

**Harrison Avenue Mixed Use Binding Site Plan**  
**Permit Number 16-9112**  
**Public Comments November 11, 2020 thru November 25, 2020**  
**and**  
**November 26, 2020 thru December 29, 2020**

<u>No</u>	<u>Date of Comment</u>	<u>Name of Commenter</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u>
1	11.11.20	Lisa Quinn	(a) Adamantly opposed;  (b) increased traffic and noise - would decrease property values	(a) <i>Applicant notes this comment;</i>  (b) An updated Traffic Impact Analysis was prepared for the Project that analyzes the Project's estimated traffic and noise impacts. <i>See</i> Harrison Avenue Mixed-Use Traffic Impact Analysis (dated Dec. 1, 2020). The scope of the traffic impact analysis for the Project was determined by City standards. <i>See</i> Appendix: Trip Generation to Harrison Avenue Mixed-Use Traffic Impact Analysis (dated Dec. 1, 2020) (Harrison Avenue Mixed-Use – Trip Generation Summary). Existing level of service (LOS) at the study intersections are shown to operate at LOS D or better meeting City standards. <i>See</i> Harrison Avenue Mixed-Use Traffic Impact Analysis (dated Dec. 1, 2020). The Project is anticipated to generate approximately 1,098 daily trips, 40 AM peak hour trips and 103 PM peak hour trips based on ITE data. As shown in Table 3, a portion of these trips are anticipated to be in the form of pass-by. Under a three-year horizon forecast, LOS is shown to continue operating with LOS D or better conditions. The

				<p>surrounding roadways were found to have sufficient capacity to support the Project's demands. Traffic mitigation includes payment of transportation impact fees to the City of Olympia based on anticipated Project trips. <i>See</i> Harrison Avenue Mixed-Use Traffic Impact Analysis (dated Dec. 1, 2020). The main access and exits into and out of the development will be from Harrison Avenue.</p> <p>Property values are determined by the Thurston County Assessor's Office based on property characteristics (e.g., size, age, style, quality, and condition of individual properties) and current activity in the real estate market. Proposed development generally indicates an increase in demand for a particular area. As such, residential and commercial development tend to increase property values as such development attracts more consumers and potential residents.</p>
2	11.13.20	Julie Drennon, Barron Financial (comments-except a-are from one of her renters as Julie is located in Puyallup)	<p>(a) Not opposed to progress unless it has negative impact on her property;</p> <p>(b) loss of median/sidewalk/street parking/rentability /sale of surrounding property;</p> <p>(c) permit states 81 residents for 61 units-concern units will house more than 81 residents;</p> <p>(d) traffic;</p> <p>(e) types of commercial businesses;</p> <p>(f) landscaping on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue;</p> <p>(g) wants 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue for walking ONLY</p>	<p>(a) <i>Applicant notes this comment;</i></p> <p>(b) The existing 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW is not proposed to have any changes to the design of the street, meaning it will stay as existing. The City has parking standards that provide what the associated parking requirements are for certain uses.</p> <p>(c) The proposed Project includes 61 units and is intended to house 81 residents;</p> <p>(d) <i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 1 relating to traffic analysis;</p>

				<p>(e) Contemplated commercial uses include office, retail, and restaurants. Examples of the many commercial type uses allowed in the High-Density Corridor 4 zoning district include, but are not limited to, retail, office and restaurant;</p> <p>(f) A landscape plan will be prepared as part of the construction permit package. Binding Site Plan (dated Oct. 29, 2020) shows the landscape areas, including a planter on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW and landscaping north and south of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue/ Craftsman Drive intersection. Landscaping will be completed with each phase of the Project as the individual lots are improved.</p> <p>(g) Current City standards require that connections be made to existing stubbed streets. Under the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A), the Comprehensive Plan process provides the opportunity for the public to provide input regarding how property should be zoned and therefore used. The use of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW is outside the scope of Project review and the use of 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW as solely pedestrian is not consistent with the City plans and codes.</p>
3 4	11.17.20 11.09.20	Susan Roewe, RE/MAX NW Realtors	<p>3(a) High volume of traffic – difficult / dangerous to turn left onto Harrison heading East;</p> <p>3(b) believes routing traffic around Grass Lake more sense-increase safety and protect quality of life/property values;</p>	<p>3(a) <i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 1 relating to traffic analysis;</p> <p>3(b) <i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 1 relating to traffic analysis. Moreover, the majority of commercial activity is expected to arrive and depart via Harrison Avenue. Further, any</p>

