

16-9112

**HARRISON AVENUE BINDING SITE PLAN –PRELIMINARY  
SUBSTANTIVE REVIEW COMMENTS 2/13/2017**

**NOTE: Application vested to codes prior to code changes adopted after December 1, 2016**

**NOTE: Engineering Option B amendment added 24-Apr-2017**



CP&amp;D CITY OF OLYMPIA

07/12/2019 1:11:20 PM

kcarlson

**Note:** Please type your responses into the column titled *Applicant Response*, 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	16-9112DETAILS	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<b>PLANNING</b>				
Parking	OMC 18.38.100	Requested Revision	Based on the listed uses for lots 2-4, the required parking calculated is 177 vehicle stalls. Only a 20 percent variance to decrease parking can be applied. Decrease in required parking over 20% is not allowed since the property is within 300 feet of a single family zone. Revise plan so that each lot has the appropriate amount of parking required by the use.	Total Stalls Provided is 136. Cross parking agreement will be in place for all lots. Overlap use is expected between residential and commercial.  Parking calculations are as follows: Office 1/300 SF x 4675 = 16 Retail 3.5/1000 sf x 10,222= 36 Restaurant 10/10000 sf x 4000 = 40 Residential 1.5 per unit x 81 = 122 Total = 214 total (171 after 20% reduction)
Loading Berth	OMC 18.38.140.A	Requested Revision/Information	Any building being or intended to be used for retail shall provide the following:  <i>For buildings under five thousand (5,000) square feet, an off-street loading space, having access to a public thoroughfare, shall be required adjacent to each business building, hereafter erected or enlarged; and such loading space shall be of adequate size to accommodate the maximum number and size of vehicles simultaneously loaded or unloaded in connection with the business conducted in such building.</i>  See OMC 18.38.140.C for loading berth design standards.	Loading spaces provided for commercial buildings on each lot.
Landscaping	OMC 18.36.180	Requested Revision	Interior Parking Lot Landscaping. The require amount of landscaping is 35 sq. ft. per stall. Landscape islands should be a minimum of 144 sq. ft. and be designed so that trees will be planted a minimum of 6 feet from any hard surface area. 1 tree per island is required.	Landscaping islands enlarged to 12’ wide.
	OMC 18.36.060.L.2	Requested Revision	Perimeter Landscaping. A Type II Visual Screen will be required around the perimeter of the site. Vegetative landscaping shall consist of evergreen or a combination of approximately 60% evergreen and 40% deciduous trees, interspersed with large shrubs and ground cover. A sight-obscuring fence or other landscaping structure can be used and may be required if necessary to reduce site specific adverse impacts to adjacent land uses. Tree, shrub and groundcover spacing shall be appropriate for the species type.  The area proposed for Landscaping and Drainage is not adequate to provide these types of screening vegetation with your proposed drainage swales.	Swales have been reduced and Leland Cypris is proposed to provide a screen along with the perimeter fencing.
	OMC 18.36.160	Requested Revision	Perimeter Landscaping. The required width of perimeter landscaping shall be the depth of the required yard or setback area. The required setback areas for this BSP are as follows: Front= 0-10 feet Side (West)= 0 setback but should be wide enough to accommodate the proposed plants as described above (18.36.060.L.2) Side (East) = 10 feet Rear= 15 feet	Lots revised to ensure landscaping setbacks are met.
SEPA-Environmental Checklist		Revision Requested	Update the Environmental Checklist using the form dated July 2016. Also see attached staff comments on the environmental checklist.	Updated checklist provided on July 2016 form and addresses staff comments.
<b>ENGINEERING</b>				
Water	EDDS 3.110	Revision	Delete the northwesterly watermain connection to Craftsman Drive; satisfactory redundancy is achieved by the	Done.

