

CITY OF OLYMPIA HEARING EXAMINER

STAFF REPORT

May 20, 2015

Case: Bayan Trails Land Use Approval Permit
Case No. 14-0139

Applicant: Golden Alon Development, LLC
PO Box 1068
Olympia, WA 98507

Representative: Ross Jarvis, PE
SCJ Alliance
8730 Tallon Lane NE, Lacey, WA 98516
Lacey, WA 98516

Type of Action Request: Construction of four senior apartment buildings (167 units), ten townhome-style apartment buildings (70 units), a 5,000 sq. ft. community building, and a 4,000 sq. ft. pool building. Associated improvements include a public street network (including a street connection to San Mar Drive), parking, solid waste facilities, landscaping, and utilities. A 120-foot wetland buffer has been established; buffer averaging is proposed to offset the impacts of the road and trail within the outer portion of the buffer. Construction is proposed to be phased over a multi-year period.

Project Location: 607 and 709 Sleater-Kinney Road NE, Olympia, WA 98506. The project site encompasses two parcels: 11817210100 and 11817210200.

Legal Description: Parcel A: The north $\frac{1}{4}$ of the Northeast $\frac{1}{4}$ of the Northwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 17, Township 18 North, Range 1 West, W.M., excepting therefrom the East 30 feet for county road known as Sleater Kinney Road.

Parcel B: Parcel A of Boundary Line Adjustment No. BLA-5784 as recorded August 20, 1983 under Auditor's file No. 9308200260.

Comprehensive Plan/ Zoning Designation:	Residential Multifamily – 18 Units per acres Residential Multifamily – 18 Units per Acre (RM-18)
SEPA Determination:	A Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance was issued by the City’s SEPA Official on April 28, 2015 (Attachment 2)
Public Notification:	Public notification for this hearing was mailed to parties of record, property owners within 300 feet, and recognized neighborhood associations on April 28, 2015; posted on the site on April 28, 2015, and published in <i>The Olympian</i> on May 1, 2015 in conformance with Olympia Municipal Code (OMC) 18.78.020.
Staff Recommendation:	Approve the proposed project subject to conditions.

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Land Use Application

The application for the Land Use Approval was received November 12, 2014 (please see Attachment 3, General Land Use Application Form and Project Narratives). The Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) conducted a first round of review, provided comments to the applicant, with revisions submitted to the City on April 22, 2015. SPRC met on April 29, 2015 and recommended approval of the proposal with conditions to the Hearing Examiner.

OMC 18.60.080(C) states that the SPRC shall have the prerogative of refusing to rule on a proposed land use if in the Committee’s opinion the project is so extraordinarily complex or presents such significant environmental issues that it should be reviewed by and be the subject of a public hearing. On November 19, 2014, the SPRC determined the application was appropriate for review by the Hearing Examiner, based on issues related to the wetland, storm drainage, transportation impacts, and groundwater.

Concept Design Review was completed on January 22, 2015. The Design Review Board requested certain changes (Attachment 10) related to site design, landscaping, building design. The changes are included as conditions of approval.

On May 5, 2015 the City Council approved a development agreement (Attachment 17) between the property owner of the subject site. The purpose of the development agreement is to ensure coordinated phasing occurs during development of the project.

Existing Site Conditions and Surrounding Development

The existing site contains two parcels. On parcel 11817210100 (709 Sleater-Kinney Road NE), there is one single family residence and a detached carport. On parcel 11817210200 (607 Sleater-Kinney Road NE), there is one single family residence.

The site generally slopes from east down to the west, with a drop in grade along the eastern perimeter of a wetland. The steepest slope is a small area in the buffer, at 21%. The wetland is located on the western portion of the site and is a total of 5.974 acres (Attachment 5).

The site is bound by Sleater Kinney Road SE to the east, the San Mar Villas single-family residential homes to the south, the Chehalis Western Trail to the west, and residential property to the north. Vacant land is also located north of the site.

Figure 1 – Existing Conditions



Description of Proposed Improvements

Note: See narratives under Attachment 3 for greater detail regarding the proposed project, the design process, and the overview. See Attachments 5 through 7 for site, civil, and landscape, and architectural plans.

Overview – The proposal is senior housing apartments and multi-family townhome style apartments. Four senior housing apartment buildings (55 and over for active adults) along with a community building and pool building and associated parking lots are proposed on the northern half of the project site. Ten townhome-style apartment buildings with seven units per building and associated parking is proposed on the southern half of the project site. In all, construction will include 167 senior housing units and 70 townhome-style apartment units. In addition to the proposed buildings, three public roads will be constructed through the project site. 6th Avenue NE will extend west through the project site along the northern property line. A second road will be located along the wetland buffer setback line and will be oriented in a north/south direction. The third road will be oriented in an east/west direction and will connect to Sleater-Kinney Road NE to the east. The project site comprises a total area of 19.52 acres. There is an existing wetland within the western half of the project site. A 100-foot wetland buffer has been established, which allows for a total buildable area of 10.86 acres. An existing single-family residence and groundskeeper’s quarters will be demolished to allow for the development of the Bayan Trails project.

Parking/On-site Circulation – The completed project will provide 299 parking stalls. The project would provide 167 senior housing units and 70 townhome style. Short term bicycle parking is proposed in front of the senior housing buildings, as well as the townhouse style units. Long term bicycle parking is proposed in the senior housing buildings, and the garages of the townhouse style units.

The project will construct a network of public roadways to accommodate site traffic circulation, per City requirements. The roadways include 6th Avenue Extension along the northern site boundary; a north-south road along the wetland buffer setback line (Road B); and an east-west road on the southern portion of the site (Road C) that connects to Sleater-Kinney Road to the east. The roadways will be constructed incrementally as needed to provide access to areas within the development. The roads will be designed to City of Olympia standards and will require approval of the City of Olympia prior to construction.

Landscaping/Tree Protection - The site will be landscaped as depicted on the landscape plans (Sheet L1.00 of 1, Attachment 6.) Trees proposed to be saved and removed are shown on Attachment 5. All existing trees in the wetland buffer will be preserved except where the trees will be removed for the hydraulic flow spreaders, which are used to release treated stormwater and maintain wetland hydrology. Other trees throughout the site are proposed to be retained.