			<p>3(c) put stop light at Craftsmen and Harrison to route traffic to Yauger;</p> <p>3(d) concern about litigation if tenants/children hit by speeding vehicle.</p> <p>4(a) Same concerns as previously stated</p>	<p>truck traffic would enter the site via the Craftsman Drive access, which would be designed with appropriate turning radii to accommodate larger vehicles. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW access and roadway extension, as required by the City, is to enhance interconnectivity and would benefit both the proposed Project and local neighborhood. 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW is to remain closed at the west end until such time that Craftsman Drive is fully constructed;</p> <p>3(c) <i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 1 relating to traffic analysis. In addition, recommended mitigation includes additional right-of-way and/or construction of a three-lane Craftsman Drive section at the newly created intersection of Craftsman Drive / Harrison Avenue as needed based on the City's review and decision;</p> <p>3(d) Drivers will be required to abide by the same driving laws and rules of the roads imposed by Washington law.</p> <p>4(a) <i>See</i> Responses to Comment Nos. 3(a)–3(d).</p>
5	11.21.20	Sheryl Dorney	<p>(a) Streets built for residential use;</p> <p>(b) wear out streets quickly;</p> <p>(c) dangerous to children/seniors.</p>	<p>(a) <i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 1 relating to traffic analysis;</p> <p>(b) <i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 1 relating to traffic analysis;</p> <p>(c) <i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 1 relating to traffic analysis, and Comment No. 3 relating to rules of the road.</p>
6	11.21.20	Carol Horvath	<p>(a) traffic will increase;</p>	<p>(a) <i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 1 relating to traffic analysis;</p>

			(b) property values will decrease.	(b) <i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 1 relating to property valuation.
7	11.21.20	Magdalena Webb	<p>(a) Commercial enterprise of this magnitude is disruptive / dangerous to residents;</p> <p>(b) repeatedly violated municipal codes/zoning ordinances-showing disregard for neighbors;</p> <p>(c) cutting down trees next to her property;</p> <p>(d) do not trust applicant;</p> <p>(e) City knows problems created by 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave access and Craftsman Dr NE;</p> <p>(f) get no response from City;</p> <p>(g) environmental checklist has many errors and generalized statements;</p> <p>(h) negative impact and dangerous for ingress and egress on Grass Lake Community.</p>	<p>(a) Property is zoned as High-Density Corridor 4, which allows a variety of commercial uses including, but not limited to, retail, office and restaurant;</p> <p>(b) Applicant believes the Project proposal complies with all applicable state and local laws, rules, regulations, codes, and ordinances. City staff will review all Project application materials to determine compliance;</p> <p>(c) <i>Applicant notes this comment;</i></p> <p>(d) <i>Applicant notes this comment;</i></p> <p>(e) <i>Applicant notes this comment, but cannot speak to internal City procedures;</i></p> <p>(f) <i>Applicant notes this comment, but cannot speak to internal City procedures;</i></p> <p>(g) For cities planning under the Growth Management Act (Ch. 36.70A RCW), such as the City of Olympia, the SEPA Responsible Official is entitled to rely on existing plans, laws, and regulations to determine that the requirements for environmental analysis, protection, and mitigation of a project under SEPA are met. RCW 43.21C.240(1); WAC 197-11-158. SEPA allows, and indeed encourages, officials to rely on existing plans, rules and regulations and fill in any gaps by imposing mitigation measures under SEPA. WAC 197-11-158(3) provides examples of when project</p>

