

| Pioneer Elementary Mini-Building/NUMBER: 16-9094 PROJECT ADDRESS: 1416 San Francisco Avenue REVIEW COMMENTS | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---|--|--------------------|
| Note: Please type your responses into the column titled <i>Applicant Response</i> , and include as much information needed to clearly respond to each comment. Please do not say “comment noted or acknowledged” without providing an explanation; doing so may delay resubmittal. Additionally, please avoid referring to the plans without a sheet number, or explanation of how the plans were revised. | | | | |
| ITEM | CODE REQUIREMENTS | COMMENT OR REQUESTED REVISION/INFORMATION | DETAILS | APPLICANT RESPONSE |
| PLANNING | | | | |
| 1) CUP Criteria of Approval | OMC 18.04.060(cc) | Revision / Additional Information | Please provide some analysis regarding how screening is provided where the new structure is adjacent to residential uses. | |
| 2) Parking | OMC 18.38.060 | Revision / Additional Information | <div>a) Long term bike parking is required at a rate of 1 per classroom. Please identify the location and quantity of long term bike parking being provided. For this calculation, the classrooms constructed prior to the requirement being in effect do not need to be counted. Plans must clearly identify the proposed location and design of the parking.</div> <div>b) Short term bike parking is required at a rate of 3 per classroom. Please identify the location and quantity of short term bike parking being provided. For this calculation, the classrooms constructed prior to the requirement being in effect do not need to be counted. Plans must clearly identify the proposed location and design of the bike parking. Short term bike parking must be covered and located as close to the front entry as possible. If it is not clearly visible from the front entry, signage identifying its location will be required. Plans must provide dimensions.</div> | |
| 3) Screening | OMC 18.36.090(h) | Revision | c) Screening around the mechanical equipment box appears to be lacking on the southern side. Screening must include shrubs. Plans appear to indicate that ground covers will be provided without shrubs. | |
| 4) SEPA Checklist | | Revision | <div>The SEPA Checklist must be revised as follows:</div> <div><ul style="list-style-type: none">• Generally, spell out all acronyms, be sure answers are formatted and worded in complete thoughts/sentences.• A.11: Add resurfacing of the field to the project description and remove impervious surface list. If applicable, this information can be added to the site plan or other plan sheets, but is not particularly applicable to the project scope.• B.1.e: indicate source of fill.• B.1.f: Revise answer. The site being flat does not eliminate the potential for erosion.• B.1.h: Spell out “BMP’s” and list the specific examples proposed for the project. This can be brief, but needs to include specifics.• B.2.c: Add “no idling”• B.3.a (surface water): Spell out FPARS• B.3.c.1 (water runoff): Revise answer to more specifically identify measures to collect and dispose of water.• B.3.c.2: SWPPP is for stormwater, not waste water. Question specifically asks about waste water, please revise.• B.3.c.3: Response is too general, please provide project specific answers.• B.4.d (wildlife preservation): In vasive should say invasive. Formatting appears to need correction on this question.• B.6.a.4: General construction materials needs to be replaced with a site specific answer based on this project</div> | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | <p>proposal. What materials are anticipated?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.6.a.5: Provide specific answers, rather than generic ones. Which guidelines from Ecology or Corp of Engineers are planned? • B.6.b (noise): Noise limits within the City are from 7am to 6pm, please revise accordingly. Also, answer does not make sense regarding long term school noises. Please clarify. Are school noises anticipated to exceed noise limits? If so, will that be outside the general hours listed above? • B.7.h (critical areas): Remove reference to the County, project is in the City. • B.7.i (people onsite): Be specific and list the number anticipated. • B.7.l (surrounding land uses): Be more specific, which “guidelines” are you referring to? Development standards, design guidelines, etc? • B.9.c (aesthetic impacts): Vague, be more specific. In what way will the building take aesthetic queues from the existing structure? • B.10.a (light and glare): Response does not answer question. Answer either assumes no new lighting is proposed, or