Pedestrian and Transit Facilities/Transit - Pedestrian facilities include an existing sidewalks along Sleater-Kenney Rd. The Chehalis Western Trail is located adjacent to the western side of the site, and would be accessible from the site. Sidewalks are also proposed adjacent to the roadway in the areas to be dedicated as public right of ways, as

well as throughout the side. Intercity Transit (IT) does not currently serve the project site. However, there is a bus stop approximately one-half mile south of the site on Martin Road (served by routes 60, 62A and 62B). Additionally, Lacey Transit Center is roughly one mile from the site, and the Martin Way Park & Ride is approximately 1.2 miles to the southeast. Under the existing conditions there has been an informal trail established to the Western Chehalis Trail.

There is a high school and middle school across the street that will be accessible by sidewalks. The sidewalks provide safe walking routes to school. Additional crosswalks across Sleater-Kinney Road are planned for the near future.

Utilities - The proposed project will be served by water, sewer and stormwater facilities as shown on the attached plans (Attachment 5).

Transportation/Frontage Improvements - The applicant has submitted deviation requests to the City's street standards to preserve trees within the proposed public right of way (see discussion under Engineering on page 17 of this report). Additionally, intersection and frontage improvements will be constructed at the new intersections. The construction of the 6th Avenue NE Extension will require intersection channelization improvements to the 6th Avenue NE/Sleater-Kinney Road NE intersection. The improvements will include removing the short section of raised median on Sleater-Kinney Road south of 6th Avenue NE to allow for the northbound left-turn lane and restriping the westbound approach to change the left-turn lane to a through-left lane. The construction of the Road C/Sleater-Kinney Road NE intersection will require removing a short section of raised median on Sleater-Kinney Road to allow for the northbound left-turn lane. Connection to the existing San Mar Dr right of way is recommended to be consistent with the Engineering Development and Design Standards, and the Comprehensive Plan.

Public Comment

On September 30, 2014, the Community Planning and Development Department provided a notice of a Neighborhood Meeting at Olympia City Hall. The neighborhood meeting occurred on October 13, 2014. The applicant and City staff attended the meeting to answer questions regarding city regulations and the review process. An expanded notice to the San Mar Neighborhood was provided on November 25, 2014.

A notice of application was mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the property on November 19, 2014, with a comment period that ended on December 3, 2014. The Community Planning and Development Department received written comments pertaining to the proposal (see Attachment 12). Concerns expressed in the correspondence include stormwater impacts, water quality, tree protection, pedestrian connection, and traffic on Sleater-Kinney. One written comment was received during the

neighborhood meeting, and discussed high ground water on the South End of the site. Other comments expressed concern regarding the connection to San Mar Drive.

The City of Lacey provided comments (Attachment 13) related to traffic impacts on Sleater-Kinney Road and mitigating traffic impacts on the Lacey transportation network. The requested mitigation measures were included in the Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance (Attachment 2).

Subsequent to the SPRC meeting, the City received comments from the North Thurston Public Schools regarding school mitigation fees (Attachment 14). OMC 14.04.155 authorizes the Hearing Examiner to modify mitigating conditions or measures as appropriate when deemed necessary by the Examiner to ensure consistency with any decision rendered by the Examiner on the underlying application or permit. Therefore, staff recommends that the Hearing Examiner include the North Thurston Public Schools mitigation fee in the SEPA mitigations conditions, as well as the conditions of permit approval.

II. APPLICABLE REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

This section identifies specific regulations in the Olympia Municipal Code that apply to the proposed project. Staff's responses to these standards are noted in italics.

Applicable Regulations

- OMC 18.04 – Residential Districts
- OMC 18.32 - Critical Areas
- OMC 18.36 – Landscaping and Screening
- OMC 18.38 – Parking and Loading
- OMC 18.60 – Land Use Review and Approval
- OMC 18.82 – Hearing Examiner
- OMC 18.100 – Design Review
- OMC 12.02.020 – Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS)*
- OMC 13.16.017 – Stormwater Manual, 2009*

** On file with the City*

OMC 18.04.020.B.8 – Purpose

“Residential Multifamily - 18 Units per Acre (RM-18). To accommodate predominantly multifamily housing, at an average maximum density of eighteen (18) units per acre, along or near (e.g., one-fourth (¼) mile) arterial or major collector streets where such development can be arranged and designed to be compatible with adjoining uses; to provide for development with a density and configuration that

facilitates effective and efficient mass transit service; and to enable provision of affordable housing.

Finding/Conclusion:

The existing zoning of the site is RM-18 per Ordinance 6824. The proposed density of 237 units on 13.528 net acres is 17.52 units per acre. The project is adjacent to Sleater-Kinney Road, which is classified as a major collector.

OMC 18.04.040 Table 4.01 – Permitted and Conditional Uses

“District. RM-18. Permitted Uses listed outright, include, but is not limited to Apartments, Boarding Homes, Dormitories, Duplexes – Existing, Duplexes, Triplexes & Fourplexes, Retirement Homes, and Accessory Structures.”

Finding/Conclusion:

OMC 18.02.180 defines “Apartment” as “A dwelling within a structure designed and used for occupancy by three or more individual persons or families living independently of each other. These structures include triplexes, fourplexes, and other multi-unit configurations.”

OCM 18.64.040.A requires a preliminary plat or short plat approval and any design review and land use approval to be submitted simultaneously. Because the development is not proposing a plat, the development does not contain townhouses, per OMC 18.64 and 18.02.180. Therefore, the proposed development consists of ‘apartments’ by definition, which is an allowed use per OMC 18.04.040 Table 4.01.

OMC 18.04.060.N.1 – Mix of Dwelling Types

“To ensure that large multifamily housing projects provide a transition to adjoining lower density development, multifamily projects shall be subject to the following requirements:

1. Mix of Dwelling Types.
 - a. In the RM-18 and RMU districts, no more than seventy (70) percent of the total housing units on sites of ten (10) or more acres shall be of a single dwelling type (e.g., detached single-family units, duplexes, triplexes, multi-story apartment buildings, or townhouses).”

Finding/Conclusions

The project is on 19.028 acres, consisting of 167 multi-story senior housing apartment units, and 70 townhouse style units. Therefore, apartments comprise 70.46% of the units.