			connection to Harrison Avenue (Ref. Fire Dept. comment below), and future extension of 3rd Avenue westward.	
		Revision	Note, a hydrant on 3rd Avenue at the entrances, and a hydrant on Harrison Avenue at the entrance, would provide satisfactory site coverage; revise accordingly.	Done.
Streets	EDDS 2.040(B)	Revision	Extend 3rd Avenue through Lot3 as a public Commercial Collector street; denote a conceptual future alignment of 3rd Avenue through Lot4 as a public Commercial Collector street. Denote a conceptual future alignment of Craftsman Drive as a public Commercial Collector street southward connecting to future 3rd Avenue (Ref. Engineering Exhibits 1&3).	Done, deviation request was approved for 48’ ROW local access street is provided for 3 <sup>rd</sup> ave extension to Lot 1. Craftsman drive extension is also an approved deviation for 48’ ROW local access.
	EDDS 4I.080	Revision	The Harrison Avenue access shall be a full movement access; by modifying the existing pedestrian island, and turn lane striping, in Harrison Avenue (Ref. Engineering Exhibit 2).  <b><i>OPTION B (Result of 10-Mar-2017 Meeting with Applicant): The Applicant met with city Transportation and Fire Dept staff on 10-Mar-2017 to consider optional site access and street connectivity design, to better serve the site, and minimize impacts to the surrounding neighborhoods; resulting in new attached Exhibit #4 (Option B). The primary element of this option is a new Commercial Collector Street connection with Harrison Av (A), and the restriction to right-in, right-out of the secondary access (B); both to be constructed as part of the first phase of site development. Future construction of the onsite Commercial Collector Street will be dependent on proposed development.</i></b>	Option B is shown on the BSP.
		Review Comment	Commercial traffic to and from the site will be restricted to Harrison Avenue by signage; and lane restriction of the 3rd Avenue connection to Grass Lake Village.	Note added to BSP.
Sewer	EDDS 3.110	Revision	Extend the existing 3rd Avenue sewer westward along the new street alignment. It appears that all Lot3 structures can be served by lateral connection to this public main; revise accordingly (Ref. Engineering Exhibit 1).	Done.
		Revision	It appears that Lot2&4 structures can lateral into the existing 8” sewer on Harrison Avenue by placing a manhole at the right-of-way line. Note: Utilities are to be located along street frontages wherever possible; therefore, delete the proposed sewer crossing through Lot2 to Lot1 (Ref. Engineering Exhibit 1).	Done.
Stormwater	DDECM	Revision	Water quality treatment swales shown on the binding site plan and discussed in the drainage report are incomplete. Please provide additional detail for the design and sizing of swales for compliance with Minimum Requirement #6 – Runoff Treatment (Section 2.5.6, Volume I, DDECM). Specifically, the report should describe the type of swale to be used and geometry (i.e., cross section, longitudinal slope, and minimum flow paths).	Stormwater revised to utilized porous pavement for the majority of the site. Swale design for 3 <sup>rd</sup> ave is provided in Section 6.
		Revision	The development of Lots 2, 3, and 4 are commercial/multi-family in nature and require enhanced water quality treatment meeting Chapter 3, Volume V of the DDECM. Biofiltration swales (T9.10, Volume V, DDECM) do not meet enhanced treatment requirements. However, other BMPs such as bioretention or a WSDOT compost amended biofiltration swale may be used to meet the enhanced treatment requirement provided the design criteria are met.	Lots 2, 3, 4, and 5 use porous pavements. Only 3 <sup>rd</sup> ave used swales for treatment.
		Revision	The joint stormwater facilities proposed to manage stormwater from Lots 2, 3, and 4 shall be located within separate tracts or easements. Easement widths for swales and pipes must meet requirements for maintenance access in the EDDS and DDECM. The proposed pond needs to meet the access, slope, setbacks, and landscape standards of Volume III, DDECM.	N/A
		Revision	Requirements for construction and maintenance of stormwater facilities serving Lots 2, 3, and 4 must be stated on the face of the final recorded binding site plan. The note shall also clarify Lot 1 as not included in the facilities and maintenance serving the other 3 lots.	Note added.
		Revision	Construction of joint stormwater facilities serving Lots 2, 3, and 4 must occur prior or concurrently with development of those lots.	Noted.
		Review Comment	The Binding Site Plan proposes four lots and stormwater management improvements intended to serve only Lots 2, 3, and 4. No new or replaced hard surface or construction activity is proposed on Lot 1 as part of this binding site plan, and therefore retrofit of stormwater facilities on Lot 1 is not required as part of this application. Only Lots 2, 3, and 4 shall be vested to use stormwater facilities shown on this binding site plan. Any redevelopment that occurs on Lot 1 will be required to do so under the standards in place at that time of engineering permit application.	Noted.
		Review Comment	Lots 2, 3, and 4 are vested to the requirements of the 2009 City of Olympia Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual (DDECM) if substantial construction on individual lots commences prior to January 1, 2022. Redevelopment of Lot 1 is not vested to the 2009 DDECM, since no improvements are proposed as part of this binding site plan application.	Noted.
Solid Waste	EDDS 8	Review Comment	Location and detail satisfactory for BSP approval.	Noted.
<b>FIRE DEPARTMENT</b>				
Fire Flow		Review Comment	Water pressure in this area averages about 50 PSI static; connection of the new on-site water main to the existing Harrison Avenue watermain is required.	Noted.

