (Debra is perhaps third most impacted), and within the intention of the law.

Sincerely, Liv Monroe

On Mar 19, 2016, at 9:15 AM, Steve Hall <shall@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Hi Liv

Thanks for your note to the City Council and staff about your desire to change conditions of the Woodard Lane Coop Housing approval. I can understand your rationale for wanting to modify the City's Hearing's Examiner's condition for the development.

As you are aware the approval by the Examiner was based on neighborhood and Cop member input that lead to a very specific outcome for the Coop Housing expansion. Neither side got all they wanted in the final decision, but it is the current legal framework for the Coop and the neighborhood. I understand that some of what you want to do may have actually been specifically prohibited by the examiner.

I want to be very clear that neither the City staff nor the City Council can change the conditions of approval for the project. If you wish to make changes, you will need to ask for formal consideration by the Hearing's Examiner. While this may seem like a burdensome process for you, this approach will ensure that all parties can be heard in the consideration of additional changes.

Steve Hall
City Manager

From: [Keith Stahley](#)
To: [Tim Smith](#)
Cc: [Leonard Bauer](#)
Subject: FW: Changes to the Woodard Lane Coop Housing
Date: Monday, March 21, 2016 10:34:47 AM

Hi Tim,

You might want to call Liv and see if she intends to show up tomorrow. If not you're off the hook.

Cheers,

Keith

From: Steve Hall
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2016 10:31 AM
To: Keith Stahley; Leonard Bauer; Tim Smith
Subject: FW: Changes to the Woodard Lane Coop Housing

Can you guys please respond to this.

Thanks

Steve

From: LIV MONROE [<mailto:livmonroe@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, March 19, 2016 12:49 PM
To: Steve Hall
Subject: Re: Changes to the Woodard Lane Coop Housing

Dear Steve,

Your reply has confirmed for me what I had believed, that only <formal consideration by the Hearing's Examiner> can resolve this. We will commit to taking this to the hearings examiner. Our request is about the timing of removal of the asphalt. I have been told that we cannot apply for an amendment to the PDR immediately without delaying the distribution of our new homes to the owners which in turn prevents them from moving in before the process is complete. I have also been told that it will take months. We would happily apply for an amendment with the examiner before the 30 days the City gave us and block off the ability to park on the asphalt pad if one of the following were true:

1. The new owners are allowed to take ownership and move in as soon as the buildings are complete and pass inspection and that the city inspectors will complete the final inspections as soon as they would have if the application had not been made.
2. The new owners can, with or without city permission if it isn't needed, move in without taking ownership as soon as the buildings are complete as stated in #1 above and we proceed through the PRD amendment process until the Examiner has made a determination. Then we comply with the determination which may include removing the asphalt. In this case the legal owners of the homes would continue to be the LLCs that are building them until we have complied with the Hearing Determinations and the BSP and Condo Plans are approved by the City and filed with the County. After this is done legal transfer of title to the home owners

can be made.

3. We apply for the PRD amendment this coming week. The city agrees to complete the process within a month (or some time we agree to) and then we comply with the Examiners determination.

Please let me know why these possibilities are not workable for the City. Also, let us know if they inspire other workable possibilities. I am particularly interested in #2 because I already understand some reasons #1 and #3 would not work for the City. I would be happy to come to your office to discuss this or receive a phone call at 360-357-4503. Email works too.

If we can't find a solution that includes our temporary retention of the asphalt would you please help me understand the problem of retaining an asphalt bicycle path from the bike storage area to the road and to our homes. We are trying to come up with a solution that is more green (encourages biking and to not remove asphalt before later replacement is ruled out), that allows for time to consider the whole picture including the impact on and desires of the two neighbors most impacted (Debra is perhaps third most impacted), and within the intention of the law.

Sincerely, Liv Monroe

On Mar 19, 2016, at 9:15 AM, Steve Hall <shall@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Hi Liv

Thanks for your note to the City Council and staff about your desire to change conditions of the Woodard Lane Coop Housing approval. I can understand your rationale for wanting to modify the City's Hearing's Examiner's condition for the development.

As you are aware the approval by the Examiner was based on neighborhood and Cop member input that lead to a very specific outcome for the Coop Housing expansion. Neither side got all they wanted in the final decision, but it is the current legal framework for the Coop and the neighborhood. I understand that some of what you want to do may have actually been specifically prohibited by the examiner.

