

NOTICE OF LAND USE DECISION SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW & DESIGN REVIEW Tolt Villas

Date:	January 31, 2022	
Permit Request:	Site Development Review, Design Review	
File No:	SPR-20-0001 & DR-20-0001	
Applicant:	Shane Fortney PO Box 522 Woodinville, WA 98072	
Property Owner:	Tolt Villas LLC PO Box 522 Woodinville, WA 98072	
Location:	Addresses associated with the property include: 4210 Tolt Avenue 4240 Tolt Avenue 31750 Tolt Avenue 21803 E Eugene St 4215 McKinley Avenue 31822 E Myrtle Street Assessor's Parcel Number: 8657300226 The subject site is bordered by Tolt Avenue, E Eugene Street, McKinley Avenue, and E Myrtle Street.	
Proposal:	The proposal includes construction of 43 new residential dwelling units. The 43 units are spread over 14 buildings, with nine live- work units along Tolt Avenue and 34 townhouse units. Associated development includes frontage improvements along all public streets, open space, parking, pedestrian infrastructure, and new interior access alleys.	
Decision:	Approve with Conditions	
SEPA:	The Responsible Official for the City of Carnation issued a Mitigated Determination of Non-significance (MDNS) for this proposal on July 26, 2021 pursuant to WAC 197-11-350.	
Appeal Procedure:	The applicant for a project permit, owner of property to which a project permit decision is directed, and/or any other person aggrieved or adversely affected by the decision on a Type I or II permit may appeal a final decision by filing an appeal for an open record appeal hearing before the Hearing Examiner. Said appeal must be filed within fourteen (14) calendar days following the date of issuance of said notice of decision. Pursuant to Section	

15.11.010 CMC, appeals and the appeal fee, if applicable, shall be
delivered to the planner or city clerk by mail or personal delivery
before the close of business on the last day of the appeal period.
Therefore, any notice of appeal must be filed with the City of
Carnation Planning Department at 4621 Tolt Avenue, Carnation,
Washington, by 4:30 P.M. on February 14, 2022 and must be
accompanied by a filing fee of \$750. The statement of appeal
shall identify the decision being appealed, the grounds for appeal,
and the facts upon which the appeal is based.

I. Description of Proposal

The applicant is proposing to construct a mixed-use development consisting of 43 new residential dwelling units. The 43 units are spread over 14 buildings with nine live-work units along Tolt Avenue and 34 townhouse units. Associated development includes frontage improvements along all public streets, open space, parking, pedestrian infrastructure, and new interior access alleys.

The project site occupies an entire city block bounded by Tolt Avenue, E Eugene Street, McKinley Avenue, and E Myrtle Street. Proposed vehicular access will be through internal alleys via three alley entrances – one along Myrtle Street and two along McKinley Avenue. Parking facilities consist of uncovered parking and private garages, and all on-site parking is accessed through the alleys. Pedestrian access includes new sidewalks along all public streets along the site's frontage, as well as internal pedestrian paths both serving common areas as well as individual unit entrances. The three live-work buildings (Buildings A, B, and C) as well as five of the townhouse buildings (Buildings D, E, M, N, and P) at the site's perimeter have main entrances facing the public streets, while six townhouse buildings more interior to the site (Buildings F, G, H, J, K, and L) have main entrances facing an internal east-west pedestrian path and common open space that connect to McKinley Avenue to the east and the central plaza to the west. Additionally, there are two north-south pedestrian paths providing mid-block pedestrian access through the site, one located along the back side (east) of the live-work buildings, and one that runs through the townhouse buildings. Both north-south paths provide connections to Eugene Street to the north and Myrtle Street to the south.

All of the proposed buildings are two stories. The live-work units are designed to enable future potential conversion to a non-residential use, and as a result, are designed with storefronts on the ground floor, minimum floor-to-ceiling height of 13 feet, and minimum depth of 20 feet. Parking and open space for residents of the live-work units will be shared in common facilities for these purposes. Uncovered shared parking is provided in the linear parking area east of these buildings, with additional uncovered parking distributed throughout the site. Open space for the live-work units is provided in three common plazas and landscaped areas along Tolt Avenue – one to the south and east of Building A, one between Building B and C, and one to the north and east of Building C. A trash enclosure to the east of Building B would serve all three live-work buildings. The townhouse buildings are entirely residential in character and feature private one or two-car garages, with private entry porches that serve as private open space.