				<p>specific impacts may not be adequately addressed and require additional review as including, but not limited to, “impacts resulting from changed conditions, impacts indicated by new information, impacts not reasonably foreseeable in the GMA planning process, or impacts specifically reserved in a plan EIS for project review.”</p> <p>(h) <i>See</i> Responses to Comment Nos. 1, 2, and 3.</p>
8	11.22.20	Lawrence Kantor	<p>(a) increased traffic through idyllic community-disruptive-dangerous-negative consequences;</p> <p>(b) 81 units or 61 units- which one correct? and # of residents-same as <b>2c</b> above;</p> <p>(c) noise during construction and long-term with increased traffic; views altered or obstructed;</p> <p>(d) vehicular trips /day;</p> <p>(e) measures to control transportation-site amenities, etc.;</p> <p>(f) repeated violations of municipal codes/zoning ordinances – blatant disrespect for neighbors – tearing down trees – do not trust applicant – same as <b>7 b, c, d above</b></p>	<p>(a) <i>See</i> Responses to Comment No. 1, 2, 3, and 7;</p> <p>(b) <i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 2(c);</p> <p>(c) Pursuant to OMC 18.40.080.C.7, construction activity detectable beyond the site boundaries shall be restricted to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Idling of construction equipment and vehicles visiting the Project site will be required. All vehicles will be equipped with sound limiting devices to meet National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) guidelines for on-road vehicles. At this time, no views in the immediate vicinity are intended to be altered or obstructed by the Project.</p> <p>(d) <i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 1 relating to traffic analysis;</p> <p>(e) Anticipated residential and commercial traffic impacts are considered in the Harrison Avenue Mixed-Use Traffic Impact Analysis (dated Dec.</p>

				<p>1, 2020). Amenities such as picnic tables and benches, along with bike racks and pedestrian paths, are intended to encourage community members to walk and/or cycle, when possible;</p> <p>(f) <i>See</i> Responses to Comment Nos. 7(b), (c), and (d).</p>
9	11.23.20	Barbara Andrews	<p>(a) Environmental checklist glaring errors-misleading statements;</p> <p>(b) 81 units or 61 units, which is accurate?;</p> <p>(c) soil type;</p> <p>(d) erosion control plan should be developed;</p> <p>(e) impacts to earth;</p> <p>(f) dust control;</p> <p>(g) water runoff from washing wheels and watering road;</p> <p>(h) collection of stormwater onsite;</p> <p>(i) tree preservation-what is plan?;</p> <p>(j) project will block future western/southern facing solar panels;</p> <p>(k) increase of traffic;</p> <p>(l) project will have huge detrimental impact on Grass Lake Village;</p> <p>(m) increase of children-no place to play;</p>	<p>(a) <i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 7(g);</p> <p>(b) <i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 2(c);</p> <p>(c) A geotechnical report is on file with the City. The soils type is Alderwood Gravelly sandy loam;</p> <p>(d) An erosion control plan will be implemented as part of this Project. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion (or other impacts to the earth) include, but are not limited to, BMPs during construction, silt fence, inlet protection, construction entrance, and compost amendment and landscaping will be provided to any exposed soil after construction;</p> <p>(e) <i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 9(d). In addition, excavation is expected for the parking lot, swales, and building foundations (approximately 3,000 cubic yards). However, fill is not expected to be required. The entire site will have some grading, either fill or cut;</p> <p>(f) Construction equipment will have emissions equipment installed per EPA standards. Construction equipment will also avoid unnecessary idling. Finally, dust will be</p>

			<p>(n) repeated violations of municipal codes and zoning ordinances-disrespect for neighbors-does not trust applicant.</p>	<p>controlled by covering stockpiles, wheel washes, and watering roads;</p> <p>(g) The Project will be served by City sewer. Once the Project is completed, potential water contamination will be collected by the storm system and treated before infiltration onsite;</p> <p>(h) Stormwater will be collected, treated, and infiltrated onsite per the 2009 City of Olympia Stormwater Manual;</p> <p>(i) Trees will be preserved where feasible in the area on Lot 5 (denoted as “Landscaping &amp; Tree Retention (Open Space)” on the Binding Site Plan (dated Oct. 29, 2020));</p> <p>(j) The Project is estimated to be 32 feet in height. Moreover, there are no solar easements or similar restrictions on record burdening the Project site;</p> <p>(k) <i>See Responses to Comment Nos. 1, 2, and 3;</i></p> <p>(l) <i>See Response to Comment Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 7;</i></p> <p>(m) The Project proposal does not anticipate constructing facilities for children to play. Notably, the City is soliciting community input for its 2022-2028 Parks, Arts and Recreation Plan. More information about this process can be found here: <a href="https://olympiawa.gov/city-services/parks/opar-plans-and-studies/parks-arts-and-recreation-plan.aspx">https://olympiawa.gov/city-services/parks/opar-plans-and-studies/parks-arts-and-recreation-plan.aspx</a></p> <p>(n) <i>Applicant notes this comment.</i></p>
--	--	--	--	---