I want to be very clear that neither the City staff nor the City Council can change the conditions of approval for the project. If you wish to make changes, you will need to ask for formal consideration by the Hearing's Examiner. While this may seem like a burdensome process for you, this approach will ensure that all parties can be heard in the consideration of additional changes.

Steve Hall
City Manager

From: [Tami Tonder](#)
To: [Tim Smith](#)
Subject: FW: esc Woodard Co 1-12-16
Date: Monday, March 21, 2016 2:52:25 PM
Attachments: [esc Woodard Co 1-20-16.docx](#)
[image001.jpg](#)
[image002.jpg](#)
[esc Woodard Co 1-12-16.docx](#)

From: Tami Tonder
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2016 9:11 AM
To: Chris Smith
Subject: esc Woodard Co 1-12-16

Chris here are the two reports- one asking to rock d/w due to mud and one thanking them for doing it.

Tami Tonder

Engineering Construction Inspection-Stormwater | **Public Works Engineering**
City of Olympia | olympiawa.gov
O:360.753.8579 | C:360.972.6375 | ttonder@ci.olympia.wa.us



Connect With Us!



Get Real-time Project Updates

All email to and from this address is a public record and subject to disclosure.

EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL INSPECTION



City of Olympia
PO Box 1967
Olympia WA 98507-1967

PROJECT Woodard Co-Housing		PW PROJECT # or CPD PERMIT	
CONTRACTOR Scott Homes		CONTRACTOR'S DESIGNATED CESCL	
ADDRESS or LOCATION Woodard/ Off Thomas		INSPECTOR FILLING OUT THIS FORM Tami Tonder	
DATE 1/20/16	TIME 9:30am	CURRENT WEATHER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear <input type="checkbox"/> cloudy <input type="checkbox"/> light rain <input type="checkbox"/> rain <input type="checkbox"/> heavy rain	APPROXIMATE 24 HR. PRECIPITATION, . trace"
TYPE OF INSPECTION <input type="checkbox"/> set up <input type="checkbox"/> project end <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> weekly <input type="checkbox"/> post heavy rain event			
BMP DESIGNATION		STATUS	LOCATION/CONDITION/COMMENT
1- Project Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWPPP- Discharge locations, corrections • BMPs shown on ESC Plans, numbered • ESC Reports • Site log 		<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	Have seen before
2-Mark Clearing Limits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buffer Zone around sensitive areas • Clearing Limits Identified 		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
3-Construction Access Stabilization: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stabilized Construction Entrance/Exit • Stabilized roads/Parking area 		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Thanks for adding CSTC to driveway
4-Control Flow Rates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swale • Dike • Check dam • Sediment pond/trap • Berms 		<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
5-Install Sediment Controls: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sediment pond/trap • Interceptor dike or swale • Silt fence • Wattles • Vegetative Filter • Berms 		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
6-Preserve Vegetation/Stabilize Soils: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nets/Blankets • Mulch/Straw • Seeding • Compost/Manure • Unworked piles covered 		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Thanks for starting to landscape-could use more straw at low ends of project behind buildings
7-Protect Slopes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrace • Pipe slope drains • Roof drains/gutters • Stormwater ponds 		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
8-Protect Drains Inlets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socks/Booms • Above ground grates/Beehives • Inserts 		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
9-Stabilize Channels & Outlets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conveyance channels • Energy dissipaters • 		<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	

BMP DESIGNATION	STATUS	LOCATION/CONDITION/COMMENT
10-Control Pollutants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solid Waste management/ dumpster Chemical storage area covered Concrete washout Wheel wash • Spill kit 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
11-Control De-Watering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pump Containment Splash pad/energy dissipater 	<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
12-Protect Low Impact Development BMP's: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Siltation • Phasing Soil Compaction Undisturbed vegetation/trees 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	

Was water quality monitoring part of this inspection? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No						
Parameter	Method (select one)	Result			Calibrated (Y/N)	Comments (muddy, cloudy, oil sheen, color, etc.)
		NTU	cm	pH		
Turbidity ¹	Tube/meter/lab					
Ph ²	Paper/kit/meter					

¹ Compliance for Turbidity is normally < 250 NTU

² Compliance for pH is between 6.5 and 8.5; only required for sites with 1,000 cubic yards or more of concrete or engineered soils

Does the site appear to be in compliance with the SWPPP (and CSWGP Permit, if applicable) requirements? Yes No

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS REQUESTED OR TAKEN

BMP Designation Or Number	Description and Location	Action Requested or Taken	Completion Date

General Comments
 Thanks for rocking driveway- site ok- could use more straw behind buildings at low end of slope.