OMC 18.04.060.N.2 – Transitional Housing Types

“2. In the RM-18, MR 7-13 and MR 10-18 districts detached single-family houses or duplexes shall be located along the perimeter (i.e., to the depth of one (1) lot) of multifamily housing projects over five (5) acres in size which are directly across the street and visible from existing detached single-family houses. Townhouses, duplexes, or detached houses shall be located along the boundary of multifamily housing sites over five (5) acres in size which adjoin, but do not directly face, existing detached single-family housing (e.g., back to back or side to side). The Director (or Hearing Examiner) may allow exceptions to these requirements where existing or proposed landscaping, screening, or buffers provide an effective transition between the uses. (See Chapters 18.170 Multi-Family Residential Design Guidelines and 18.36.140 Residential Landscape requirements.)”

Finding/Conclusions

The units on the north side of the property face the new 6th Avenue NE road. There is one single family unit to the north which has the side of the building to the property line. The multi-family units on the south side of the site have their sides to the single family units. There are not detached single family residences to the east or west sides.

OMC 18.04.080 TABLE 4.04: Residential Development Standards

<i>RM 18 Development Standard</i>	<i>Required</i>	<i>Proposed</i>
Maximum Housing Density ¹	24	237 units/13.528 acres = 17.52
Max. Average Housing Density	18	17.52 units/acre
Min. Average Housing Density	10	17.52 units/acre
Minimum Lot Size	7,200 square feet for multi-family	Over 7,200 square feet
Minimum Lot Width	None for multi-family	Not applicable
Minimum Front Yard Setbacks	10'	10 feet from any existing or proposed right of way.
Maximum Front Yard Setbacks	None specified	Not applicable
Minimum Rear Yard Setbacks	15' for multi-family	15' or more proposed
Minimum Side Yard Setbacks	5' except: 10' along flanking streets; ... 10' for multifamily; 20' next to R 4- 8, or R 6-12 district 10' - mobile home park	20 feet from the north and south property lines. Road B is a flanking street, with a setback of 10' proposed
Maximum Building Height	35, except:	Less than 35 feet

Maximum Building Coverage	50%	19.82%
Maximum Above Grade Stories	3 stories	3 stories maximum
Maximum Impervious Surface Coverage	70%	50.56%
Minimum Open Space	30%	49.44%

¹ Density calculations include associated and/or previously dedicated right-of-way, but does not include wetlands, per OMC 18.04.080.A.1.a.

Finding/Conclusion:

The proposal complies with the RM 18 development standards provided for in OMC 19.04.080 Table 4.04.

OMC 18.04.080(D)(1) Transitional Lots

“Lot Size. The square footage and width of lots in developments larger than five (5) acres located in the MR 7-13, MR 10-18, or RM-18 districts, which immediately abut an R-4, R 4-8 or R 6-12 district, shall be no less than eighty-five (85) percent of the minimum lot size and width required in the adjoining lower density district.”

Finding/Conclusion:

The following table provides the list of abutting zones, minimum lot sizes, lot widths, and 85% of both.

	Zone	Zone min. lot size	85% of min. lot size	Zone min. Lot width	85% of min. lot width
North	R 4-8	2,000 – 5,000 sq ft	1,700 – 4,250 sq ft	18 ft – 50 ft	15.3 ft – 42.5 ft
South	R 4-8	2,000 – 5,000 sq ft	1,700 – 4,250 sq ft	18 ft – 50 ft	15.3 ft – 42.5 ft
East*	OSI-S	Not specific	Not specific	Not specific	Not specific
West	MS	7,200 sq ft	6,120 sq ft	None	None

*Zoning to the west is per the City of Lacey. For the OSI-S(Open Space School) zone, LMC 16.48.060 states “The minimum size and shape of the site shall be appropriate to the proposed use of said site and its relationship to abutting properties and traffic patterns in the vicinity of the site.”

The lots would be significantly larger than 6,120 square feet, and 42.5 feet wide (Attachment 5).

OMC 18.04.080(D)(1) Transitional Lots

“Setbacks. The minimum rear yard building setback for lots in the MR 7-13, MR 10-18, and RM-18 districts which share a rear property line with a parcel in an R4, R 4-8, or R 6-12 district shall be no less than the setback required for the adjoining lower density district.”

Finding/Conclusion:

Due to the right-of-way dedication associated with the proposal, the multi-family units on the southern portion of the site would be the only units that would share a property line with the adjacent R 4-8 zoning district, which is a side yard. The applicant exceeds the side yard setback to the south, and has made alternative designs to the site plan to provide adequate separation.

OMC 18.32.100(C) General Provisions – Application of Critical Area Regulations

“Developments which include or lie within three hundred (300) feet of a landslide hazard area, stream, or wetland, and a distance of up to one thousand (1,000) feet of an important habitat or species location depending upon the type of habitat, shall be subject to the provisions found herein.”

Finding/Conclusion:

The subject property contains a wetland, per Attachment 8. The wetland on Parcel A is 2.852 acres, and 3.122 acres on Parcel B. Therefore, the site is subject to the provisions found in OMC 18.32.

OMC 18.32.100(E) General Provisions – Application of Critical Area Regulations

“No action shall be undertaken by any person, which results in any alteration of a critical area or its buffer except in compliance with the requirements, purpose and intent of this Chapter.”

Finding/Conclusion:

The proposal requests the alteration of a wetland buffer averaging to accommodate Road B, the street connection to the south, and the overlook. An analysis is provided below for the applicable criteria.

OMC 18.32.100(F) General Provisions – Application of Critical Area Regulations

“Special reports shall be prepared pursuant to OMC Section 18.32.115(B) prior to approval of development proposals in order to evaluate any potential adverse environmental impacts upon the critical area.”

Finding/Conclusion:

OMC 18.32.115(B) requires a report that:

- 1. Identifies and characterizes critical areas on the development parcel, and critical areas located on adjacent parcels to the extent feasible;*
- 2. Assesses the impact upon the critical areas both from activities outside the critical area and from any proposed alteration of the critical areas determined to be permitted under this Chapter, and*
- 3. Proposes adequate protection mechanisms for the specific critical areas which may include but not be limited to avoidance, mitigation, monitoring and financial measures.*

A wetland report was prepared (Attachment 8) which complies with OMC 18.32.115(B). Additional information related to specific details of the replantings (size, location, species) and the buffer averaging calculations for the area impacted by the street connection to San Mar Drive is required for analysis of mitigation. The Department of Ecology reviewed the wetland report, has a concern about a train near the wetland, but has reasonable assurance that the wetland functions and values will be maintained.