Egress		Review Comment	Flat surface required on backside of residential buildings for emergency egress/rescue (Ref. Dwg. SD-01).	Flat surfaces provided
URBAN FORESTRY				
		Requested Revision	This Site Plan does not appear to have allowed enough space to meet the minimum tree density of 210 tree units. Leeland Cypress planted as a perimeter landscaping hedge does not qualify toward meeting the Tree Density. Parking Lot canopy trees would qualify or other trees planted within the landscaping. This site plan must demonstrate it can support healthy long term survivability of the minimum density of trees	Tree units are met, from the 2002 report, 215 units exist and will remain on lot 1. Tree unit table added to BSP plan.
PUBLIC WORKS- SURVEY & MAPPING				
Binding Site Plan Map		Requested Revisions	1) Lines crossing text in Multiple locations throughout site plan 2) No legend- Identify Line types and symbols 3) Needs survey data- Identify Mons and property corners found and/or set. Identify a basis of bearing and show bearings on the property lines. Survey procedure and equipment. 4) No shading on plan sheets, shading is not recordable 5) Lot 4 - must show site planned development currently shows existing building to remain and future building on the same site?	1. Revised 2. Legend added 3. All known survey data added. 4. Shading removed 5. Lot 3 (formerly lot 4) will have the house remain while the other lots are developed. Future layout is shown where the house will be removed for a larger commercial building. This is shown to provide compliance with all land use codes.
ADDRESSING				
		Review Comment	Addresses for proposed buildings will be: 3850 Harrison Ave NW 3860 Harrison Ave NW 3870 Harrison Ave NW 3880 Harrison Ave NW 3902 Harrison Ave NW See attached drawing for which addresses go with which buildings.	Addresses added.
THURSTON COUNTY ASSESSOR				
		Request Revisions/Comments	Standard, full-size blueline map required.  Make lot number labels bold  Remove parcel numbers from map area  Need to show all bearings and distances of lots.  Make lot boundaries solid, bold lines distinguishable from building lines.  Add Situs Addresses, including city and zip code, to the map.  Include Auditors Index listing , section, township, range in W.M.  Verification Request for "Plat Name Approval" sent to Auditor's Office. (Please contact the Auditor's Office, 360 786-5405, for reservation and approval of Name for Plat, BSP, and Condo.)  Show location of all improvements (buildings)  Note Only: If there are any buildings to be removed, a "Destroyed Property Form" must be completed by the property owner. This will remove the improvement value from the property assessment. You may obtain this form by calling Customer Service in the Assessor's office at 867-2200.	18x24 map provided  Lot numbers revised  Parcel numbers removed  Bearings and distances added  Lot boundaries revised  Addressed added  Added  Requested  All improvements shown  Noted.
THURSTON COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT (TCEH) -Revised Comments				
The review packet sent to Thurston County Health Department was returned back to our office due to “no review fees were paid”. Please note, that health department is a required signature on the face of the Binding Site Plan map before it can be recorded. Review and Approval by this department is required. After the revised plans are submitted, a second review packet will be sent to TCEH for their review and review fees will need to be paid to them.				

**16-9112 HARRISON AVENUE MIXED USE BSP**  
**PRELIMINARY BINDING SITE PLAN**  
**2<sup>nd</sup> SUBSTANTIVE REVIEW COMMENTS November 4, 2019**

**NOTE: Application vested to codes prior to code changes adopted after December 1, 2016**

**Note:** Please type your responses into the column titled *Applicant Response*, 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 10/2020
<b>PLANNING</b>				
BSP Map Detail		Staff Review Comment	Please note, the review of the binding site plan relates to the general binding site plan layout, building location, parking areas provided and the land uses proposed. Before development on each lot, Land Use Review will be required to provide detail site plan review.	Noted
Rear Yard Setback	18.06.080 Development Standards	Staff Review Comments	The rear yard setback in the HDC-4 has a 10 minimum with the exception, if development is next to a single family use or RLI District it requires a 15 foot minimum plus 5 feet for each floor above 2 stories.  Lot 1 and Lot 5 have rear yards next to the RLI District.	Noted, site plan adjusted
		Requested Revision	Remove all setback indications on map. Provide only building distances from property lines. Provide a plat note with the following statement: “Lots within this BSP are subject to the setback requirements of Olympia Municipal Code 18.06.080.”	Setbacks removed, building distances added.  Note added to BSP
Side Yard Setback	18.06.080 Development Standards	Staff Review Comments	There is no minimum setback except: next to MR 10-18 District requires a 10 foot minimum setback plus 5 feet for each building floor above 2 stories. Residential (excluding mixed use) requires a 5 foot setback. Lots 3, 4 and 5 have MR 10-18 district along the side boundaries. Lot 3 future development- indicates a 2 story structure will require a 10 foot setback and shows more than a 10 foot setback. Lot 4- Setback for Lot 4 will need to be 15 feet on side east boundary. Lot 5 is all residential in use and will allow for a 5 foot setback. Plan shows a 14 foot.	Site plan has been updated and buildings shifted to the west to meet setbacks.
		Requested Revision	Lot 4- Remove setback indication on BSP map. Provide distances from buildings to property boundaries only.	Done.
Maximum Height	18.06.080 Development Standards	Staff Review Comments	The portion of a building within 100' of land zoned for maximum density of less than 14 units per acre is limited to 35'. The portion of a building within 50' of land zoned for a maximum density of 14 units per acre or more is limited to the lesser of 60' or the height allowed in the abutting district. Up to 60 feet otherwise or up to 75 feet if at least one story is residential.  Lots are subject to these standards. Lot 1- there is no proposed building at this time. Lot 3, 4 and 5- The buildings are shown to be all within 50 feet of land zoned for 14 unit or more (MR 10-18) and is limited to the height allowed by that district which is 45 feet. Lot 3 build appears to be indicated as a 2 story bldg. Lot 2 appears to be just a 2 story building- would be allowed up to 60 feet/75 feet if top floor residential. To be confirmed at Land Use Review.	Lot 5 building has been shifted to the west and also stepped back from the north to meet setback and height guidelines per zoning.  Buildings are shifted west outside the 50’ zone
		Requested Revision	Add a Plat Note to face of the BSP Map to include the following: “Lots within this BSP are subject to height limits as set forth in Olympia Municipal Code 18. 06.080.”	Note added to BSP
Historic Preservation	18.12	Staff Review Comment	The project site is considered to be at moderate to low risk for the discovery of archeologic or cultural resources. In response to SEPA checklist item 13.b., an Inadvertent Discovery Plan must be in place prior to issuance of any construction permit. A signed copy of the IDP must be maintained on site throughout construction.	Noted, IDP will be in place prior to permit.