The applicant has expressed an intent to pursue a Unit Lot Subdivision separately from the Site Development Review and Design Review application, to allow all units to be sold individually, and has indicated that there will be a future Homeowners Association to maintain the common areas and facilities.

Future permits required:

- The applicant has expressed intent to pursue a Unit Lot Subdivision to enable each unit to be sold individually.
- Construction permits may include, but are not limited to: building permits, mechanical permit, plumbing permit, fire permit, clearing and grading permit, drainage review, side sewer installation, water installation, and right-of-way permit. All future permitting must be consistent with the standards of the MU (Mixed Use) zone.

II. Background

Project History:

The applicant submitted an initial application proposing 43 residential units, and requested a Development Agreement to reduce the number of required on-site parking spaces. A modified application was subsequently submitted for the same development proposal of 43 residential units, eliminating the Development Agreement component from the initial proposal and providing all parking on site as required. The project history for both the initial and modified applications are provided below.

Initial Application

- Application Submittal: June 26, 2020
- Determination of Complete Application: July 17, 2020
- Notice of Application and SEPA Likely Determination of Non-Significance Mailed to Property Owners Within 300 Feet: July 30, 2020
- Notice of Application and SEPA Likely Determination of Non-Significance Published in the Snoqualmie Valley Record: July 31, 2020

Modified Application

- Modified Application Submittal: August 7, 2020
- Notice of Notice of Modified Application Mailed to Property Owners Within 300 Feet: August 20, 2020
- Notice of Modified Application Published in the Snoqualmie Valley Record: August 21, 2020
- Notice of Modified Application Re-mailed to Property Owners Within 300 Feet: September 17, 2020
- Notice of Modified Application Re-published in the Snoqualmie Valley Record: September 18, 2020
- Notice of Modified Application Notice Board Posting: September 17, 2020

Site Description:

The subject property is the city block bounded by Tolt Avenue, E Eugene Street, McKinley Avenue, and E Myrtle Street (assessor's parcel number 8657300226). The property is currently vacant, and pre-existing buildings (four single-family residences, one commercial building, and one City Public Works shop building) have been demolished. Surrounding uses include:

North: vacant land

East: residential apartments and single-family detached residences South: single-family detached residence, residential fourplex, and a service building West: various commercial uses (strip shopping center, self-storage facility) and vacant property

The subject property is flat and located in a developed area south of the downtown core. There are no mapped critical areas on site or within 200 feet of the subject property, and the letter from Re-Align Environmental dated December 6, 2019 confirms that there are no wetlands and streams on the property that would be subject to critical area regulations. The subject property is not located within the shoreline jurisdiction or flood hazard zone.

The subject property is zoned MU (Mixed Use) with a Comprehensive Plan land use designation of Medium Intensity Commercial. Zoning for adjacent properties include MU to the south, SC (Service Commercial) to the west, CBD (Central Business District) to the north, and R24 (Residential 24) and MU to the east. The proposed use is allowed in the MU zone and is subject to the Carnation Design Standards and Guidelines. The Medium Intensity Commercial Comprehensive Plan land use designation allows both residential and commercial uses, with the MU zone intended to create a buffer between the commercial and residential areas.

Agency Review and Comments:

The proposed development has been reviewed by the Building Official/Building Plans Examiner, City Engineer, Public Works Supervisor, and Fire Marshal, and applicable conditions of approval are included in Section IV Decision below.

Public Comments:

The initial Notice of Application and SEPA Likely Determination of Non-Significance was issued on July 31, 2020 with a comment period ending on August 14, 2020. The Notice of Modified Application was subsequently issued on August 21, 2020 with a comment period ending on September 4, 2020 pertaining only to the Site Development Review and Design Review applications, as the comment period for the SEPA Likely Determination of Non-Significance ended on August 14, 2020. A second Notice of Modified Application was issued on September 18, 2020 with a comment period ending on October 2, 2020.