OMC 18.32.100(G) General Provisions – Application of Critical Area Regulations

“Mitigation required by this Chapter shall be incorporated into the project except in cases where an alternative mitigation has been considered by the Department or the Hearing Examiner and found to be equal to or better than the requirements, and meets the purpose and intent of the Chapter.”

Finding/Conclusion:

The wetland report (Attachment 8) contains mitigation throughout the report. The SEPA MDNS also provides mitigation for the protection of the wetland. These mitigation measures are included into the project as conditions of approval.

OMC 18.32.100(H) General Provisions – Application of Critical Area Regulations

The Department may approve, approve with conditions or deny permits and approvals in order to carry out the purpose and intent of this Chapter.

Finding/Conclusion:

Staff is recommending approval of the wetland buffer averaging, subject to the conditions provided below.

OMC 18.32.135 (A) General Provisions – Mitigation Priorities

“A. Mitigation shall be undertaken in the following order of preference:

1. Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;
2. Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation, by using appropriate technology, or by taking affirmative steps to avoid or reduce impacts;
3. Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating or restoring the affected environment;
4. Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action;
5. Compensating for the impact by replacing, enhancing or providing substitute resources or environments;
6. Monitoring the impact and taking appropriate corrective measures.

Mitigation for individual actions may include a combination of the above measures.”

Finding/Conclusion:

The Wetland Report states:

This project entirely avoids direct impacts to wetland areas, but minor buffer impacts will occur. The original proposal included more impacts to buffers. Most of those impacts are avoided in this final site plan layout. Those design changes are listed below to document that the project layout was revised to avoid impacts whenever possible. Some of this avoidance was made possible by a recent agreement with the property owner to the north who agreed to share the 6th Avenue Street easement, thus allowing buildings, roadways and associated parking areas to shift away from the wetland and buffers. (Attachment 8, page 6)

To avoid, minimize, and mitigate potential impacts to the wetland, the wetland report includes (a) stormwater level spreader devices to maintain hydrology, (b) modified overlook platform to avoid buffer impacts, (c) removal of English ivy and Himalayan blackberry stands, (d) replanting with taller, denser native shrub and trees (e) and monitoring the mitigation over a 5-year period. The proposal would also add 4,104 square feet of buffer to mitigate for the 2,956 square feet of impacted buffer.

The wetland report states that the reduced buffer from the street connection to San Mar Neighborhood to the south “would result in a significant impact to the wetland buffer in the southwestern portion of the project site.” However, the report does not identify why the reduced buffer would have a “significant impact.” Staff finds that the buffer reduction for the street connection to the south:

- 1. Is mitigated through an increase in buffer area for the same wetland;*
- 2. Does not reduce the buffer below 75% of the standard buffer size;*
- 3. Does not affect other mitigation measures proposed;*
- 4. Does not have any unique functions and values that could not be mitigated elsewhere;*
- 5. Would be included in the 5-year monitoring;*
- 6. The closest test pit (#4) “was distinctly different from Pits 1-3 – having impermeable, densic glacial till” which causes more hydrology to the wetland (Attachment 8, page 12);*
- 7. Is similar in size as the buffer reduction for the overlook platform (which was not identified in the report to have a significant impact);*
- 8. The wetland report states “Unavoidable impacts to the 120’ wetland buffer can be effectively compensated for through a combination of buffer averaging, buffer vegetation planting and a properly designed and maintained trial system.” (Attachment 8, page 14);*

9. *An evaluation of the SEPA checklist and wetland report found that there would be no probable significant adverse environmental impacts with the incorporation of mitigation conditions; and*
10. *The proposal complies with the code requirements of OMC 18.35.535(H) for a reduced buffer. An evaluation of each criteria is provided below.*

Therefore, staff finds that impacts to the wetland buffer would be minimized, as well as mitigated through the buffer averaging.

OMC 18.32.135 (B) General Provisions – Mitigation Priorities

“B. Unavoidable impacts to critical areas often can and should be minimized by sensitive site design and deliberate actions during construction and implementation.”

Finding/Conclusion:

The proposal includes minimizing impacts through design, location of structures, mitigation, and best management practices during construction.

OMC 18.32.135 (C) General Provisions – Mitigation Priorities

“In addition to meeting the standards of the underlying zone, the Department may require the use of more restrictive mitigation techniques described as follows:

1. Limitation of building and development coverage;
2. Setbacks or buffers;
3. Size of lots and development sites;
4. Height limits;
5. Density limits;
6. Time limits;
7. Restoration of ground cover and vegetation;
8. Creation of critical area tracts;
9. Innovative design or construction methods;
10. Signing, fencing, and limitation of access;
11. Notice of conditions placed on the title of the property;
12. Provisions for access or rights-of-way;
13. Financial surety; and/or
14. Other measures for environmental protection.”

Finding/Conclusion:

Staff is unable to determine the additional mitigation measures that may be required until the applicant provides a wetland report and updated buffer averaging calculations based on the street connection to San Mar Drive. The requirement for additional information in the wetland report is included as a recommended condition of approval.

OMC 18.32.150 General Provisions - Notice on Title

- “A. The property owner shall record a notice approved by the Director with the Thurston County Auditor.
- B. This notice will provide notice in the public record of the presence of a critical area or its buffer, the application of this Chapter to the property, and limitations on uses and activities within or affecting this area.”

Finding/Conclusion:

The requirement for a notice on title is appropriate as a condition of approval.

OMC 18.32.535 Wetlands and Small Lakes – Wetland Buffers

“Wetlands buffer areas shall be maintained between all regulated activities and wetlands to retain the wetlands’ natural functions and values. The required width of the wetland buffer shall be determined as provided in the tables below. Wetland buffers are based upon the rating of the wetland pursuant to OMC 18.32.585.”

...

“Habitat Score of 22 points requires a 120 foot buffer. Water Quality Improvement Score of 24 to 32 point requires a 100 foot buffer.”

Finding/Conclusion:

The wetland report demonstrates the existing wetland has a habitat score of 22 points, and a water quality score of 20 points. Therefore the wetland requires a 120 foot buffer.

OMC 18.32.535(H) – Wetlands and Small Lakes – Wetland Buffers

“H. The Hearing Examiner may allow:

1. Reductions to the required wetland buffer width greater than those described in OMC 18.32.535(G) on a case-by-case basis when it can be demonstrated that:
 - a. The provisions of OMC 18.32.535(G) have been evaluated by a Wetland Mitigation Report described in OMC 18.32.590, and
 - b. The proposed wetland buffer width will protect the wetlands’ functions and values based upon the Wetland Mitigation Report and the best available science.”