that the new lighting will not create glare. Please clarify. • B.10.b: Please address safety hazards. • B.12.a: Spell out WISAARD. Remove reference to the historic district, there is no historic district or designated historic properties nearby. • B.12.b: Please add that according to the City of Olympia’s Historic Preservation Officer the WISAARD Database indicates that this general area has a very high risk of encountering archaeological materials. • B.12.d: Please add a note that all measures outlined in OMC 18.12.120 will be adhered to and that should any event of an unanticipated discovery the applicant will contact Michelle Sadlier, Historic Preservation Officer of the City of Olympia. • B.12.e: All other materials list 8 new classrooms, this question says 10 new classrooms. Please be consistent. Additionally, correct formatting/typos in the sentence so that it reads more clearly. • B.12.g: Remove the last part of the sentence regarding the site being in an isolated area. This is unclear. • B.15.b: Replace City of Lacey with City of Olympia. • Sign the checklist and submit an electronic copy of the signed version. • Remove the supplemental questions intended for non-project actions. These are not necessary as this is a project. • Remove all supplemental pages following the checklist. They can be submitted as supplemental documents, but should not be included within the PDF of the “Checklist”. If they are already provided as part of the Land Use Application, they do not need to be duplicated. | |
| DESIGN REVIEW | | | | |
| 5) Design Review | 18.110 | Revision | <p>a) Modify the type of tree proposed adjacent to the new structure along Garrison Street such as a Hornbeam or similar. Add shrubs along Garrison Street, similar to the plantings shown on the west side of the building and consider modifications to the landscaping on all sides of the building that enhance consistency, such as the rhododendrons.</p> <p>b) Improve student access from the east exit of the new building south towards the play field.</p> | |
| ENGINEERING | | | | |
| 6) Water | EDDS 2.050.B | Revision | a) Show the RPBA (for irrigation) and DCVA backflow on the Site Plan and Civil Plans. | |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------------|----------|--|--|
| 7) Solid Waste | EDDS Chapter 8 | Revision | b) Show the existing location of the solid waste on the site plan. Verify that this proposal will not impact the existing location and ability to access. If the location or ability to access is changed, provide details that conform to Chapter 8 of the EDDS including dimensions and turning templates for the trucks. | |
| 8) Storm Drainage | EDDS Chapter 5 & DDECM | | a) Details for the proposed detention pipe and flow control structure described in Notes 3 and 8 on Sheet CE.09 and on Sheet CE.08 have been omitted. Please provide these additional details for the Land Use review plan set. b) The Stormwater Site Plan report incorrectly states the project is exempt from Additional Requirement Offsite Analysis (Volume I, Section 2.6). Please provide a qualitative analysis of downstream and offsite systems with Engineering Permit submittals. It may be necessary to provide a quantitative assessment of discharge of stormwater from the existing infiltration system to the City's storm system in Tullis Street. c) Runoff treatment retrofit of the existing parking lot area requires selection of a BMP meeting the Enhanced Treatment Menu of Chapter 3, Volume V, DDECM as the existing site is similar in use to a commercial project site. While the Contech StormFilter media filter does not have an Enhanced Treatment General Use Level Designation (GULD) from Ecology's TAPE certification program, the City may permit a StormFilter for treatment in a retrofit situation only of existing pollution generating surfaces if the media cartridges are ZPG or MetalRx (i.e., targets the removal of dissolved metals in runoff). Please revise the proposed treatment system approach with Engineering Permit submittals. | |
| URBAN FORESTRY | | | | |
| 9) Tree Plan | OMC 16.60 | Revision | a) Verify with Sound Urban Forestry and correct all plans to reflect trees to be saved given the close proximity of new construction such as, but not limited to; the 4 foot walkway, new fencing, concrete sidewalk, irrigation and utilities. b) Correct Tree Density count on plans. c) The grading plans require the Tree Protection Fencing Detail and location and additional note stating the Project Forester is to be on site during construction within the critical root zone of existing trees to be saved. d) Damaged trees will require replacement. | |