



E N G I N E E R S S U R V E Y O R S P L A N N E R S L A N D S C A P E A R C H I T E C T S

July 6, 2004

Ryan Larsen
Senior Planner/Project Manager
Snohomish County
3000 Rockefeller
Everett, WA. 98201

PFN - 04 112029 SD Panther Lake Ridge
Received - 07/06/2004



Project File Number: 04-112029
Project Name: Panther Lake Ridge
Project Description: 32 Lot Rural Cluster Subdivision
Tax Account Number: 280606-001-004-00

Mr. Larsen:

This submittal is to provide information and clarification of items addressed in the County response letter dated May 24, 2004. Please review the following comments and attached documents for approval of this subdivision.

Planner Comments: Project Manager: Ryan Larsen 425.388.3311 Ext. 2943

a) The wrong project file number appears on every sheet. Correct the file number to reflect the actual project file number (PFN 04-112029).

The PFN number has been added to the preliminary drawings and supporting documents.

b) The applicant is not clearly identified on the cover sheet. On a revised cover sheet, identify Cimarron West, LLC as the applicant for this project

The Owner/Applicant is Cimarron West LLC. This has been clarified on the Cover Sheet P1.0.

c) The cover sheet indicates the smallest lot size and average lot size as net area. However, the code simply calls for the smallest lot size and average lot size (gross area). Revise cover sheet accordingly.

The Development Data has been revised to reflect this.

d) Lot 15 buildable lot area appears to be a little tight. In order to avoid lot redesign in the future, provide PDS with information on how this lot will be built on with a singlefamily residence. It is the experience of this department, that lots with tight buildable areas have a high likelihood of being redesigned as the project moves forward.

Note that lots have been renumbered and Lot 15 is now Lot 18. The lot layout has been revised by shifting the cul-de-sac southerly. This allows more buildable area for Lot 18 (previously Lot 15).

e) Shared driveways are not allowed for subdivision applications, therefore Lot 27 and Lot 28 will need to be redesigned to meet this requirement. The code requires that each lot have at least 20-feet of direct access to an opened, constructed, and maintained public road. Refer to Chapter 30.34.052(1) and 30.41A.210.

Note that Lots 27 and 28 have been renumbered to Lots 30 and 31. Lots 30 and 31 (previously Lots 27 and Lot 28) have been revised to have at least 20' of frontage at the proposed plat road.

f) The rural cluster subdivision ordinance allows for a maximum of 30 residential lots per cluster (30.41 C.200(11)). Based on the design presented it appears that there are 31 lots within one of the clusters (Lot 1 through Lot 31). Provide PDS with justification on Lot 1 through Lot 31 is to be considered more than one cluster.

The proposed subdivision now contains three clusters, lots 1 - 29, lots 30 - 31, and lot 32.

g) On sheet P.6 show the existing well (if any) and the existing septic system for the existing House.

These features are now shown for the existing house.

h) The open detention pond will need to be landscaped to meet the requirements of a Type A landscaping buffer per Chapter 30.25.023 (See Chapter 30.25.017 for Type A landscaping requirements). The landscaping plan will need to be revised to meet this requirement.

The landscaping plans have been revised to meet Type A buffers. Please refer to L1 and L2 for more information.

i) The proposed preliminary plat maps does not identify any of the open space as restricted open as required by the rural cluster subdivision ordinance. Revise the preliminary plat map to show the restricted open space and the square footage contained in that tract.

Open space has been revised.

j) Snohomish County considers a cluster to be two or more lots. Lot 32 is a cluster of one which would not meet this clustering requirement of two or more lots. At the time of next submittal either demonstrate how this lot is considered to be clustered by its self or provide another lot adjacent to Lot 32.