Finding/Conclusion:

The proposal includes buffer reduction to comply with the code requirements. The applicant did not use the criteria for buffer averaging in OMC 18.32.535(F) because of the intrusion of the hydraulic flow spreaders in the wetland buffer, that are used to maintain the wetland hydrology.

An evaluation of the above criteria with the proposal finds:

- a. A provisions of OMC 18.32.535(G) have been evaluated in a Wetland Mitigation Report (Attachment 8); and*
- b. The report demonstrates that existing habitat will be improved through invasive plant removal, adding native replantings, that the existing hydrology will be maintained, water released will be treated, that the actual wetland would not be reduced in size, trees in the wetland will be retained, the existing trail systems in the wetland buffer will be maintained and improved, and that use of the Chehalis Western Trail would not be reduced . Therefore, the report demonstrates that the wetland buffer functions and values (floodwater storage, floodwater conveyance, sediment control, pollution control, surface water supply, aquifer recharge, wildlife habitat, and recreation) would be protected if the mitigation measured described in the report are implemented.*

OMC 18.38.100 – Vehicular and bicycle parking stands

“The specific number of motor vehicle parking spaces set forth in Table 38.01 +/- ten percent (10%) shall be provided...”

Table 38.01 Multifamily dwellings requirement for motor vehicle parking spaces:

- a. Three or more units shall provide one and one-half (1.5) off-street parking spaces per dwelling unit.
- b. Apartments with one room enclosing all activities (studio units) shall provide one off-street parking space per dwelling unit.

Finding/Conclusion:

The proposal includes 207 non-studio units, and 30 studio units.

- a. 1.5 parking stalls per non-studio unit x 207 units is 310.5 parking stalls for non-studio apartments.*
- b. 1 parking stall per studio unit x 30 studio units is 30 parking stalls.*
- c. Therefore, the total required number of parking stalls, including the 10% reduction allowed by code, is rounded up to 298 stalls per OMC 18.38.060(L).*

The applicant is proposing 209 surface parking stalls, and 90 parking spaces in the townhouse style units. Therefore, there would be a total of 299 parking stalls provided.

OMC 18.38.100 – Vehicular and bicycle parking stands

Table 38.01 Multifamily dwellings requirement for:

- a. long term bicycle parking spaces is one storage space per unit (excluding studio units) that is large enough for a bicycle, and
- b. one short term bicycle pace per 10 units, excluding studio units, (with a minimum of two per building).

Finding/Conclusion:

The proposal includes 207 non-studio units, and 30 studio units.

- a. One long term bicycle space x 207 non-studio units is 207 long term bicycle space required. 36 long term spaces would be provided in each of the four buildings, and one long term space in each garage of the 70 townhouse style units. Therefore, the application proposes 214 long term bicycle.*
- b. One short term bicycle space per 10 non-studio units x 207 non-studio units is 21 short term spaces requires. The proposal includes five short term bicycle spaces at each entrance of the four senior housing apartments. The proposal also includes one short term bicycle parking space at each entrance of the 70 townhouse style units. Therefore, there would be 90 short term bicycle parking spaces.*

OMC 18.38.200 – Parking Facility Location

“B. Where possible, surface parking lots shall be located behind a building. Where it is not possible to provide parking behind a building, parking lots may be located along the side of a building, provided that it comprises no more than fifty percent of the site’s street frontage. This provision does not apply to commercial parking which comprises the only use of a site in the R-4, R 4-8, and R 6-12 districts.”

Finding/Conclusion

The applicant has evaluated alternative site designs with placement of the building and connectivity. Ultimately, the current parking lot is supported by staff to enable an interior courtyard that connects the building and encourages a community gathering place.

A deviation from parking lot island landscaper requirements (18.36.180(C) and parking lot screening (18.36.180(B)(1) has been requested. Additional information is needed to demonstrate compliance with the deviation standards. The requirement for additional information is included as a recommended condition of approval.

OMC 18.100 – Design Review

“OMC 18.100.090.A.3 requires projects any multifamily building with five (5) units or more, and any multifamily development with twenty (20) units or more to be reviewed by the Design Review Board. On January 22, 2015, the project was reviewed by the Design Review Board for Concept Design Review. The Board recommended approval with conditions which are summarized in the attached recommendation memo (Attachment 10). These conditions are also incorporated into SPRC recommended conditions of approval to the Hearing Examiner.”

Finding/Conclusion:

The proposed project has complied with OMC 18.100 for Concept Design Review by the Design Review Board. The applicant is required to submit plans for Detail Design Review prior to or in conjunction with the building permit applicant. Said plans must respond to conditions of approval of the Design Review Board as noted in their recommended conditions of approval memo (Attachment 10) as well as any conditions established by the Hearing Examiner. Information provided for a relative recent appeal regarding transitioning from single family to multifamily help shape the conditions of approval to ensure compliance with the code. The appeal required stepping the multifamily buildings to minimize the impacts, and ensure a transition from the zones. Following SPRC's recommendation regarding the south elevations of the town homes, the applicant has provided updated elevations to address the Design Review Board comments (Attachment 7).

Engineering Standards

Development is subject to Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS) for water, sewer, storm water, solid waste, and transportation improvements. Preliminary plans have been reviewed and conceptually approved by engineering staff for all improvements except for transportation, stormwater, and an offsite sewer line. A street connectivity plan was prepared for the proposal (Attachment 15). To comply with EDDS 2.040.A and 2.040.B.3.c through e, as well as Comprehensive Plan policies PT4.1 through PT4.11, sufficient right of way must be dedicated, and construction of a local access street connection south to the San Mar Drive on the south property line. The requirement is included as a condition of approval.

Transportation

The applicant is seeking deviations from the street standards. The deviations are to modify the local access standard for both roadways B and C. Modifications include 2% super elevation across the entire roadway, modifying roadway B to allow for two way traffic and no parking, and modifying Roadway C to allow for two way traffic as well as parking.

The reasons provided for the deviations (1) to the standard corridor width is to save existing trees (2) to the crowned roadway so runoff will enter the proposed bio-retention cells and use low impact technologies for water quality improvements, and (3) to improve traffic flow through the development. These deviation requests are currently under review by Public Works staff; if not approved, modifications to the site plan would be required. The deviation requirement is included in the recommended conditions of approval.

