



To: Steve Morasch, representing the applicant
 From: Sarah Fox, Senior Planner
 Date: January 3, 2018
 RE: Dawson Ridge Subdivision (File #SUB17-02)

CITY'S RESPONSE TO APPLICANT EMAILS DURING PERIOD 12/28 TO 1/3

APPLICANT	CITY RESPONSE
<p>[Exhibit 79] From: Steve C. Morasch Sent: Friday, December 29, 2017 3:37 PM To: Robert Maul</p> <p>1. Given the specific circumstances of this application and without creating a precedent for geohazard areas to be placed in easements under other circumstances: City agrees that the geotechnical hazard setback on lots 8, 9 and 31-34 will have a recorded easement restricting use to fencing, landscape and patios. Any future change in the language of the easement will require city approval based on additional geotechnical reports that support other uses. The easement will be enforced by the Dawson's Ridge HOA. Temporary warning signs will be put up on each affected lot along the setback. This should resolve the issue relating to geohazard areas.</p>	<p>The city agrees in this specific case and in consultation with our geotechnical consultant that certain lots within this development, which have unique site specific conditions (e.g. existing access road) could be developed with an easement over their back yards and restrictive notes on the plat. Lots 8, 9 and 31-33 could include an easement over their back yards, only if the building setbacks are adjusted outside of those areas.</p> <p>The city continues to assert that Lots 10 and 34 should not be burdened with geohazard limitations for such small areas (Refer to Figures in Exhibit 78), as these lots can and should be adjusted to be outside of the hazard setback areas.</p>
<p>2. At the December 18th meeting with yourself, Pete Capell and David Lugliani. It was determined that there was not a suitable viewpoint on the Dawson's Ridge subdivision site. The picture in your December 27 response was taken off site from tax lot 127174000. At the meeting David Lugliani offered to sell the property to the city under threat of condemnation.</p> <p>Therefore: In lieu of the City's requested condition relating to a view analysis at the bottom of page 2 of the staff response dated December 27, 2017, there would be a new condition added requiring the applicant to sell 2.5 acres of tax lot 127174000 for an off site viewpoint (SU-11) and construct the viewpoint. The sale will be under threat of condemnation. The viewpoint will be accessed from McIntosh Rd via the existing driveway which will connect with trail T11. The existing gate will be removed and bollard installed. City shall issue PIF credits in lieu of cash at fair market value for land and improvements. The applicant will also remove the large fir tree in picture obscuring view. The City will design the viewpoint and submit under separate approval from this application. The applicant will commence construction of the viewpoint within 180 days of such approval weather dependent. This obviates the need for a view analysis and satisfies the issue relating to the viewpoint (SU11). There shall be no delay in engineering review or approval with regard to SU11 as suggested in staff response.</p>	<p>As discussed in the city's letter (Exhibit 78), a View Analysis will be required for this development.</p> <p>At this time, the city is not prepared to discuss purchasing terms of adjacent property, which is not considered part of this development.</p>

APPLICANT	CITY RESPONSE
<p>3. I understand the city is willing to support 40% lot coverage. We would still request equal treatment to Parklands with the same size lots and 50% coverage to promote ADU and ADA uses. The additional lot coverage will support the City's goals of facilitating ADA and ADU lots.</p>	<p>The city would agree to an increase to the lot coverage standards, only to promote the comprehensive plan goal of providing more housing options. In this particular single family development, the city would support a 40% lot coverage maximum for those lots that construct an ADU or home that meets ADA standards, otherwise all lots will be subject to the density transfer standard of the R-15 zone, which is 35%. A plat note would specifically state this provision.</p>
<p>4. Finally, the city has made it a condition to build T11 in the open space tract bordering the creek and wetland along McIntosh as shown in attached exhibit. Kevin Grosz with the resource company states "It is my opinion that the 10-foot wide asphalt trail which provides multiple human activities (walking, biking, and horseback riding) will functionally isolate the buffer." We can submit this additional statement from Kevin Grosz for the record. Therefore we request that lot 39 remain as proposed since there is no buffer impact. Because the trail borders lots and the underground storm facility the same argument applies to city required fencing.</p>	<p>The city has not received a revised critical area report to review and evaluate in regard to Lot 39.</p> <p>However, the critical area buffers were not the only concern that was raised by the city. Lot 39 requires a 15-foot high retaining wall that would be highly visible to vehicular and pedestrians along McIntosh Road (Refer to Section 6 of the Staff Report, page 14).</p>
<p>[Exhibit 80] From: Kurt Stonex Sent: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 4:04 PM To: Robert Maul</p> <p>Robert, Here's the revised layout. If the 80' width is utilized to establish the front setback a typical pie shaped culdesac lot won't provide enough lot depth. The only way to make it work was to create a flag lot.</p>	<p>The city can support the revised cul-de-sac layout.</p>
<p>[Exhibit 81] From: Steve C. Morasch Sent: Tuesday, January 02, 2018 4:43 PM To: Robert Maul</p> <p>Robert, In addition to the four issues from last Friday, will the City agree that Lot 39 can remain as it is currently proposed because (1) the wetland and riparian critical areas are functionally isolated from Lot 39 by the path, so they do not need to be in a tract, and (2) a stormwater easement is neither a "lot access" nor "critical area" and therefore no tract is required. Alternatively, will the City support a reduction in lot size for Lots 37-39 of approximately 4,213 square feet under (2,054 square feet of stormwater area and 2,159 square feet of wetland/riparian habitat) under Section 18.09.060.D, which allows additional flexibility in a density transfer subdivision where, as here, a tract includes one-half acre or more of contiguous acreage? Please let me know if the City will agree to one of these two alternatives.</p>	<p>This email (Exhibit 81) did not include a drawing, and for that reason, staff is unclear as to the proposal.</p> <p>However, as noted in the city's letter (Exhibit 78, page 2), we can support a lot size range for Lots 37-39 that is consistent with the R-12 density transfer standard.</p>