			An IDP plan is required prior to issuance of permits for excavation of site and for each lots during development.	
Pedestrian Street Overlay	18.16.060	Staff Review Comment	New Development. The regulations in this chapter apply to all properties which abut the Streets identified in Figure 16-1 and Figure 16-1b (both "A" and "B" Streets). The regulations of this Chapter apply to all new building construction. Lots 1, 2 and 3 abut Harrison Avenue which is identified as a pedestrian “A” street. Chapter applies to Lot 1, Lot 2 and Lot 3 future development. This will be reviewed for compliance during Land Use Review of these lots.	Noted.
		Requested Revision	Add Plat Note to face of BSP to include the following: “Lots abutting Harrison Avenue are subject to the standards of Pedestrian Street Overlay OMC 18.16.”	Note added to BSP
18.36 Landscaping	18.36.060.I	Staff Review Comment	Solid waste containers (dumpsters, carts, drop boxes and compactors) and mechanical and electrical equipment in industrial, commercial, multi-family and mixed-use projects, which would otherwise be visible from adjoining streets shall be screened from public view by a Type II Visual Screen unless such would interfere with access and service, in which case a Type III Visual Buffer shall be provided. Please note, that waste containers and mechanical equipment visible from public street will need to be screened. Will be reviewed for compliance during Land Use Review.	Noted, solid waste locations will be screened per guidelines.
	18.36.060.J	Staff Review Comment	Stormwater drainage ponds and swales and other stormwater facilities shall be attractively landscaped with native, or well-adapted drought-tolerant plants and integrated into the site design. This will be verified during Land Use Review on a detailed Landscaping Plan meeting 18.36.080 requirements.	Stormwater has changed to be all out of sight. Porous pavement will be mostly through the development. Public roads will have filter vaults for treatment prior to underground infiltration trenches.
	18.36.060.L.2	Staff Review Comment	Perimeter Landscaping. Some boundaries of the site, will require a Type II Visual Screen around the perimeter.. Vegetative landscaping shall consist of evergreen or a combination of approximately 60% evergreen and 40% deciduous trees, interspersed with large shrubs and ground cover. A sight-obscuring fence or other landscaping structure can be used and may be required if necessary to reduce site specific adverse impacts to adjacent land uses. Tree, shrub and groundcover spacing shall be appropriate for the species type.  Landscaping areas and landscaping for drainage swales on Lot 5 may need more area for plantings for both.  A detailed landscaping plan with plants and material will be reviewed during Land Use Review.	Noted  Lot 5 drainage has changed, the swales have been removed to allow for landscaping. Noted.
		Revision Requested	Remove all detail plant identifications and symbols off of the BSP map. Approval of such information is not being reviewed during this process. Please note that arborvitae will not be considered in meeting tree density requirements. Confirm with City’s Urban Forester for tree species types.  Lot 5- the area provided for perimeter landscaping and the landscaping needed for the drainage swale on the east boundary of lot 5 will need to be increase to accommodate both.	All plantings and tree symbols have been removed from the BSP.  Lot 5 drainage swale has been removed.
18.38 Parking and Loading	18.38.100	Staff Review Comment	<b>Vehicle Parking.</b> The plan provides for 135 vehicle parking stalls. The code requires parking to be within +/- of 10 % of the required number. Based on the land uses proposed, the parking code would require the following: Multifamily Units = 1 stall per unit Office Use= 1 stall per every 300 square feet Retail = 3.5 stalls per 1,000 sq. ft. and Restaurant = 10 stalls per 1,000 sq. ft.  Based on the uses stated on the BSP Map a total of 173 parking stalls would be needed. (81 Multifamily Units = 81 stalls; Office at 4,675 sq. ft. = 16 stalls; Retail at 10,222 sq. ft. = 36 stalls and Restaurant at 4,000 sq. ft. = 40 stalls). It is was clarified in an email from Chris Cramer (Auth. Rep.) that Lot 5	Parking is now at 132 spaces for the full buildout of lots 2 thru 5.  (61 Multifamily Units = 61 stalls; Office at 4,675 sq. ft. = 16 stalls; Retail at 10,222 sq. ft. = 36 stalls and Restaurant at 4,000 sq. ft. = 40 stalls) total = 153 stalls required.  With the 10% reduction, 138 would be the minimum required. Lot 1 will have a shared parking agreement for the missing 6 stalls.