"I certify that this report is true, accurate, and complete, to the best of my knowledge and belief."

SIGNATURE Tami Tonder	PHONE NUMBER 360.753.8579
--------------------------	------------------------------

EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL INSPECTION



City of Olympia
PO Box 1967
Olympia WA 98507-1967

PROJECT Woodard Co-Housing		PW PROJECT # or CPD PERMIT	
CONTRACTOR Scott Homes		CONTRACTOR'S DESIGNATED CESCL	
ADDRESS or LOCATION Woodard/ Off Thomas		INSPECTOR FILLING OUT THIS FORM Tami Tonder	
DATE 1/12/16	TIME 10am	CURRENT WEATHER <input type="checkbox"/> Clear <input type="checkbox"/> cloudy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> light rain <input type="checkbox"/> rain <input type="checkbox"/> heavy rain	APPROXIMATE 24 HR. PRECIPITATION, .59"
TYPE OF INSPECTION <input type="checkbox"/> set up <input type="checkbox"/> project end <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> weekly <input type="checkbox"/> post heavy rain event			
BMP DESIGNATION		STATUS	LOCATION/CONDITION/COMMENT
1- Project Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWPPP- Discharge locations, corrections • BMPs shown on ESC Plans, numbered • ESC Reports • Site log 		<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	Have seen before
2-Mark Clearing Limits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buffer Zone around sensitive areas • Clearing Limits Identified 		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
3-Construction Access Stabilization: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stabilized Construction Entrance/Exit • Stabilized roads/Parking area 		<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	The entry off Muirhead is muddy and causing tracking and silt run off. Needs to be rocked.
4-Control Flow Rates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swale • Dike • Check dam • Sediment pond/trap • Berms 		<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
5-Install Sediment Controls: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sediment pond/trap • Interceptor dike or swale • Silt fence • Wattles • Vegetative Filter • Berms 		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
6-Preserve Vegetation/Stabilize Soils: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nets/Blankets • Mulch/Straw • Seeding • Compost/Manure • Unworked piles covered 		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Some areas not yet land scape and ponding (although it appears contained- concerned it will get muddy- keep an eye on- also area that slopes at side of communal house where utilities are- keep an eye on.
7-Protect Slopes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrace • Pipe slope drains • Roof drains/gutters • Stormwater ponds 		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
8-Protect Drains Inlets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socks/Booms • Above ground grates/Beehives • Inserts 		<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	When last checked (a few weeks ago) CB at entry off Thomas on Muirhead had no insert and silt build up in gutter showed signs of turbid runoff. Likely due to Access- needs to be reworked (rocked-see above 3).
9-Stabilize Channels & Outlets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conveyance channels • Energy dissipaters • 		<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	

BMP DESIGNATION	STATUS	LOCATION/CONDITION/COMMENT
10-Control Pollutants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solid Waste management/ dumpster Chemical storage area covered Concrete washout Wheel wash • Spill kit 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
11-Control De-Watering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pump Containment Splash pad/energy dissipater 	<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
12-Protect Low Impact Development BMP's: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Siltation • Phasing Soil Compaction Undisturbed vegetation/trees 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> NOT OK <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	

Was water quality monitoring part of this inspection? Yes No

Parameter	Method (select one)	Result			Calibrated (Y/N)	Comments (muddy, cloudy, oil sheen, color, etc.)
		NTU	cm	pH		
Turbidity ¹	Tube/meter/lab					
Ph ²	Paper/kit/meter					

¹ Compliance for Turbidity is normally < 250 NTU

² Compliance for pH is between 6.5 and 8.5; only required for sites with 1,000 cubic yards or more of concrete or engineered soils

Does the site appear to be in compliance with the SWPPP (and CSWGP Permit, if applicable) requirements? Yes No

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS REQUESTED OR TAKEN

BMP Designation Or Number	Description and Location	Action Requested or Taken	Completion Date
3 & 8	Issues related to the bad shape of entry on muirhead	Fix road (rock) clean sediment run off	Will check in next week

General Comments
Called Steve

"I certify that this report is true, accurate, and complete, to the best of my knowledge and belief."

SIGNATURE Tami Tonder	PHONE NUMBER 360.753.8579
--------------------------	------------------------------

From: [Steve Hall](#)
To: [Keith Stahley](#)
Cc: [Tim Smith](#)
Subject: FW: Hearing
Date: Thursday, April 14, 2016 2:33:06 PM

Hi Keith,

I see that Tim was copied.