Chapter 30.41C does not specifically exclude a one lot cluster. Also, in this particular case, it would be difficult to add more lots to this area of the proposed plat. The access for the existing house is at the southwest corner from 151st Ave. SE. 151st Ave. SE is not a public road and the existing house does not have legal access from 151st Ave. SE, but has an easement by use. Legal access is from the north through a 60 foot wide easement. There is an existing gravel road approximately 10 feet wide extending through the easement, onto the property, across and through environmentally sensitive areas, as shown. This easement is usable for access, but would be difficult to upgrade to serve more than one residence without greatly impacting the existing wetland. In other words, development of this portion of the site beyond one lot, as proposed, is prohibitive because of access and environmental concerns. Ann Goetz did note on the Presubmittal Conference Review Form that Lot 32 proposes to keep the existing access via 151st Ave SE and that requirements would be determined by review.

k) The minimum buffering requirements from adjacent property is 50-feet per table under 30.41 C.210(1). The proposed design shows several locations where the buffer is 35-feet. The only allowance for the 35-foot buffer would be if the project had at least 75 percent of the lots one acre in size or greater. This project clearly does not meet this. Revise all plans to show the buffers at least 50-feet in width.

The buffers between adjacent properties and the proposed lots have been revised to be at least 50' wide.

l) At the time of next submittal, an open space management plan will be required. It appears that the original submittal did not include this management plan, which is a requirement of the rural cluster subdivision ordinance (30.41 C.200(10)).

An Open Space Management Plan has been prepared by the Client and is included with this submittal package.

m) At the time of next submittal, provide justification on how this project meets the requirements of 30.41C.200(15). More specifically this section states, "individual clusters shall not be located on ridgelines and other prominent topographical features visible to adjacent and vicinity properties when other locations are available." It appears that the project could utilize the area around the existing house to better meet the intent of this section.

The proposed layout was developed based on the topographic features, such as steep slopes, wetlands, and power lines. The ridge line is the only usable area to place the lots. The majority of the land to the west of the proposed building sites is considered environmentally sensitive or contain the Bonneville Power Administration easement for existing power lines. Please refer to Decision of the deputy Hearing Examiner for the proposed rural cluster plat of Estates at Hidden Creek II, PFN 02-106118. The Findings of Fact, 5.E.iii, states, "Each cluster within the subdivision shall be located near the interior of the site, *if feasible*, and also located where the cluster and/or building sites are within existing forested areas of the site; except individual clusters shall be sited as far as possible from adjacent natural resource lands as permitted in chapters 30.32A-30.32C SCC. Individual clusters shall not be located on ridgelines and other prominent topographic features visible to adjacent and vicinity properties *when other locations are available.*" (Emphasis is per HER). The Hearing Examiner went on to grant preliminary approval to this proposed plat on a ridge because of the same types of constraints facing the instant application. In this particular project, the applicant proposes to keep a vegetative screen, including existing trees, to screen the proposed building sites from adjoiners.

Development around the existing house is restricted by access and environmental concerns. Refer to my comments to item "j)" above.

Drainage Comments: Reviewer: Ken Crossman 425.388.3311 Ext. 2227

a) Please provide a geotechnical report addressing the impacts to the wetlands from the interception of ground water. Specifically address the hydro period of the wetland.

A Geotechnical Report is provided with this submittal. This report addresses the hydro period of the wetland.

b) Please address the impacts of interception of groundwater on the functioning of the detention facility. The pond will need to be enlarged if groundwater interception is anticipated.

Groundwater was not encountered during test explorations. There is additional dead storage available above that amount required for Wet Pond functionality.

c) It appears the surface water flow arrows are pointing in the wrong direction on tier of lots 20 thru 28 on the targeted drainage plan.

The surface water flow arrows shown on C4-0 are correct. The ridgeline consists of a series of small hills and dales that cause existing surface water flow in numerous directions. There were

surface water flow arrows shown on C3-0 that were incorrect. They are not required to be shown on this sheet and have been removed.

Biologist Comments: Reviewer: Patrick McGraner 425.388.3311 Ext. 2745

a) There is no way for PDS to verify the accuracy of the proposed NGPA boundary for Tract 994 because Wetland F was not flagged in the field for verification. Field staff reported that the map appears to generally reflect the location and the shape of Wetland F and may be accurate but staff cannot make a determination on the accuracy of the wetland buffer/Tract 994 boundary line without wetland flag verification. This wetland needs to be flagged in the field for verification.