			was not expected to have 60 units but between 30 – 40 units.	
		Revision Requested	Revise the proposed uses on the face of the BSP Map to accommodate the 135 parking stalls proposed.	Done (132 stalls available at full buildout)
		Staff Review Comment	<b>Bicycle Parking</b> Residential= Long Term (LT) 1 per unit /Short Term (ST) -one per 10 units (min. 2) Office= LT Minimum of 2 ST= Min. of 2 Retail= LT 1 per 6,000 sq. ft. ST one per 3,000 sq. ft. Restaurant= LT= 1 per 2,000 sq. ft. ST= one per 1,000 sq. ft.  It is noted that no long term or short term bicycle parking locations are shown on the map. Please note that this will be reviewed during land use review for compliance.	Noted.
Design Review	18.170.040 Usable Open Space	Staff Review Comment	Please note that the multifamily building located on Lot 5 will require usable open space for use of residents of the development that is not occupied by buildings, streets, driveways or parking areas. Usable open space shall include a minimum dimension of 10 feet with an overall grade less than 10 percent. This will be reviewed for compliance during Land Use Review/Design Review	Open space labeled at the north end of the lot.
BSP Map Design			There are areas between proposed future street dedication on Lot 1 and BSP lots lines need to be considered as revising the BSP Map. See highlighted areas below.  	Since the location of the Craftzman road connection is not finalized, the areas in yellow will remain as lot 1, not separate tracts.
BSP Map	17.34.040		Show any existing buildings if any on Lot 1.	No buildings exist, but greenhouses have been added to lot 1
Environmental Checklist		Revision Requested	Responses in the SEPA checklist need to reflect that the proposal is for multiple phases generally including preliminary and final binding site plan approval followed by land use and construction permit review for individual lots. The preliminary binding site plan identifies how future development will occur. Because of this, environmental review will need to take a phased approach. Information in the checklist should be consistent with the trip generation analysis provided in the Traffic Impact Analysis. All phases, timing, uses and required permits/approvals will need to be clearly identified in Section A of the checklist. Responses under Section B will need to address impacts/mitigation for all phases. If information related to any of the future phases has not been prepared, this can be noted as being addressed at the time of a future land use application.  Taking a phased approach does not preclude future environmental review. An environmental checklist will be required for each phase, but if impacts and mitigation have been adequately addressed under the original threshold	SEPA has been updated to include phasing mentioned in several comments in sections A and B.

			<p>determination, the City would consider adoption of that determination.</p> <p>For more information on phased review, please consult WAC 197-11 and the SEPA Handbook which is available at: <a href="https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance">https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance</a> . In addition, please utilize the SEPA checklist guidance resources at the same url.</p>	
ENGINEERING				
ITEM	CODE REQUIREMENTS	COMMENT OR REQUESTED REVISION/INFORMATION	16-9112 DETAILS	APPLICANT RESPONSE
Assistant City Engineer				
Binding Site Plan dated 7/10/19	OMC 17.34.040	Request Revision	Show more detail on the Binding Site Plan to show “location and dimensions of existing and proposed stormwater drainage and retention areas”, per OMC 17.34.040.	Note added to BSP
Stormwater Plans 2-sheet (ER-01 and SD-01)		Requested Revision	Test pits to establish infiltration rates were dug to a depth of 30” below ground surface (bgs). Native soils on Lots 2, 3 and 4 have significant compaction from heavy vehicle traffic, so that it is unlikely that un-compacted native soils will be encountered at 11 inches bgs. Therefore, compacted native soils in pervious pavement areas must be removed, and the pervious asphalt section shown on drawing on sheet 2 of 2 (SD-01) must be revised to show a sufficient depth of clean gravel base (> than the 6” shown on the current detail) to account for the needed over excavation to remove compacted soils. On Lots 2, 3, 4 and perhaps Lot 5.	Compaction note added to Stormwater Sheet, Geotech will verify soils at base of paving section are uncompacted and recommend over excavation amount for areas that are.
Transportation				
Traffic Impact Analysis		Requested Revision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Traffic Impact Analysis is out of date and does not represent the current proposal. Need to re-scope and update analysis with new trip generation and distribution that separates commercial and residential trips.</li> <li>2. The TIA will need to provide a 2040 Full Build-out scenario that shows a trip distribution only of commercial and residential trips that uses all future street connections to Grass Lake Village and Bay Hill developments.</li> <li>3. This work will need to be coordinated with TRPC and the Dynameq subarea model. Once the TIA is complete, City staff will analyze street connectivity with the criteria that is provided for in the Comprehensive Plan Policy GT5 (PT5.2).</li> </ol>	TRPC has not completed the modeling and the Traffic Impact Analysis has not been revised. This will be submitted as soon as possible.
Development Phasing		Requested Revision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The development shall be phased, as shown on the Comment Drawing (Attachment 1), to ensure the primary access to Harrison Avenue is established before further development traffic is generated.</li> </ol>	Noted, Craftsman Drive will be completed to allow Harrison Ave access. Phasing plan added to BSP
General Comments		Requested Revision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Show the Craftsman Drive intersection configuration to Harrison Avenue.</li> <li>6. Show 3rd Avenue as a Local Access street from the east boundary of the site west to Craftsman Drive.</li> <li>7. Remove the Loading Zones from the 3rd Avenue design.</li> <li>8. Depict the general alignments of future Craftsman Drive and 3rd Avenue as shown on the Comment Drawing.</li> <li>9. Delete the "Emergency Access" designation from the easterly Harrison Avenue driveway.</li> <li>10. Indicate access easements through Phase-One drive isle; providing Phase-Two legal access to through Phase-One to Craftsman Drive and to Harrison Avenue.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Done.</li> <li>6. Done.</li> <li>7. Done.</li> <li>8. Craftsman Drive location has not been changed, it is unknown how Lot 1 will be developed. The connection is shown from North to south and at the east.</li> <li>9. Done.</li> <li>10. Access easements added.</li> </ol>
Solid Waste				
		Information Request	<p>The applicant's BSP shows a solid waste area but lacks sufficient detail to make a determination. Applicant must provide the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify which lots will use which solid waste areas.</li> <li>2. Include turning templates based on a front-load collection truck profile (EDDS 8.034, Table 3), that shows access to all dumpster areas.</li> <li>3. The solid waste truck shall not back out onto a street.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Done.</li> <li>2. Turning movement exhibits are provided with this submittal.</li> <li>3. Noted.</li> <li>4. All enclosures are 22x10</li> </ol>