A total of six public comments were received for this proposal, including:

• Adam Osbekoff, Snoqualmie Indian Tribes Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP), email dated July 30, 2020. The commenter requests the opportunity for Snoqualmie Indian Tribes DAHP to be on site during ground disturbing activities.

This request has been incorporated as a mitigation measure in the Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance (MDNS) that was issued for the proposed project.

• Peter Alm, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Northwest Region Development Services, email dated August 4, 2020. The commenter requests WSDOT review and approval of any pavement or channelization on SR 203.

The request has been incorporated as condition 28.

 Stephanie Lundeen, letter dated August 18, 2020 and received August 20, 2020. The commenter expresses support for the proposed development, including the proposed pedestrian infrastructure and diversification of housing. The commenter requests that some of the trees be preserved and that the design maintains the craftsman aesthetic of the town.

Three significant trees throughout the project site are proposed to be retained. The project's architectural style isn't craftsman, but does draw from building forms and elements common to early 20^{th} century Carnation structures.

• Kevin Crutchfield, email dated September 1, 2020. The commenter requests retention of a sequoia tree along Tolt Avenue.

The giant sequoia tree along Tolt Avenue is proposed to be retained as part of the proposed project.

 Jules Hughes, email dated September 4, 2020. The commenter expresses support for the proposed architectural design, residential density, orientation of the townhouse units, and landscape amenities and design. The commenter requests saving mature trees where possible, especially the walnut and sequoia, and if it would be possible to retain more trees along the site's perimeter. The commenter also discusses the following topics: evaluation of preserving the existing house on the property, housing affordability, acknowledging the history of the site, the design and location of the trash enclosure, and typographical errors on the plan set.

Three significant trees throughout the project site are proposed to be retained, including an English walnut and giant sequoia. All three are located at the site's perimeter. Preservation of the existing houses was infeasible due to their dilapidated conditions. The proposed trash enclosure location has been approved by Recology, the City's solid waste service provider.

• Kevin Crutchfield, email dated October 2, 2020. The commenter requests saving the sequoia tree along Tolt Avenue, designing the storefronts along Tolt Avenue to fit within Carnation's small-town character, and for additional parking to be provided.

The giant sequoia tree along Tolt Avenue is proposed to be retained as part of the proposed project. The ground floor of the live-work buildings are designed as storefronts and would fit with Carnation's small town character. The number of parking spaces as proposed meets the parking required per CMC 15.72.

III. Analysis – Findings and Conclusions

Criteria for Approval:

The proposal must be consistent with the following applicable codes and documents:

- City of Carnation Comprehensive Plan
- City of Carnation Municipal Code, Title 15 CMC
- Site Development Review (CMC Chapter 15.18)
- Design Review (CMC Chapter 15.18)
- City of Carnation Design Standards and Guidelines
- SEPA (CMC Chapter 14.04)
- City of Carnation Street and Storm Sewer System Standards
- City of Carnation Water and Sewer Technical Standards

The following is an analysis of the proposal for consistency with the applicable codes and documents, with findings and conclusions.

1. City of Carnation Comprehensive Plan

Findings: The Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan indicates that the Medium Intensity Commercial land use designation includes the MU zone, and the purpose of the MU zone is to create a buffer between commercial and residential areas.

The subject property is zoned MU (Mixed Use) which is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Medium Intensity Commercial land use designation.

Conclusions: The MU zone allows for residential uses consistent with this proposal. Compliance with the standards for the MU zoning designation and Design Standards and Guidelines will ensure consistency with the Carnation Comprehensive Plan.

2. City of Carnation Municipal Code, Title 15 CMC

CMC Chapter 15.36 – Zoning Districts

Findings: CMC 15.36.010.C establishes that the MU zone is designed to accommodate "a mixture of certain, limited residential uses, office uses and commercial uses...as a transition zone between commercial and residential uses."