Wetland F was not flagged by a biologist. I have attended at least two Presubmittal Conferences where it was decided that wetland flagging may not be required because the proposed protection and buffering greatly exceeded the requirements listed in SCC 30.62.310. In this particular case, protection and buffering of Wetland F exceed those requirements. A site visit by the staff biologist will confirm this. The west line of the BPA easement has been staked and the west line of proposed NGPA Tract 994 has been flagged and accurately located on the proposed plat.

b) Two wetlands were not identified in the field or on the site plan map. The Category 3 wetland that lies on the western side of 163^d Avenue SE to the north of the proposed access road needs to be flagged in the field for verification and accurately depicted on the submitted site plan. The other wetland lies to the west of proposed Lots 16-19 partially within the power line easement and extending to the west beyond the power line easement. This wetland may be connected to Wetland F and therefore a Category 1 wetland or it may be a separate Category 3 wetland.

The wetland along 163rd Avenue SE has been located and now shows in the drawing set. The wetland west of the ridge will be incorporated into the NGPA areas. Therefore, it was not surveyed.

c) The Critical Areas Study and Wetland Mitigation Plan (CAS) prepared by Wetland Resources, Inc., dated April 20, 2004 adequately addresses most of the critical area issues associated with the proposed development but did not adequately address the presence/absence of fish use in the streams on site. A total of two sentences were devoted to fish use were found in the CAS. Both of these sentences were statements that claimed no fish use but without any supporting documentation or discussion. PDS has already received a letter from the Snohomish Sportsmen's Club dated May 14, 2004 that claims fish use by coho salmon and cutthroat trout immediately upstream of the site. Both coho salmon and cutthroat trout have reportedly been stocked in Stream C. Additional investigation is required to address this concern. The presence of coho in the stream or associated wetland system of Wetland C may necessitate the preparation and submittal of a Habitat Management Plan for bull trout.

Wetland Resources has performed research on the presence of fish in the stream. Please refer to their revised documents for more information.

d) The CAS did not address the stormwater outfall and level spreader that is proposed in the buffer of Wetland A.

Wetland Resources Inc has revised their work to address impacts associated with the level spreader discharge from the proposed detention pond. Please refer to their documents for more information.

e) Staff notes that proposed Lot 15 appears to be severely constrained by critical area buffer and setbacks from the buffer and the public roadway. The applicant may want to redesign this portion of the plat to allow additional room for a building envelope on Lot 15.

Note that lots have been renumbered and Lot 15 is now Lot 18. The lot layout has been revised by shifting the cul-de-sac southerly. This allows more buildable area for Lot 18 (previously Lot 15).

Public Works Comments: Reviewer: Andy Smith 425.388.6440

Access is proposed from 163rd Avenue SE. How is access given to Lot 32? Access must meet the requirements of 30.24. 052 SCC. On a revised preliminary plat show how access for Lot 32 is meeting this requirement.

Please refer to Planner Comments, item j. Access is shown on the proposed plat.

The access road to the development exceeds the minimum required grade of 12 percent for a subcollector. An approved deviation is required for this design. At time of next submittal, provide a deviation request.

The access road profile has been revised to not exceed 12% slope.

Access is proposed from 163rd Avenue SE across a 60 private easement. There is no indication on the plat whether the access road is to be private or public. If the road is to be public, then that portion of the road outside of the development will have to be made public through road establishment.

The access road will be located within a 60' wide public Right-of-Way dedicated to Snohomish County.

There are more than 25 lots on a dead end, which is not permitted per EDDS 3-01 (B)(4). An approved deviation is required for the current design as proposed. The access road to the development exceeds the minimum required grade of 12 percent for a subcollector. An approved deviation is required for this design.

Ann Goetz noted at the Presubmittal Conference that a deviation request is required if there are more than 25 lots on a dead end road, unless there is a viable stub provided to a property line. There is a viable stub to the south property line. Just to be on the safe side, we are including an EDDS Deviation Request with this submittal to allow for more than 25 lots to access a dead end street.

A voluntary offer, acceptable to the State, signed the applicant indicating their chosen method of fulfilling their mitigation requirement under the ILA, and is required prior to providing a final recommendation. A WSDOT offer from the applicant was received by PDS on April 20, 2004. Comments from WSDOT are required but haven't been received to date.

Noted.

County Fire Marshal Comments: Reviewer: Ron Tangen 425.388.3311 Ext. 2264

Snohomish County Code UDC 30.53A.115 defines a turnaround as a cul-de-sac having a driving surface with a minimum 40' outside radius. This proposal depicts a possibility that the access road will exceed 15% grade which is not acceptable.

The cul-de-sac meets County requirements. There is no proposed road grade steeper than 12%.