			4. The minimum solid waste enclosure is 22 feet wide by 10 feet deep with gates that swing 110 degrees from the closed position, with full direct access to the entire front width of the enclosure.	
<b>Water</b>				
		Requested Revision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extend an 8" water main along the Craftsman Drive and 3rd Avenue roadways as shown on the Binding Site Plan Redlines.</li> <li>2. Delete outdated water main information on the plans, as shown on the Comment Drawing, e.g., onsite hydrants, easements, watermain.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Done.</li> <li>2. Done.</li> </ol>
<b>Sewer</b>				
		Requested Revision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extend an 8" sewer main along the Craftsman Drive and 3rd Avenue roadways as shown on the Binding Site Plan Redlines. A sewerage basin study is necessary to minimum determine depth; and whether one of these extensions can be waived do to the basin analysis showing the entire sewerage basin can be served by a single line.</li> <li>2. Buildings on different lots (e.g. lots 2 and 3) may not share a side sewer.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Done. Basin study will occur with building permit.</li> <li>2. Noted.</li> </ol>
<b>FIRE DEPARTMENT</b>				
		Review Comment	This project shall adhere to Olympia Municipal Code (OMC) Ch. 16.32, 16.36, 16.40, 16.44, & 13.04, Olympia Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS) Chapter 4 & 6, 2015 IBC, and 2015 IFC. All new residential construction shall be sprinkled per OMC 16.32.140. Water main connections and extension shall adhere to EDDS Chapter 6 Section 6.030 and 6.040. Access shall adhere to 16. 32.050. Emergency access, fire flows and required fire protection facilities shall be developed prior to issuance of building permit as per EDDS 6.010.	Noted.
<b>URBAN FORESTRY</b>				
		Staff Review Comment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The City's Urban Forester will confirm that each lot within the Binding site plan meets the minimum tree density of 30 tree units per acre at time of Land Use Review.</li> <li>2. Please note that Leyland cypress, Arborvitae or other columnar vegetation planted as a vegetative buffer along the perimeter of lots do not count toward the minimum density. Leyland Cypress and the infiltration swale along the east property line of Lot 5 are not compatible due to the limited space available.</li> <li>3. A Level 5 Soil and Vegetation Report shall be submitted at the time of Land Use submittal for each Lot. A check list for the Level 5 Report will be provided upon request. The Level 5 report shall inventory and locate all trees and their condition on each lot. The report shall document the required minimum tree density for each lot, the trees to be saved and removed. And shall identify the necessary tree protection measures to protect the Save trees during construction.</li> <li>4. Tree density shall be met by existing and planted trees within the parking lots and other landscaped areas for each lot. Trees within a Soil and Vegetation Protection Area (SVPA) are not required for this plat* but would count toward the tree density of the lot where the SVPA is located. (*This BSP was vested prior to the SVPA requirement for multifamily developments).</li> <li>5. Trees to be planted shall meet the standards in Chapter 8 of the City of Olympia Urban Forestry Manual. Trees shall full canopied (non-dwarf) varieties in locations with acceptable soil volume and space to reach full maturity without conflicts with adjacent infrastructure and buildings.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. Noted, swales removed on Lot 5.</li> <li>3. Noted.</li> <li>4. Noted.</li> <li>5. Noted.</li> </ol>
<b>PUBLIC WORKS- CITY SURVEYOR</b>				
		Staff Review Comments	<p>Comments on the submitted Preliminary Binding Site Plan dated 7/10/19 (drawing BSP-01) to be revised and confirmed at time of Final Binding Plan Application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No grayscale text, symbols, or line types.</li> <li>2. Resolve all text obscured by hatching or lines see text in loading zone hatched area, line types with text as part of the line type, etc.</li> <li>3. Line labels L6, L8 &amp; L9 appear to indicate different length portions of the same line yet L9 has a different bearing indicated in the Parcel Line Table than the bearing indicated for L6 and L8. Clarify/correct</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grayscale removed</li> <li>2. done.</li> <li>3. updated.</li> </ol>
<b>THURSTON COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH (TCEH)</b>				
		Request	No comments have been received thus far from this agency. TCEH is a required signature on the face of the BSP. The City will need their review comments before a decision can be made.	Noted.