Stormwater

The proposed stormwater system includes bioretention, infiltration, and diversion to the wetland for the treatment and release of stormwater. Issues raised by the City's

stormwater engineer focus on several areas of concern, the most critical being the methodology used to determine the design infiltration rate and the accuracy of the information as the basis of the stormwater system design.

Finding/Conclusion:

As conditioned, engineering improvements will comply with city standards.

Conditions of approval have been included for the final design, monitoring of the stormwater system, and a contingency plan.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the preceding analysis of materials submitted by the applicant and applicable code section, the Site Plan Review Committee recommends approval the Land Use Permit for the Bayan Trails Project, Case No. 14-0139, subject to the following conditions, as may be modified by the Hearing Examiner. The following conditions were approved by SPRC meeting on April 29th. Subsequent to the meeting, and during preparation of this staff report, three additional conditions of approval (#39 through #42) were determined necessary to comply with the municipal code:

1. This approval is based on the development being substantially in conformance with the Property developed according to the Exhibit 1 through 4, and as required to be amended by the Conditions of Approval.
2. This approval is subject to the development agreement entered into by the City of Olympia and Golden Alon Development, adopted by resolution and approved on May 5, 2015.
3. Building Height: Buildings shall not exceed 35 feet in height, measured per OMC 18.04.080 Table 4.04.
4. Bicycle Parking – Location/Design: Final details regarding bicycle parking on the building and engineering plans shall be submitted; final location and design shall be in accordance with OMC 18.38.220.C.
5. Landscaping: A detailed landscape plan in conjunction with engineering plans shall be provided in compliance with OMC 18.36, wellhead protection standards, and subject to Detail Design Review conditions of approval.
6. Hours of Operation/Construction Noise: Pursuant to 18.40.080.C.7, construction activity is restricted to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m.

7. Impact Fees: Impact fees for transportation, parks, and schools shall be paid prior to building permit issuance.
8. SEPA: The development must comply with the Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance issued on April 28, 2015, which includes:
- a. Intersection channelization improvements at, and in the vicinity of, the intersection of 6th Avenue NE and Sleater-Kinney Road NE shall be required. These improvements shall include:
 - i. removing the existing section of raised median on Sleater-Kinney Road south of 6th Avenue NE. Said existing raised median is approximately 90 feet long;
 - ii. repaving the area where the raised median was removed, and installing a North bound left turn lane; and
 - iii. restriping the West bound approach, at the intersection of 6th Avenue NE and Sleater-Kinney Road NE, to change the left-turn lane to a through-left lane on Sleater-Kinney Road.

All improvements must be constructed to City of Olympia Engineering Design and Development Standards, and shall require approval by the City of Olympia prior to construction.

- b. The construction of the Road C and Sleater-Kinney Road NE intersection shall require:
 - i. removing a portion of an existing section of raised median on Sleater-Kinney Road, south of the Road C and Sleater-Kinney Road NE intersection to allow for a North bound left-turn lane. Scope of improvements would be determined during engineering review; and
 - ii. repaving the area where the portion of the existing section of raised median was removed, and installing a North bound left-turn lane on Sleater-Kinney Road.

All improvements shall be constructed to City of Olympia Engineering Design and Development Standards, and shall require approval by the City of Olympia prior to construction.

- c. The on-site sewer system shall be connected to the existing 8-inch sewer main that is located approximately 380' north of the subject property, in the Sleater-Kinney Road right of way.
- d. The project shall pay traffic mitigation fees to the City of Lacey to mitigate offsite impacts. These fees are collected according to LMC 74.27 and results of the Transportation Impact Analysis. The mitigation collected will fund designated transportation improvement projects.

The mitigation fee will be determined at the date of payment for issuance of the building permit, unless otherwise noted. The fee shall be increased on July 1 and each year thereafter in an amount equal to the increase in the Engineering News

Record Construction Cost Index. The estimate for the City of Lacey's traffic mitigation fees is attached to this threshold determination.

The applicant will receive credits toward City of Olympia transportation impact fees based on trips generated, credits to be determined at the time of building permit issuance.

- e. Historic Preservation/Archeology - Although the site is not listed as a potential historic or cultural resources site, there is the possibility that archaeological material could be on-site. Therefore, should historic or archaeological material be encountered during ground disturbing activities or construction:
 - i. Construction shall be suspended immediately at that location;
 - ii. The contractor shall immediately contact the City of Olympia at (360) 753-8314 or Michelle Sadlier, Historic Preservation Officer at (360) 753-8031;
 - iii. A qualified professional archaeologist shall be retained by the applicant to document and assess the discovery;
 - iv. If the discovery involves potential Native American resources, the applicant shall also contact the Washington State Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) and the affected tribe for additional consultation; and
 - v. In no case should additional excavation be undertaken until a protocol has been agreed upon by the above mentioned parties.
9. Design Review: The following concept design review conditions of approval shall be met prior to or at the time of building permit application. Said plans shall address the following conditions of approval from Concept Design Review, to be approved by a subcommittee of the Design Review Board prior to permit issuance (*italics added for clarification*):
- a. Context Plan:
 - i. Based on staff's analysis of neighborhood scale and character under OMC 18.170.110, approve the context plan for the north, west and eastern portions of the site. For the southern portion of the site, require additional measures beyond those included in the proposal (larger setbacks, modulation) to improve neighborhood scale and character between the townhome buildings and single family homes in San Mar. These changes shall be reviewed either by the full Design Review Board or by a Subcommittee prior to the Site Plan Review Committee making a recommendation to the Hearing Examiner, or at time of detailed design review.
 - b. Preliminary Site and Landscape Design:
 - i. Provide greater separation between walkways and buildings for greater privacy of the ground floor units. *OMC 18.170.020*