The proposed mixed multi-family development consisting of live-work and townhouse units are uses at a scale that is appropriate for the neighborhood just outside of the downtown core.

Conclusions: The proposed development is consistent with the intent of the MU zone.

CMC Chapter 15.40, Table 1: Table of Permissible Uses

Findings: As shown in CMC Chapter 15.40, Table 1, multifamily residences and townhouses are listed as a permitted use in the MU zone. A footnote 4 in Table 1 requires these uses fronting on Tolt Avenue to provide ground floors that are constructed for future potential

conversion to non-residential uses. This design criteria includes ground level building frontages at least 20 feet deep and containing a minimum floor-to-ceiling height of 13 feet.

The proposed development includes multi-family units that are designed as live-work units along Tolt Avenue, and are permitted on the subject property. The nine live-work units along Tolt Avenue located in Buildings A, B, and C have ground floor frontages that are at least 20 feet deep with a 13-foot floor-to-ceiling height and are designed with commercial storefronts to give these buildings a more commercial character and enable future potential conversion to non-residential uses.

Conclusions: The proposed project complies with the use provisions in the MU zone.

CMC Chapter 15.48 – Density and Dimensional Requirements

Findings: The minimum lot dimensional standards, setback requirements, building height limits, and the maximum allowed impervious surface percentage for the MU zone are as listed in the table below:

	Required in MU Zone	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size (sq. ft.)	2,500	Gross Lot Size: ±105,788 sf
Residential Density (units per net acre)	Minimum: 12 units/net acre (24 units)	Net Lot Size: ±88,000 sf (2.02 net acres)
	Maximum: 24 units/net acre (48 units)	21.3 units/net acre (43 units)
Minimum Lot Width (feet)	25′	±338′
Maximum Impervious Surface	80%	±76%
Maximum Building Height (feet)	35′	Varies between 25'-4" to 32'-9"
Building Setback Requirements Minimum Distance, in feet, from:		
Front Yard (Tolt Ave)	0 Garages must be set back 20 feet from the front property line	4′-0″
Side Yard lot-line: street (Eugene St, McKinley Ave, Myrtle St)	0	Eugene St: 7'-2" McKinley Ave: 10'-0" Myrtle St: 6'-2"
Rear Yard	20' or 20% of lot, whichever is smaller	N/A

The proposed site plan complies with the minimum lot size, allowable range of residential density, minimum lot width, maximum impervious surface, maximum building height, and building setbacks.

The site plan shows the proposed setbacks. Given that the site occupies an entire city block and is bounded by public streets on all sides, staff has determined that the "front" lot line would be Tolt Avenue as it is the most prominent street, and the "street side" lot lines are those along E. Eugene Street, McKinley Avenue, and Myrtle Street would constitute "side" lot lines. This is consistent with the intent in Table I Density and Dimensional Standards in CMC Chapter 15.48 which shows the setbacks for lot lines along streets is treated differently from lot lines that are interior to the block. For this reason, a rear lot line does not exist and the associated rear yard setback is not applicable. Although no setbacks are required from the front and street side lot lines, the proposed project does provide setbacks of four to ten feet from the public streets. The garage setback requirement as it applies to the front setback is intended to ensure the safety of vehicles backing out of garages onto the public street. As such, all garages accessed from public streets must be set back a minimum of 20 feet to allow drivers to view oncoming traffic. The proposed site plan does not have any garages backing out onto the public street, all garages are accessed through the internal alleys. The proposed project meets all setback requirements.

The maximum allowable height in the MU zone is 35 feet. The proposed project consists of two-story buildings with a combination of flat and gable roofs. Height is measured differently for different roof styles. For flat roofs, building height is measured from the mean finished grade to the highest roof beams. For gable roofs, building height is measured from the mean finished grade at the front of the building to the mid-point between the ridgeline and the eaves. The proposed building heights range from approximately 25'-4" to 32'-9", with the livework buildings being taller than the townhouse buildings. The proposed project meets the 35-foot height limit.