10	11.23.20	Sheryl Dorney	<p>(a) Project hard to follow-no response from City;</p> <p>(b) never given timely information by City planners-often no information given at all;</p> <p>(c) repeated violations of municipal codes and zoning ordinances;</p> <p>(d) EIS inaccurate, complete, and shoddy;</p> <p>(e) City bending over backwards for Rexius-ignoring residents.</p>	<p>(a) <i>Applicant notes this comment, but cannot speak to internal City procedures;</i></p> <p>(b) <i>Applicant notes this comment, but cannot speak to internal City procedures;</i></p> <p>(c) Applicant believes its Project proposal complies with all applicable state and local laws, rules, regulations, codes, and ordinances. City staff will review all Project application materials to determine compliance;</p> <p>(d) An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has not been prepared for the Project. An EIS is prepared when the lead SEPA agency determines that a proposal is likely to have significant environmental impacts. <i>See generally</i> Ch. 197-11 WAC;</p> <p>(e) <i>Applicant notes this comment but cannot speak to internal City procedures.</i></p>
11		W. Thomas Harlan	(a) traffic congestion in Grass Lake Village	<i>See Response to Comment Nos. 1, 2, and 3.</i>
12	11.23.20	Ruby Hartnett	(a) traffic congestion in Grass Lake Village	<i>See Response to Comment Nos. 1, 2, and 3.</i>
13	11.23.20	Dr. Katrina Meyer	<p>(a) traffic congestion in Grass Lake Village-egress more difficult;</p> <p>(b) project will create visual and noise disturbance</p>	<p>(a) <i>See Response to Comment Nos. 1, 2, and 3;</i></p> <p>(b) <i>See Response to Comment 8(c).</i></p>
14 15	11.23.20 08.14.19	Joyce Neas	(a) does not want to widen 3 <sup>rd</sup> Avenue taking away half of front yard and parking;	(a) <i>See Response to Comment 2(b);</i>

			<p>(b) tree removal without permit;</p> <p>(c) reiterates front yard and parking will be decreased;</p> <p>(d) more traffic;</p> <p>(e) quality of life and safe street will be gone;</p> <p>(f) apartment building too close to homes</p>	<p>(b) <i>Applicant notes this comment;</i></p> <p>(c) The Project would increase parking by adding 133 new on-site parking stalls. The existing 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW is not proposed to have any changes to the design of the street, meaning it will stay as existing. The City has parking standards that provide what the associated parking requirements are for certain uses.</p> <p>(d) <i>See Response to Comment Nos. 1 and 3.</i></p> <p>(e) <i>See Responses to Comment Nos. 1, 2, and 7;</i></p> <p>(f) The location of the Project is subject to City rules, regulations, and ordinance.</p>
16	11.23.20	Betty Rodriguez	Same as <b>10 above</b>	<i>See Response to Comment No. 10.</i>
17	11.23.20	Tony and Brenda Vacca	Same as <b>10 above</b>	<i>See Response to Comment No. 10.</i>
18	11.24.20	B. Egan	Does not oppose Project but coming thru Grass Lake Village is not right-remove berm on Harrison would solve problem.	<i>See Responses to Comment Nos. 1, 2, and 3.</i>
19	11.22.20	Virginia Doty	<p>(a) traffic through high-density family neighborhood dangerous, unconscionable-streets already too narrow-dangerous to children playing;</p> <p>(b) does not object to Project but not to detriment of neighborhood – use his own land to accomplish objective;</p>	<p>(a) <i>See Responses to Comment Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 7;</i></p> <p>(b) <i>Applicant notes this comment;</i></p> <p>(c) <i>Applicant notes this comment, but cannot speak to internal City procedures</i></p>