It is probably best for him to respond rather than me.

Thanks

Steve

From: Debra VanTuinen [mailto:dvantuinen@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 12:27 PM
To: Steve Hall
Cc: Cheryl Comcast; Cindy Weitekamp; Sandi Huston; Jason Whalen; Tim Smith
Subject: Hearing

Steve,

So we all can better understand...Can you explain to our community why WLCH can continue to have hearings to amend the original hearing examiners rulings. Is it legal to change the original hearing examiner's ruling and undermine the neighborhoods input because WLCH doesn't like what they original asked for. This is very stressful and creates a lot of work for the surrounding community especially after we did so much work for the original hearing. The last hearing they did not send out letters to the neighbors as required and very few knew about it. I thought this was mandatory as it affected all of our property values with the garbage site change and transfer development rights that added two more huge 3 story buildings. The original hearing examiner allowed only 1-2 story homes.

Catherine McCoy, Cindy Weitekamp and I had a lunch meeting two years ago and we asked her to make sure we knew of any changes the WLCH was trying to make. Shortly after that Catherine had a staff meeting and let Liv Monroe attend. At this meeting Liv wanted and was allowed to move the garbage site to Muirhead and on my lot line instead of where it was approved by the original hearing examiner. Can Catherine change the hearing examiners ruling in a staff meeting because the developer wants them to? I and neighbors had to attend three hearings and I paid an attorney \$2500.00 to have it moved back to the site approved by the original hearing examiner and the city council. I feel that the city should reimburse me. Catherine continues to ignore the hearing examiners ruling on allowing them to park and use Muirhead. Once again creating rifts in the neighborhood.

Liv Monroe further affected our community by contacting the city to have our street light on Muirhead shut off. This is not on her property and puts three of our back yards and the house at the end of Muirhead in darkness. Several of us have had our cars broken into of late and I would like to know why Liv was allowed to do this without our input? I would like it turned back on.

Thanks for your time Steve.

Debra

From: [Keith Stahley](#)
To: [Steve Hall](#)
Cc: [Tim Smith](#)
Subject: RE: Hearing
Date: Thursday, April 14, 2016 2:38:14 PM

Yes. Definitely. Thanks

From: Steve Hall
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 2:33 PM
To: Keith Stahley
Cc: Tim Smith
Subject: FW: Hearing

Hi Keith,
I see that Tim was copied.
It is probably best for him to respond rather than me.
Thanks
Steve

From: Debra VanTuinen [<mailto:dvantuinen@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 12:27 PM
To: Steve Hall
Cc: Cheryl Comcast; Cindy Weitekamp; Sandi Huston; Jason Whalen; Tim Smith
Subject: Hearing

Steve,

So we all can better understand...Can you explain to our community why WLCH can continue to have hearings to amend the original hearing examiners rulings. Is it legal to change the original hearing examiner's ruling and undermine the neighborhoods input because WLCH doesn't like what they original asked for. This is very stressful and creates a lot of work for the surrounding community especially after we did so much work for the original hearing. The last hearing they did not send out letters to the neighbors as required and very few knew about it. I thought this was mandatory as it affected all of our property values with the garbage site change and transfer development rights that added two more huge 3 story buildings. The original hearing examiner allowed only 1-2 story homes.

Catherine McCoy, Cindy Weitekamp and I had a lunch meeting two years ago and we asked her to make sure we knew of any changes the WLCH was trying to make. Shortly after that Catherine had a staff meeting and let Liv Monroe attend. At this meeting Liv wanted and was allowed to move the garbage site to Muirhead and on my lot line instead of where it was approved by the original hearing examiner. Can Catherine change the hearing examiners ruling in a staff meeting because the developer wants them to? I and neighbors had to attend three hearings and I paid an attorney \$2500.00 to have it moved back to the site approved by the original hearing examiner and the city council. I feel that the city should reimburse me. Catherine continues to ignore the hearing examiners ruling on allowing them to park and use Muirhead. Once again creating rifts in the neighborhood.

Liv Monroe further affected our community by contacting the city to have our street light on Muirhead shut off. This is not on her property and puts three of our back yards and the house at the end of Muirhead in darkness. Several of us have had our cars broken into of late and I would like to know why Liv was allowed to do this without our input? I would like it turned back on.

Thanks for your time Steve.