The maximum allowed impervious surface coverage is 80% and the proposal would result in impervious surface coverage of approximately 76%. The proposed project meets the impervious surface coverage limit.

The MU zone has a minimum density of 12 units and a maximum density of 24 units, per net acre. The entire property is calculated for density. A net acre excludes any space that would not be factored into computing minimum lot size, such as right-of-way and open space tracts. The net lot size which excludes the proposed internal alleys is approximately 88,000 square feet, and the proposed 43 residential units will result in a density of 21.3 units per net acre, which complies with both the minimum and maximum density requirements.

Conclusions: The proposal complies with setback, building height, impervious surface coverage, and density standards. The proposal meets all applicable density and dimensional requirements in the MU zone.

CMC Chapter 15.72 – Parking

Findings: This chapter outlines vehicular and bicycle parking requirements.

• CMC Chapter 15.72 Table VI, the Table of Parking Requirements, both multi-family residences and townhouses are required to adhere to multi-family parking requirements, which is based on the number of bedrooms. For a fractional space, section 15.72.010.C states that "any fraction of one-half or less may be disregarded, while a fraction in excess of one-half shall be counted as one parking space."

The applicant proposes a total of 92 on-site parking spaces, with spaces either enclosed within private garages or shared and uncovered. The number of required and proposed parking spaces are summarized in the following table:

Bedrooms per Unit	Number of Units	Parking Spaces Required
1	1	1 per unit plus 1 per 4 units
		1.25 spaces required for 1 unit
2	8	1.5 per unit plus 1 per 4 units
		14 spaces required for 8 units
3	34	2 per unit plus 1 per 4 units
		76.5 spaces required for 34 units
Total Spaces Required		92 spaces
Total Spaces Provided		92 spaces

• CMC 15.72.120 Bicycle parking standards requires 1 space per 6 vehicular parking spaces for the live-work buildings and 1 space per five dwelling units for the townhouse buildings, for a minimum of 10 bicycle parking spaces. The site plan shows a total of two bicycle racks each accommodating four bicycles, for a total of eight bicycle parking spaces. The proposal is 2 bicycle parking spaces short of meeting the minimum requirement.

Conclusions: The proposal complies with minimum vehicular parking requirements. Condition 60 has been added for compliance with bicycle parking requirements.

CMC Chapter 15.76 – Landscaping

Findings: This chapter outlines required landscape planting locations and materials for new developments.

The applicant submitted a landscape concept as part of the site development review and design review applications. Compliance with the landscape requirements will occur with the review of detailed landscape plans as part of the civil permits.

As the project site occupies an entire city block and is bounded by public streets, the proposed development is exempt from perimeter landscaping requirements per CMC 15.76.040 that are intended to buffer and/or screen non-single-family residential uses from abutting uses.

The proposed development is subject to the following landscape provisions in CMC Chapter 15.76:

• CMC 15.76.045 Landscape requirements for parking lots prescribes internal landscaping for surface parking lots containing 10 or more parking spaces.

The proposed site plan includes a small, linear, uncovered parking lot consisting of 22 parking spaces immediately to the east of the live-work buildings (Buildings A, B, and

C). Parking spaces are arranged to ensure that there are no more than eight parking spaces in a row without a landscape bed to break up the areas dedicated to surface parking. Approximately 1,800 square feet of landscape beds surround these parking spaces and meets the requirement to have at least 15 square feet of landscape area per parking space. The landscape beds also contain a total of five new trees, which well satisfies the requirement to have at least one tree for every six parking spaces. Each parking space is designed with wheel stops to provide adjacent landscaping from vehicles. The proposed project meets the landscape requirements for parking lots.

• CMC 15.76.070 Requirements for planting materials

The proposal must meet all of the requirements listed in CMC 15.76.070 including, but not limited to, providing all new landscaping materials that include species native to the coastal region of the Pacific Northwest or non-invasive naturalized species that have adapted to the climatic conditions of the coastal region of the Pacific Northwest. Specifically, 75% of ground cover and shrubs and 50% of trees must be native species.