			(c) Project been in works for 4 years-City should not push through during COVID-public hearing necessary	
20		Raymond and Allne Fisette	(a) Object to use of 3 <sup>rd</sup> Ave and Craftsman Drive to enter and leave property – safety for children – roads are narrow, more difficult for homeowners to access their property	(a) <i>See Responses to Comment Nos. 1 and 3.</i>
21	11.24.20	Mary Morris	<p>Same as <b>9 above</b>, plus</p> <p>(o) dissatisfaction of community way Project has been handled-begun Project w/o authorization-knocked down private fence-harassed people living on 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave-accessed electricity thru neighbors' cable boxes;</p> <p>(p) traffic impact to 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave and Craftsman Dr;</p> <p>(q) need updated TIA;</p> <p>(r) more specific legal description of boundaries;</p> <p>(s) traffic during construction 8-5, but after completion of phase 1, includes restaurant, traffic will be into evening hours;</p> <p>(t) future development of Lot 1;</p> <p>(u) actual height of project-needs to be consistent throughout docs;</p> <p>(v) traffic light or roundabout at Harrison/Craftsman;</p> <p>(w) how many additional parking spaces;</p>	<p><i>See Response to Comment No. 9.</i></p> <p>(o) <i>Applicant notes this comment;</i></p> <p>(p) <i>See Responses to Comment Nos. 1 and 3;</i></p> <p>(q) <i>See Response to Comment No. 1;</i></p> <p>(r) Legal descriptions for the parcels are provided on the Binding Site Plan (dated Oct. 29, 2020);</p> <p>(s) <i>See Response to Comment No. 8(c).</i> Anticipated residential and commercial traffic impacts are considered in the Harrison Avenue Mixed-Use Traffic Impact Analysis (dated Dec. 1, 2020). <i>See Appendix: Trip Generation (Harrison Avenue Mixed-Use – Trip Generation Summary);</i></p> <p>(t) Plans for Lot 1 are depicted on the Binding Site Plan (dated Oct. 29, 2020);</p> <p>(u) The height of the project will be approximately 32 feet;</p> <p>(v) <i>See Response to Comment No. 3(c);</i></p>

			(x) impact on schools-school buses needed -pick-up and drop-off for children	(w) <i>See</i> Responses to Comment Nos. 2(b) and 14/15(c);  (x) RCW 28A.160.010 dictates that “[t]he operation of each local school district's student transportation program is declared to be the responsibility of the respective board of directors, and each board of directors shall determine such matters as which individual students shall be transported and what routes shall be most efficiently utilized except as provided in RCW 28A.160.240.”
22	11.24.20	Goldie Paquet	Same as <b>10 above</b>	<i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 10.
23	11.20.20	Tony and Brenda Vacca	(a) No objection to project or pedestrian /bicycle access to their street-streets too narrow; (b) object to commercial/ construction traffic; (c) remove median on Harrison-install traffic light.	(a) <i>See</i> Responses to Comment Nos. 1, 2, and 3; (b) <i>See</i> Responses to Comment Nos. 7 and 8; (c) <i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 1.
24	11.20.20	Dianne Witty	Same as <b>6 above</b>	<i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 6.
25		Patricia Yee	(a) Increase traffic causing unsafe conditions-change character of residential neighborhood-full capacity-streets too narrow;  (b) application does not meet OMC, EDDS, Drainage Design, Titles 14 and 18 and must conform to SEPA.	(a) <i>See</i> Responses to Comment Nos. 1, 3, and 7.  (b) Applicant believes the Project proposal complies with all applicable state and local laws, rules, regulations, codes, and ordinances. City staff will review all project application materials to determine compliance.
26	11.25.20	Lisa Quinn	Same as <b>10 above</b>	<i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 10.
27	11.25.20	Gabi Russell	Same as <b>10 above</b>	<i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 10.