THURSTON COUNTY ASSESSOR				
		Staff Review Comments	The following comments to be addressed at time of Final BSP Application: 1. Make lot number labels bold 2. Remove parcel numbers from map area 3. Need to show all bearings and distances of lots. 4. Make lot boundaries solid, bold lines distinguishable from building lines. 5. Add Situs Addresses, including city and zip code, to the map. 6. Include Auditors Index listing , section, township, range in W.M. 7. Verification Request for "Plat Name Approval" sent to Auditor's Office. (Please contact the Auditor's Office, 360 786-5405, for reservation and approval of Name for Plat, BSP, and Condo.) 8. Show location of all improvements (buildings)	1. Done 2. Done 3. Done 4. Done 5. Done 6. Done 7. Done. 8. Done.
THURSTON COUNTY TREASURER				
		Staff Review Comments	Property taxes on all properties involved in BSP must be paid prior to recording of the final binding site plan.	Noted.

Attachment 1- Comment Drawing 10/30/2019 by J.Fant

<div>16-9112 HARRISON AVENUE MIXED USE BSP</div> <div>PRELIMINARY BINDING SITE PLAN</div> <div>3rd SUBSTANTIVE REVIEW COMMENTS March 12, 2021</div> <div>NOTE: Application vested to codes prior to code changes adopted after December 1, 2016</div>				
<div>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.</div>				
ITEM	CODE REQUIREMENTS	COMMENT OR REQUESTED REVISION/INFORMATION	DETAILS	APPLICANT RESPONSE
PLANNING				
Vehicle Parking	OMC 18.38	Additional Information Requested	<p>Previous review of the calculated vehicle parking had an incorrect stall requirement. Multifamily uses in the High-Density Corridor 4 requires 1.5 stalls per unit and not 1 stall as indicated previously.</p> <p>Please Note: HDC requires a 10% reduction from the calculated total. A total of 166 stall is required and the proposal shows a total of 132.</p> <p>To meet parking standards, there are options within the parking and loading that can be considered for either a parking modification up to 20% or shared parking standards.</p> <p>Applicant will need to decide which option to take and provide the required materials for such in the next review. See chapter 18.38 for details for both Administrative Parking Modifications 18.38.080 and Shared Parking 18.38.180</p>	<p>61 Multifamily Units x1.5 = 91.5 stalls; Office at 4,675 sq. ft. = 16 stalls; Retail at 10,222 sq. ft. = 36 stalls Restaurant at 4,000 sq. ft. = 40 stalls) total = 183.5 stalls required, 132 stalls provided</p> <p>HDC 10% reduction = 183.5 x.9 =165.15 stalls required.</p> <p>Referring to section 18.38.0808 Administrative Modifications: See included traffic study from Heath and Assoc. for 20% reduction justification</p> <p>Section 18.38.080 -20% reduction: 165.15x.8= 132.12 stalls required</p>
Environmental Checklist		Update Requested	Before SEPA Determination can be issued, staff comments/notes on the attached Environmental Checklist should be considered.	SEPA comments addressed as noted in the redlined checklist
ENGINEERING				
ITEM	CODE REQUIREMENTS	COMMENT OR REQUESTED REVISION/INFORMATION	16-9112 DETAILS	APPLICANT RESPONSE
Engineering	General Comments	Requested Revision	Clearly identify each phase and the timing of the civil improvements associated with each phase. Separate exhibits or plan sheets would be ideal for representation.	Separate exhibit created to show construction connected to each phase of the project.
Stormwater		Requested Revision	<p>We have reviewed the Storm Drainage Report, Stormwater Site Plan, and Preliminary Binding Site Plan, dated October 2020, and prepared by Patrick Harron &amp; Associates. This project is subject to the requirements of the 2009 City of Olympia Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual (DDECM) and must address Core Requirements 1 through 10.</p> <p>GENERAL COMMENT We were unable to complete the review and verify if the flow control BMPs were sized correctly, because we could not track the surface areas that were reported. It is very difficult to review a plan when none of the surface areas match or add up.</p> <p>PROJECT AREAS Project Overview (page 4) gives the Project Area: 2.89 Acres. This is the first and last time this number is found in the report.</p> <p>Area Summary Table (page 10): Says the Total Site is 2.97 Acres, which does not match the 2.89 Acres number from above. Also, the columns in the table do not add up. When the columns are added they equal 138,418 s.f. (not 129,324 s.f), and 3.178 Acres (not 2.89 acres or 2.97 acres).</p>	<p>Report has been revised to minimize area confusion throughout. Area basin map included in Min Req 7 flow control with each basin calculation from WWHM2012 broken out in a more clear format.</p> <p>Project area removed from Overview. Refer to Min Req 7 for all basin areas.</p> <p>Project area removed from Overview. Refer to Min Req 7 for all basin areas.</p>