- ii. Increase the separation between the community and pool buildings and multifamily buildings for increased light, privacy of the end units, and sense of comfort for residents. *OMC 18.170.020*
 - iii. Provide screening between parking areas and adjacent streets to reduce the visual impact on pedestrians and neighboring properties. Screening shall comply with landscape requirements in *OMC 18.36, 18.170.030, 18.36*
 - iv. Variation of the fence along the south property line shall be provided, with details to be submitted at the time of Detail Design Review. Allow the fence to be extended as far west as possible under the City's Critical Area Regulations, *OMC 18.32, 18.170.050*
 - v. Revise the landscape plan per design standards in *OMC 18.170.060* and *OMC 18.36* and submit at the time of Detail Design Review. In addition to comments made in the January 8, 2015 preliminary land use review, the revised plan shall address the following:
 - 1. Increase the width of planting beds along the building foundations for increased screening of blank walls (e.g., on the east and west elevations of the senior apartments where the depth of the bed is approximately three feet).
 - 2. Select plants to minimize headlight glare into the ground floor units of the senior apartments.
 - 3. Identify how the area between the community and pool buildings will be used, e.g., indicate whether outdoor seating will be provided.
 - 4. Clarify vegetation within the townhome auto courts; indicate whether container plants/trellises are proposed.
 - 5. Where evergreens are proposed, provide adequate separation from building walls.
- c. Preliminary Building Design:
- i. Move windows or adjust floor plans as needed to minimize opportunities for residents from one unit to look directly into other units. *OMC 18.170.130*
 - ii. Further study the use of materials and colors to better define the base, middle, and upper levels of the buildings. *OMC 18.170.140*
 - iii. Provide variation of material/color schemes throughout the project. *OMC 18.170.140*
 - iv. Modify the south elevations of the townhome buildings to improve neighborhood scale and character (see discussion above under Context Plan). *OMC 18.170.110*
10. If the application does not meet the minimum landscape standards, an application for the alternative landscape standards shall be provided in a manner that meets the requirements of *OMC 18.36*.

11. Prior to Phase 3, a lot consolidation to remove the property line between the northern lot and the southern lot shall be completed in accordance with OMC Title 17.
12. The development shall comply with the *Bayan Trails Wetland and Soils Report and Mitigation Proposal* dated April 2015, prepared by SCJA, including:
 - a. Existing trail systems in the wetland buffer shall be maintained and improved to ensure safe access for users.
 - b. In the buffer areas, invasive vegetation shall be removed and replanted with taller, denser native shrub and tree species.
 - c. Areas with temporary impacts from pipe and trench installation shall be restored and replanted with native vegetation, and the construction area shall be surrounded by silt fences and other appropriate erosion control devices until all surfaces are stabilized and restored to a native plant community.
 - d. All planting restoration areas shall be monitored over a 5-year period following completion of vegetation community planting to ensure that the native plant community survives. Survival rates of 80% or development of 60% or more canopy coverage of native plant communities at the end of 5 years, and less than 15% cover from the targeted non-native species (Himalayan blackberry and English ivy) shall be required for the mitigation planting to be considered successful.
 - e. A performance assurance device for all landscaping in the wetland and wetland buffer, in compliance with OMC 18.36.200(B), shall be provided prior to any certificate of occupancy.
 - f. Signs, in a manner and form to be approved by the City of Olympia, shall be placed every 50 feet along the buffer boundary describing the area behind the sign as a natural area to remain in an undisturbed native vegetation condition.
 - g. The surface around the level spreader stormwater trenches in the wetland buffer as well as the buried pipeline pathway shall be revegetated with native species.
 - h. All landscaping shall meet the requirement of OMC 18.36.200.

ENGINEERING

Water

13. The developer shall install water facilities in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 6 of the Engineering Design & Development Standards, (EDDS), (2.050 B.) water. The water system shall be designed to provide adequate domestic plus fire flow at the required residual pressure.
14. During phase 3, extend an 8 inch water main, from the intersection of Road B and Road C, to the existing water main in the San Mar Drive right of way located south of the southern property line of the site, complete with required easement if not

within the public right of way. Road B and Road C are identified on Sheet RD-01 of Exhibit 3.

Sewer

15. The developer shall install sewer facilities in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 7 of the Engineering Design & Development Standards, (EDDS), (2.050.A.) sewer.
16. Extend an 8 inch sewer main south from sanitary sewer man hole #6 shown on Sheet 9 of the 4/22/15 civil plans to the sanitary sewer clean out at the property line North of San Mar Drive, complete with required easement if not within public right of way.

Storm

17. This development shall comply with the Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual for Olympia October 2009 (DDECM).
18. The proposed Demolition & TESC plan is conceptually approved and further details will be required with engineering permit application following Land Use Approval.
19. The stormwater design for this development shall take measures to protect the quality and function of the neighboring wetland. Wetland protection shall be confirmed through hydrologic modeling and requirements found in the DDECM prior to construction of each phase.
20. The stormwater design for the entire development must include a contingency plan, to be reviewed and approved prior to construction of Phase 1, for expanding the size of infiltration facilities should the post-construction infiltration rate be less than the design rate.
21. Starting with Phase 2 of the development, infiltration verification testing per the DDECM must be performed on each constructed stormwater facility utilizing infiltration for stormwater mitigation to ensure compliance with the DDECM.
22. The 2009 Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual for Olympia (DDECM) does not provide guidance for the design and sizing of bioretention facilities for stormwater mitigation. All bioretention facilities proposed for this development shall be designed in accordance with the most current edition of the Washington State Department of Ecology's Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington.

Streets

23. Sufficient right of way shall be dedicated, and construction of a local access street connection south to the San Mar Drive on the south property line, prior to Phase 3, to comply with EDDS 2.040.A and 2.040.B.3.c through e, as well as Comprehensive Plan policies PT4.1 through PT4.11.
24. A minimum of three elements of the site plan will require Deviation Requests as per the Engineering Design & Development Standards, (EDDS). These must be reviewed and approved as part of the Engineering Permit Application and Approval process for Phase 1 of the project. These three elements relate to (1) tree protection and the resultant meandering of sidewalks inside and outside of

the right-of-way (ROW), (2) use of bio-retention cells outside of the right of way for street stormwater treatment, and (3) onsite street parking and lane width for streets within the project limits.

25. If sidewalks are separated from the streetscape by more than 10 feet with street trees adjacent to or between the sidewalk and streetscape, a lighting analysis is required to determine if additional lighting is required.