**Public Comments Received November 26, 2020 thru December 29, 2020**

<b><u>No</u></b>	<b><u>Date of Comment</u></b>	<b><u>Name of Commenter</u></b>	<b><u>Comment</u></b>	<b><u>Applicant Response</u></b>
28	11.22.20	Virginia Doty	Duplicate – same as <b>19 above</b>	<i>See</i> Response to Comment No.19.
29	11.24.20	Reginald and Joan Lankford	Same as <b>10 above</b>	<i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 10.
30	11.23.20	Jean Roberts	(a) Strongly objects allowing community access;  (b) supports neighbors’ objections to Project.	(a) <i>See</i> Responses to Comment Nos. 1, 2, and 3;  (b) <i>See</i> Responses to Comment Nos. 1 – 34.
31	12.08.20	Julie Drennon	(a) Concerned traffic study was done during Covid lockdown-not accurate reflection of expected traffic during regular times;  (b) does not believe any car access via 3 <sup>rd</sup> Ave necessary since adequate access via Harrison	(a) Field data was collected and/or obtained from the City to determine baseline vehicular volumes in the study area. Intersection volumes have been derived from the City’s 2018 Synchro Network. All volumes have been adjusted via a two percent annual growth rate through 2020 to reflect baseline conditions. As no data were available for the Bark & Garden Center, turning movement counts were taken in October 2020. Moreover, to establish estimated trip generation demand as a result of the proposed development, data have been derived from the Institute of Transportation Engineer’s publication Trip

				<p>Generation, 10<sup>th</sup> Edition. More information about the data analyzed can be found in the Harrison Avenue Mixed-Use Traffic Impact Analysis (dated Dec. 1, 2020).</p> <p>(b) <i>See</i> Responses to Comment Nos. 1 and 3. Furthermore, the Harrison Avenue Mixed-Use Traffic Impact Analysis (dated Dec. 1, 2020) concludes that the intersection at 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW and Yauger Way is shown to currently operate with acceptable LOS A conditions with or without the proposed Project. 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW is a City classified local access roadway with a daily trip threshold of 500 trips. Currently, six residences exist along 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW, which generally translates into 10 trips/day for each unit, or 60 existing trips per day. As identified in the model, roughly 30 percent of primary trip traffic is expected to use 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NW, which accounts for 245 trips (815 daily trips x 30%). In total, approximately 305 daily trips are expected, which remains below the 500-trip threshold. However, given the increase in traffic, the City may require traffic calming devices based on the local access classification.</p>
32	11.13.20	Julie Drennon	Same as <b>2 above</b>	<i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 2.
33	12.08.20	Larry Kantor	<p>(a) Strongly objects to November 24 deadline for written comment-TIA not posted until December 2;</p> <p>(b) strongly urges re-opening written comment deadline to allow public to comment on TIA;</p>	<p>(a) <i>Applicant notes this comment but cannot speak to internal City procedures.</i></p> <p>(b) As the notice states, the City will continue allowing public comment up to the hearing. All comments received will be provided to the Olympia Hearing Examiner before the hearing,</p>

			(c) difference between “first comment period” and “accepting public comments up to public hearing; and City policy on public hearing re Covid?	<p>with an opportunity for public participation and testimony during the hearing itself.</p> <p>(c) <i>See</i> Response to Comment No. 33(b). As explained in Paula Smith’s email (dated Dec. 9, 2020), the “First Comment Period” is associated with getting initial comments from agencies and the public on a project. This allows City staff to receive those comments earlier on in the review process. But as the notice states, the City will continue allowing public comment up to the hearing. All comments received will be provided to the Olympia Hearing Examiner before the hearing, with an opportunity for public participation and testimony during the hearing itself.</p>
34	12.11.20	Maria O’Connor	<p>(a) 2018 Complaints - Rexius damaged her fence and removed tree-concerned his people entered her property without her authorization;</p> <p>(b) upset that solid waste enclosure proposed 14 feet from her home-smell, noise, frequency of trucks arriving/leaving-requests moving them to another location so not to cause damage to community;</p> <p>(c) opening more entrances requires careful and respectful consideration of needs of residents.</p>	<p>(a) <i>Applicant notes this comment;</i></p> <p>(b) Proposed solid waste enclosure will comply with all applicable local regulations, codes, and ordinances;</p> <p>(c) <i>See</i> Responses to Comment Nos. 1, 2, and 3.</p>