		<p>WWHM screen print for Scenario Schematic: None of the elements are labeled, so we are guessing how the following screen prints fit within the diagram.</p> <p>WWHM screen print for Permeable Pavement 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o The area of permeable pavement = 46,000 s.f. (1.056 Acres), again does not match any of the areas presented thus far.</li><li>o 12 underdrain?</li></ul> <p>WWHM screen print for 3rd Ave Trench Basin: Again, the areas (0.087 ac road, 0.052 ac sidewalk, and 0.051 ac lawn) do not match any of the areas presented thus far.</p> <p>WWHM Report - Predeveloped Basin 1 (page 23) has a total basin area of 2.96 acres, which is close to the 2.97 acres shown in the Area Summary on page 10. The value of 2.96 acres does appear to equal the sum of Lots 2, 3, 4, and 5, plus 3rd Avenue Extension, and not include Craftsman.</p> <p>WWHM Report Permeable Pavement 1 basin definition: The Pavement Area is shown as 1.0560 ft instead of 1.0560 acres.</p> <p>WWHM Report: When all of the basin areas are totaled (Permeable Pavement 1 = 1.056 ac, Buildings = 0.790 ac to pavement gallery, Sidewalk to pavement gallery = 0.180 ac., Landscape to pavement gallery = 0.840 ac, 3rd Avenue = 0.190 ac, and Craftsman = 0.163 ac), they equal = 3.219 acres. This does not match any of the numbers presented thus far.</p> <p>The numbers that do appear consistent are the buildings (0.79 ac) and sidewalk (0.301 ac.), but this took breaking down three basin definitions to determine that these were correct.</p> <p>The plat shows two approaches coming off the 3rd Avenue extension. Are these approaches made of concrete, and are they included in the basin area?</p> <p>Are the off-site approaches to Harrison Avenue (work within existing City right of way) included in the area calculations? Is this where some of the confusion with areas not matching come from?</p> <p>WATER QUALITY STORMFILTERS</p> <p>Checking the Water Quality Flow Rates in WWHM appear to be correct, given the project areas used, and given that a single Contech StormFilter cartridge can treat up to 0.033 cfs.</p> <p>3rd Avenue appears to be just under the limit for a single cartridge (at 0.0306 cfs).</p> <p>Craftsman is just over the limit (at 0.0352 cfs) and should be increased to 2 cartridges.</p> <p>THRESHOLD DISCHARGE AREAS (TDAs)</p> <p>Lot 5 should be broken into its own TDA, because 3rd Avenue separates the gravel interflow from the rest of the development. The pervious pavement for Lot 5 should not be included in the pervious pavement modeling for the rest of the development.</p> <p>BINDING SITE PLAN</p> <p>Please include an area for the Craftsman Dr NW right of way dedication.</p> <p>Please include a floor 1 surface area for the buildings on Lot 5.</p>	<p>Unfortunately, WWHM2012 does not label the elements in the overview window. The screenshots and output file have been grouped together for each Basin in Min Req 7.</p> <p>Permeable pavement has been broken out into two areas as requested below.</p> <p>12” underdrain is a default in the program. This is not utilized and was removed for clarity. It did not affect facility sizing as there was no discharge from the underdrain.</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> Ave Basin areas updated in min req 7.</p> <p>Refer to Min Req 7 for all basin areas.</p> <p>Unsure of why this error occurs. WWHM2012 was rechecked for area accuracy of the square footage and calculations were re-run (see screen shot before text report). This is also an error in Basin 2. The text output simply placed ft instead of acres.</p> <p>Refer to Min Req. 7 for area break down.</p> <p>These approaches are made of standard concrete and included in Basin 3. See Min Req 7 for basin map</p> <p>No areas in the ROW are included as they are replacing existing concrete driveways that drain to Harrison Ave and do not have a way to be collected independently of the existing system in Harrison Ave</p> <p>correct</p> <p>Water quality sizing has been updated to show 2 filters required.</p> <p>Lot 5 has been broken out (basin 4) from Lot 2/3/4 (basin 2) for the porous pavement modeling.</p> <p>Done.</p> <p>Done.</p>
--	--	--	--

Solid Waste		Required Revision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Turning movement 1 is not a true hammerhead turn per the EDDS. It is an angled approach with a greater than 90* back up and turn. The turning templates show the truck accessing the middle of the enclosure and no room for error. This will not work. The enclosure will need to be moved at least 10 feet to the west and retain a similar angle. All curbing is suggested to be rolled curb so as to protect from being damaged by truck tires during maneuvering. As shown in the attached drawings with blue lines, no fences shall be installed in these areas to give maximum turn ability - to be able to utilize the rear overhang of the truck to extend beyond the curb when backing. Moreover, there shall not be any trees planted such that they would interfere with the truck backing and maneuvering.</li> <li>Turning Movement 2 shows an enclosure offset to the approach but to the parking side, making it a problem to align for dumpsters on the right side and causing a conflict with the gate swing and parked cars and the loading zone. This enclosure will need to be moved to the west a few feet. Given the radius on the west exit, the enclosure can shift a foot two west of center on the drive lane, but at a minimum, it shall be at least centered to the drive lane approach.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enclosure relocated and new turning movement provided.</li> <li>Enclosure relocated to the west.</li> </ol>
<p>The turning movements show the truck at the center of the enclosure however, it will need to access containers on each end. Based on the turning movements, there is not enough space to turn when the truck is at either side of the enclosure. Moreover, the movements shown and space leave no margin of error. Applicant will need to move the enclosure at least 10 feet to the west but retain the same general angle of approach. This will require modification of the curbing to the south of the approach. The blue lines indicate where there can be no fencing. Additionally no tall trees can be in the planter areas designated by dashed green lines. low shrubs are okay. This is due to the fact the solid waste truck end may need to extend beyond the curb to maneuver.</p> <p>70.68</p> <p>3RD AVE NW</p>				