Solid Waste

26. The proposed apartments along the north half of the site, and townhomes along the south side, shall require a compactor for garbage, and either a second compactor or loose-fill drop box for recyclables and cardboard. Roll-off trucks need 70 feet of clear space in front of the compactor/drop box (containers). If the containers are to be under cover, the roof shall be 14 feet high and the lifting bale within 2 feet of the threshold. Twenty-five feet of overhead clearance is required for loading and unloading the box. The enclosure shall meet the conditions of Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS), including a minimum width of 20 to 22 feet. Due to the location and orientation of the solid waste area in relation to the roadway, front-loading trucks shall not service solid waste containers, because they would be required to back into traffic with significant blind spots.
27. During the construction of the multi-family buildings and townhomes, garbage and recycle containers shall be located in areas with adequate access by collection vehicles in accordance with the provisions of the EDDS. Containers and collection vehicles may consist of drop box, front-load and side load during the construction phase.

Lighting

28. A street lighting plan shall be submitted and installed by the applicant for all street light installations facilities in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 4 Transportation of the Engineering Design & Development Standards, (EDDS), transportation, (4F) Illumination. The proposed street lighting represented on the civil plans is conceptually approved and further details shall be required, including an illumination study of the existing street lights on Sleater-Kinney Road to determine if the existing lighting is adequate for safe vehicle and pedestrian movements and provide solutions for any deficiencies found. An analysis for the entire project shall be completed prior to construction of Phase 1.

URBAN FORESTRY

29. The applicant shall update the locations of all SAVE TREES at time of engineering submittal.
30. Save Trees in question shall be site verified by applicants Urban Forester prior to installation of fencing for tree protection. Installation of Tree Protection Fencing shall be inspected and Approved by Applicants Urban Forester and City Urban Forester with each phase prior to demolition or any clearing and grading. If a utility is located within the Tree protection fencing (critical root zone), the

applicant's Urban Forester shall inspect and consult with the City Urban Forester on a course of action to save and protect trees.

31. Tree protection fencing detail shall be added to the Grading Plan and the Demolition Plan for each phase.
32. Tree Density Calculations shall be updated prior to clearing and grading of each phase.

FIRE

33. Fire hydrants are required at 300 foot spacing. Hydrants must deliver 2500 GPM fire flow.
34. Access roadways shall be 20 feet minimum unobstructed width and meet Olympia Engineering Design & Development Standards.
35. Requires addressable fire alarm system with communication by point.
36. Requires NFPA 13-R fire sprinkler systems minimum. NFPA 13 systems may be required depending on construction type and building size.
37. Standpipes are required in the four senior housing buildings.
38. Knox key boxes are required. Numbers and locations are to be determined.

The following recommended conditions of approval came after the SPRC meeting to discuss the project, and deemed necessary to comply with the code while developing this staff report:

39. The landscape deviation requests related to parking lot islands and screening requirements of OMC 18.36.080 B & C must be reviewed and approved as part of the Engineering Permit Application and Approval process for Phase 1 of the project. The application shall be revised and resubmitted to demonstrate compliance with the requirements, including, but not limited to, how the proposed landscaping exceeds the minimum standards.
40. The property owner shall record a notice approved by the Director with the Thurston County Auditor, regarding the wetland, per OMC 18.32.150. The notice shall provide documentation in the public record (i.e. the title) of the presence of a critical area and its buffer, the application of OMC 18.32 to the property, and limitations on uses and activities within or affecting this area.
41. Additional information related to specific details of the replantings (size, location, species) and the buffer averaging calculations for the area impacted by the street connection to San Mar Drive shall be required, prior to issuance of any building permit or a clearing and grading permit, for analysis of mitigation.

42. As an additional SEPA mitigation Condition, authorized per OMC 14.04.155, the applicant shall comply with the school mitigation requirements in the letter from Mike Lavery, of the North Thurston Public Schools, to the City of Olympia, dated April 30, 2015 (Attachment 14).

Submitted by: George Steirer, Planning Consultant on behalf of the Site Plan Review Committee

Staff Contact: George Steirer, Planning Consultant
(360) 753-8314
gsteirer@ci.olympia.wa.us

Date Prepared: May 8, 2015

Attachments:

- Attachment 2: Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance and Public Hearing Notice, including SEPA checklist, dated April 28, 2015
- Attachment 3: General Land Use Application Form and Project Narratives dated received by Community Planning and Development Department on November 12, 2014
- Attachment 4: Site Plan A1.1 and Alternative Site Plan A1.1, by Thomas Architecture Studio, dated received by Community Planning and Development Department on May 4, 2015
- Attachment 5: Civil Plans by SCJ Alliance, containing sheets CV-01 (Cover Sheet), EX-01 (Existing Conditions Map), SP-01 (Site Plan), EC-01 (TESC and Demolition Plan), CG-01 (Grading Plan), SD-01 (Drainage Plan), SD-02 (Drainage Notes and Details), WT-01 (Water Plan), SS-01 (Sanitary Sewer Plan), SS-02 (Sanitary Sewer Plan), RD-XS-01 (Roadway Cross-Sections), RD-01 (Roadway Plan), RD-02 (Roadway Plan), dated received by Community Planning and Development Department on May 4, 2015
- Attachment 6: Overall Landscape Plan, Sheet L1.00 of 1, by Jefferty B. Glander & Associates, PLLC, dated April 21, 2015
- Attachment 7: Townhome Elevations, Sheet A3.1, by Thomas Architecture Studio, dated February 12, 2015
- Attachment 8: Bayan Trails Site Wetland and Soils Report and Mitigation Proposal, by SCJ Alliance, dated April 2015
- Attachment 9: Letter from Alex Callender, Wetland/Shoreland Specialist with Washington State Department of Ecology, dated received by Community Planning and Development Department on December 8, 2015

- Attachment 10: Design Review Board, Concept Design Review Conditions of Approval, Dated January 22, 2015
- Attachment 11: Design Review Board Staff Report, dated January 22, 2015
- Attachment 12: Public comment letter from Lawrence Hanna, dated October 19, 2014; Doug Brodin, dated December 1, 2014; and Carl and Jessica Jones, dated December 1, 2014.
- Attachment 13: Letter from Patrick McGuin, Transportation Engineer for the City of Lacey, Traffic Mitigation Letter, dated February 26, 2015
- Attachment 14: Letter from Mike Laverty, Director of Construction & Design, North Thurston Public Schools, dated April 30, 2015.
- Attachment 15: Street Connectivity Plan
- Attachment 16: Bayan Trails Stormwater Site Plan, by SCJ Alliance, Revised April 2015.
- Attachment 17: Development Agreement between the City of Olympia and Goldon Alon Development, LLC, approved on May 5, 2015.

Other project- related information, reports, and correspondence not cited herein are on file with the City.