Debra

From: [Debra VanTuinen](#)
To: [Steve Hall](#)
Cc: [Cheryl Comcast](#); [Cindy Weitekamp](#); [Sandi Huston](#); [Jason Whalen](#); [Tim Smith](#)
Subject: Hearing
Date: Thursday, April 14, 2016 12:27:17 PM

Steve,

So we all can better understand...Can you explain to our community why WLCH can continue to have hearings to amend the original hearing examiners rulings. Is it legal to change the original hearing examiner's ruling and undermine the neighborhoods input because WLCH doesn't like what they original asked for. This is very stressful and creates a lot of work for the surrounding community especially after we did so much work for the original hearing. The last hearing they did not send out letters to the neighbors as required and very few knew about it. I thought this was mandatory as it affected all of our property values with the garbage site change and transfer development rights that added two more huge 3 story buildings. The original hearing examiner allowed only 1-2 story homes.

Catherine McCoy, Cindy Weitekamp and I had a lunch meeting two years ago and we asked her to make sure we knew of any changes the WLCH was trying to make. Shortly after that Catherine had a staff meeting and let Liv Monroe attend. At this meeting Liv wanted and was allowed to move the garbage site to Muirhead and on my lot line instead of where it was approved by the original hearing examiner. Can Catherine change the hearing examiners ruling in a staff meeting because the developer wants them to? I and neighbors had to attend three hearings and I paid an attorney \$2500.00 to have it moved back to the site approved by the original hearing examiner and the city council. I feel that the city should reimburse me. Catherine continues to ignore the hearing examiners ruling on allowing them to park and use Muirhead. Once again creating rifts in the neighborhood.

Liv Monroe further affected our community by contacting the city to have our street light on Muirhead shut off. This is not on her property and puts three of our back yards and the house at the end of Muirhead in darkness. Several of us have had our cars broken into of late and I would like to know why Liv was allowed to do this without our input? I would like it turned back on.

Thanks for your time Steve.

Debra

From: [Steve Hall](#)
To: [Debra VanTuinen](#)
Cc: [Cheryl Comcast](#); [Cindy Weitekamp](#); [Sandi Huston](#); [Jason Whalen](#); [Tim Smith](#)
Subject: RE: Hearing
Date: Friday, April 15, 2016 11:46:50 AM

Hi Debra,

I have asked Tim Smith in Our Planning Department to respond to your questions.

Steve

From: Debra VanTuinen [mailto:dvantuinen@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 12:27 PM
To: Steve Hall
Cc: Cheryl Comcast; Cindy Weitekamp; Sandi Huston; Jason Whalen; Tim Smith
Subject: Hearing

Steve,

So we all can better understand...Can you explain to our community why WLCH can continue to have hearings to amend the original hearing examiners rulings. Is it legal to change the original hearing examiner's ruling and undermine the neighborhoods input because WLCH doesn't like what they original asked for. This is very stressful and creates a lot of work for the surrounding community especially after we did so much work for the original hearing. The last hearing they did not send out letters to the neighbors as required and very few knew about it. I thought this was mandatory as it affected all of our property values with the garbage site change and transfer development rights that added two more huge 3 story buildings. The original hearing examiner allowed only 1-2 story homes.

Catherine McCoy, Cindy Weitekamp and I had a lunch meeting two years ago and we asked her to make sure we knew of any changes the WLCH was trying to make. Shortly after that Catherine had a staff meeting and let Liv Monroe attend. At this meeting Liv wanted and was allowed to move the garbage site to Muirhead and on my lot line instead of where it was approved by the original hearing examiner. Can Catherine change the hearing examiners ruling in a staff meeting because the developer wants them to? I and neighbors had to attend three hearings and I paid an attorney \$2500.00 to have it moved back to the site approved by the original hearing examiner and the city council. I feel that the city should reimburse me. Catherine continues to ignore the hearing examiners ruling on allowing them to park and use Muirhead. Once again creating rifts in the neighborhood.

Liv Monroe further affected our community by contacting the city to have our street light on Muirhead shut off. This is not on her property and puts three of our back yards and the house at the end of Muirhead in darkness. Several of us have had our cars broken into of late and I would like to know why Liv was allowed to do this without our input? I would like it turned back on.

Thanks for your time Steve.

Debra

From: [Debra VanTuinen](#)
To: [Steve Hall](#)
Cc: [Cheryl Comcast](#); [Cindy Weitekamp](#); [Sandi Huston](#); [Jason Whalen](#); [Tim Smith](#)
Subject: Re: Hearing
Date: Friday, April 15, 2016 12:02:40 PM

Steve,

Thanks Steve. Tim and I have met and I respect him very much as he does understand and follow the city codes and rulings.

Debra

On Friday, April 15, 2016 11:46 AM, Steve Hall <shall@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Hi Debra,

I have asked Tim Smith in Our Planning Department to respond to your questions.

Steve

From: Debra VanTuinen [mailto:dvantuinen@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 12:27 PM
To: Steve Hall
Cc: Cheryl Comcast; Cindy Weitekamp; Sandi Huston; Jason Whalen; Tim Smith
Subject: Hearing

Steve,

So we all can better understand...Can you explain to our community why WLCH can continue to have hearings to amend the original hearing examiners rulings. Is it legal to change the original hearing examiner's ruling and undermine the neighborhoods input because WLCH doesn't like what they original asked for. This is very stressful and creates a lot of work for the surrounding community especially after we did so much work for the original hearing. The last hearing they did not send out letters to the neighbors as required and very few knew about it. I thought this was mandatory as it affected all of our property values with the garbage site change and transfer development rights that added two more huge 3 story buildings. The original hearing examiner allowed only 1-2 story homes.

Catherine McCoy, Cindy Weitekamp and I had a lunch meeting two years ago and we asked her to make sure we knew of any changes the WLCH was trying to make. Shortly after that Catherine had a staff meeting and let Liv Monroe attend. At this meeting Liv wanted and was allowed to move the garbage site to Muirhead and on my lot line instead of where it was approved by the original hearing examiner. Can Catherine change the hearing examiners ruling in a staff meeting because the developer wants them to? I and neighbors had to attend three hearings and I paid an attorney \$2500.00 to have it moved back to the site approved by the original hearing examiner and the city council. I feel that the city should reimburse me. Catherine continues to ignore the hearing examiners ruling on allowing them to park and use Muirhead. Once again creating rifts in the neighborhood.

Liv Monroe further affected our community by contacting the city to have our street light on Muirhead shut off. This is not on her property and puts three of our back yards and the house at the end of Muirhead in darkness. Several of us have had our cars broken into of late and I would like to know why Liv was allowed to do this without our input? I would like it turned back on.

Thanks for your time Steve.

Debra

From: [Debra VanTuinen](#)
To: [Tim Smith](#)
Cc: [Cheryl Comcast](#); [Cindy Weitekamp](#); [Sandi Huston](#); [Jason Whalen](#); [Steve Hall](#)
Subject: Re: Hearing
Date: Friday, April 15, 2016 12:29:52 PM

Tim,

Thank you for explaining this. Liv also had the fire hydrant taken out at the end of the roundabout on Muirhead which served my house and several others including the house at the end of Muirhead. It was in the woods a bit but always taken care of by fire department where they had grass moved around it. The new owner of the house at the end was surprised he doesn't have a fire hydrant and my insurance goes up because it was taken out. WLCH doesn't need it as their buildings are ruled commercial buildings by the fire department and require ceiling sprinklers systems.

Best,
Debra

On Friday, April 15, 2016 12:11 PM, Tim Smith <tsmith@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Hello Debra,

As you are aware, the City determined that the new paved parking area is not an approved component of the project, and the applicant was given a choice of either removal or apply for an amendment to the PRD. Only the hearing examiner can approve changes to the approved plan. Because the project was subject to the hearing examiner process and public hearing, the amendment, upon receipt, must be processed in the same manner. We will ensure that surrounding properties are sent notices of the time and date of the hearing.

It is not uncommon for project applicants to submit for revisions to approved projects, and as long as the application fees are paid and the application is deemed complete, the City has an obligation to process the application in a fair, open and timely manner. I will look into the issue of the street light and follow-up with you. I will be in touch with you soon.

Regards,

Tim Smith, AICP | Principal Planner

City of Olympia Community Planning & Development
P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967
(360) 570-3915
tsmith@ci.olympia.wa.us

From: Debra VanTuinen [<mailto:dvantuinen@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 12:27 PM
To: Steve Hall

Cc: Cheryl Comcast; Cindy Weitekamp; Sandi Huston; Jason Whalen; Tim Smith
Subject: Hearing

Steve,

So we all can better understand...Can you explain to our community why WLCH can continue to have hearings to amend the original hearing examiners rulings. Is it legal to change the original hearing examiner's ruling and undermine the neighborhoods input because WLCH doesn't like what they original asked for. This is very stressful and creates a lot of work for the surrounding community especially after we did so much work for the original hearing. The last hearing they did not send out letters to the neighbors as required and very few knew about it. I thought this was mandatory as it affected all of our property values with the garbage site change and transfer development rights that added two more huge 3 story buildings. The original hearing examiner allowed only 1-2 story homes.

Catherine McCoy, Cindy Weitekamp and I had a lunch meeting two years ago and we asked her to make sure we knew of any changes the WLCH was trying to make. Shortly after that Catherine had a staff meeting and let Liv Monroe attend. At this meeting Liv wanted and was allowed to move the garbage site to Muirhead and on my lot line instead of where it was approved by the original hearing examiner. Can Catherine change the hearing examiners ruling in a staff meeting because the developer wants them to? I and neighbors had to attend three hearings and I paid an attorney \$2500.00 to have it moved back to the site approved by the original hearing examiner and the city council. I feel that the city should reimburse me. Catherine continues to ignore the hearing examiners ruling on allowing them to park and use Muirhead. Once again creating rifts in the neighborhood.

Liv Monroe further affected our community by contacting the city to have our street light on Muirhead shut off. This is not on her property and puts three of our back yards and the house at the end of Muirhead in darkness. Several of us have had our cars broken into of late and I would like to know why Liv was allowed to do this without our input? I would like it turned back on.

Thanks for your time Steve.

Debra

From: [Debra Van Tuinen](#)
To: [Tim Smith](#)
Cc: [Sandi](#); [Cindy Weitekamp](#); [Jason Whalen](#); [Cheryl Selby](#); [Dawn Hooper](#)
Subject: Parking daily
Date: Friday, April 29, 2016 12:00:56 PM
Attachments: [IMG_3340.JPG](#)
[ATT00001.txt](#)
[IMG_3215.JPG](#)
[ATT00002.txt](#)

Tim

Hope you are doing well.

They ignore the code enforcement daily.

Should their application be delayed how long will this prohibition last?

Best
Debra





From: [Debra Van Tuinen](#)
To: [Tim Smith](#)
Subject: Violations
Date: Monday, May 02, 2016 1:10:57 PM
Attachments: [IMG_3341.JPG](#)
[ATT00001.txt](#)
[IMG_3342.JPG](#)
[ATT00002.txt](#)
[IMG_3346.JPG](#)
[ATT00003.txt](#)
[IMG_3349.JPG](#)
[ATT00004.txt](#)

These cars were there a long time Friday and Saturday. I was out of town on Sunday and Monday







ELEMENT



From: [Debra Van Tuinen](#)
To: [Tim Smith](#)
Subject: Parking
Date: Thursday, May 05, 2016 8:20:52 AM
Attachments: [IMG_3769.JPG](#)

TJ , an owner at WLCH parks here a lot. He parked here yesterday afternoon and is still there completely blocking the turn around.

Tim,

When you get a some time I would like to talk to you about some of the other things I mentioned in my email. I can wait till it works for you or you have all the info you need to answer questions.

Thanks
Debra



Sent from my iPad

From: Tim Smith
To: ["Debra VanTuinen"](#)
Cc: [Steve Hall](#); [Cheryl Selby](#)
Subject: RE: WLCH proposal
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:24:00 AM

Deb,

I will have some time this afternoon to respond to your request for information regarding the WLCH amendment proposal.

-Tim

From: Debra VanTuinen [mailto:dvantuinen@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2016 1:43 PM
To: Tim Smith
Cc: Jason Whalen; Sandi Huston; Cindy Weitekamp; Cheryl Selby; Dawn Hooper; Steve Hall; Sarah Smyth
Subject: WLCH proposal

Tim,

I would like a copy of the land development proposal requesting a changed to the hearing examiners ruling and allowing a parking lot for WLCH in the 40 year old turn around at the end of Muirhead. I can't find the proposal online but have seen it posted by their houses. It is very hard to read and see. I know you promised that everyone in our community will receive this in the mail to inform us of this new hearing so we can prepare our same arguments that we presented successfully to the original hearing examiner to stop traffic on Muirhead, I would like to have a copy of this proposal now... as it looks like a much bigger area than WLCH previously illegally poured before they were stopped by the city for a code violation. Please know that all the trees that are still standing on their property are ones that the city required tree fences around so they would not be hurt in any way. One of these trees that will soon die because they surrounded it by asphalt. There is also the problem with the impervious surface and the toxic effect of asphalt to the rest of the trees, environment and residents.

It looks like they want to put the parking lot my lot line....and behind my neighbors houses. This greatly differs from their original site plan proposed to the city, community and hearing examiner for this development. It is directly in opposition to the hearing examiner's ruling. If they change their PDR then it is not a land development issue but a change to their proposed site development...right? This has been already heard and ruled on by the hearing examiner.

Would you please call to let me know what they are proposing and if it differs from what we talked about. If so why do they get to further impact my house, my neighbors and this community? The original hearing examiner listened to months of testimony from WLCH and all the neighbors when this development was proposed. He took all of that testimony and made a ruling that supported the whole community. What has changed?

As for parking, Liv Monroe testified at the last hearing they had enough parking in their parking lot for all their residents. The hearing examiner said that was a requirement for him to rule on more buildings. It will be interesting for them to be testifying under oath again in front of the same hearing examiner and say they need a new parking lot for the new buildings.

Thanks
Debra

6/7/16

Request for the following additional documents and information:

1. The recorded "Binding Site Plan (BSP)"
2. The recorded copy of the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R's) if any.
3. A copy of any amendments to the BSP or CCR's.
4. A confirmation/calculation of how much additional impervious surface
 - a.) was added to date (in violation of the Examiner/Council site Plan and BSP decision);
 - b.) how much more additional impervious surface is being proposed?
5. How many trees over 2" at breast height have been removed since the tree plan was approved, and how many additional trees are proposed to be removed.
6. Information on proposed stormwater treatment and retention facilities proposed to protect fish bearing stream.
7. An audio copy of the Hearing Examiner's public hearing recordings. This would included all three hearings we had in July, 2013... starting July 8th

From: [Catherine McCoy](#)
To: ["Debra VanTuinen"](#)
Cc: [Tim Smith](#); [Chris Grabowski](#)
Subject: DVT Comments 071116
Date: Monday, July 11, 2016 4:14:03 PM

Debra,

I've provided responses to your questions. Please continue to rely on Tim Smith for your primary communications (360-570-3915, tsmith@ci.olympia.wa.us).

- Chris Grabowski can provide you a copy of the notice of violation for putting in the asphalt parking – phone: 360-753-8168, cgrabows@ci.olympia.wa.us.
- You're right, all solid waste and recycling should be located off the parking lot by the common house. Please direct this complaint to Chris Grabowski, as he is a CPD Code Enforcement Officer.
- Please contact the Public Works Department to request that street lighting be replaced, and no-parking signs be re-installed – (360) 753-8333, or send an email publicworks@ci.olympia.wa.us (I recommend you do both to be on the safe-side).
- As a "Party of Record", you will be notified of the date of the public hearing via email or mail, and the site will be posted. I cannot guarantee when exactly that will happen, or guarantee a specified date of notification for you. I can tell you that the date has tentatively been scheduled for September 12, 2016.

Thank you,
Catherine

Catherine McCoy, Associate Planner, LEED AP

Community Planning & Development
601 4th Ave E : Olympia WA 98506
360.570.3776 : cmccoy@ci.olympia.wa.us

Note: This message and any reply may be subject to public disclosure.

From: Debra VanTuinen [<mailto:dvantuinen@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2016 3:40 PM
To: Catherine McCoy
Cc: Tim Smith
Subject: WLCH

Catherine,

Thanks you for asking if I received everything I asked for and yes I did although I will be asking for more files etc. as I confer with my attorney and others. I would like a copy of the notice of

violation for putting in the asphalt parking lot without approval and against the hearing examiners ruling. I would like to make sure it is in their file that will go to the hearing examiner.

I also would like another notice of violation by code enforcement as they placed their recycling next to the fence behind my home and continually dump glass in it. I fought this last hearing and won. Their recycling, garbage and composting are to be located off the parking lot by the common house area.

We do need the no parking signs on Thomas re-installed as their guests think that they can park in front of my house right next to my driveway.

I have asked repeatedly to have the street light turned back on. Liv Monroe had the city turn it off even though it services my house, the property of the home on Thomas and Muirhead and also the house at the end of Muirhead. The new owner of that home also needs and want the street light turned back on as it is extremely dark back there. Liv had no authority to have it turned off as it didn't service WHLC and is not close to their property.

I would like to have have the date of the hearing at least a month before the hearing.

Thanks
Debra