Compliance with these requirements will occur with the review of detailed landscape planting plans as part of the civil permits.

• CMC 15.76.080 Irrigation and maintenance requirements

The proposal is required to provide irrigation for new landscaped areas and comply with the maintenance assurance device (MAD) to ensure that landscaping will be installed and maintained for two (2) years.

Compliance with these requirements will occur with the review of detailed landscape irrigation plans as part of the civil permits.

• CMC 15.76.110 Retention and replacement of significant trees

Tree retention and replacement requirements in the MU zone differ between properties along Tolt Avenue and those not along Tolt Avenue. For properties along Tolt Avenue, there is no requirement to retain significant trees and therefore no tree replacement requirement. For properties not along Tolt Avenue, the tree retention requirement is 1 significant tree per 2,5000 square feet, and the tree replacement requirement is 1 new tree per 1 significant tree removed.

According to the Tree Inventory Report, there are a total of 27 significant trees on or near the project site, including six significant trees in the right-of-way fronting the site. The site plan indicates that all but three significant trees are proposed to be removed due to conflicts with the proposed development. The three trees proposed to be retained are all at the edges of the site, including:

- Tree #3, a 56-inch caliper Giant sequoia, located mid-block along Tolt Avenue;
- Tree #9, a 21-inch caliper Douglas fir, located at the corner of Myrtle Street and McKinley Avenue;
- Tree #19, a 55-inch caliper English walnut, located at the corner of Eugene Street and McKinley Avenue

The three significant trees proposed for retention are prominently visible along the public streets, and two trees in particular (trees #3 and 19) were requested to be retained in the project comments received.

The significant trees proposed to be removed pose conflicts with proposed site improvements, including proposed buildings, circulation facilities, frontage improvements, and would unreasonably burden the development if retained.

Given the size and configuration of the project site, staff has determined that the portion of the site containing the live-work buildings along Tolt Avenue would be subject to the tree retention requirements for properties along Tolt Avenue, while the portion of the site containing the townhouse buildings would be subject to the tree retention requirements for properties not along Tolt Avenue. Compliance with the tree retention and replacement standards are summarized in the table below.

Location	Tree Retention Requirement	Proposed
Along Tolt Avenue (Live-Work Component)	None	Significant trees to retain: 1 Significant trees to remove: 5 (includes 2 in the right-of-way)
		New trees proposed: 24 (includes 13 street trees)
Not Along Tolt Avenue (Townhouse Component)	1 significant tree per 2,500 square feet; replace at 1:1 ratio	Significant trees to retain: 2 Significant trees to remove: 19 (includes 3 in the right-of-way)
	80,510 sq.ft./2,500 sq.ft. = 32 trees	Replacement trees proposed: 57 (includes 20 street trees)

Additionally, the proposal is subject to the landscape requirements found in the Carnation Design Standards and Guidelines, which is discussed below.

Conclusions: The conceptual landscape and tree retention plans are generally consistent with the requirements for surface parking lot landscaping, planting materials, irrigation and maintenance, and tree retention and replacement requirements in CMC Chapter 15.76. Full compliance will be ensured through review of detailed landscape plans per conditions 55 and 56.

3. Site Development Review (CMC Chapter 15.18)

Findings: A Site Development Review is required for any new construction of four thousand or more square feet, excluding single-family dwellings (CMC Subsection 15.18.160.A.1.a). The proposed development is greater than 4,000 square feet; therefore, Site Development Review is required.

Conclusions: The site plan makes appropriate provisions for, but not limited to, the public health, safety, and general welfare related to dedication of rights-of-way or recreation space,

and tracts, easements, or limitations which may be proposed or required for utilities, access, drainage controls, sanitation and water supply. Further, the proposal meets the requirements of the applicable codes and ordinances which include, but are not limited to, the density and dimensional regulations for the MU zone (CMC 15.48); screening, landscaping, and trees (CMC 15.76); parking (CMC 15.72); and standards for streets and utilities (Street and Storm Sewer System Standards, Water and Sewer Technical Standards).

4. Design Review (CMC Chapter 15.18)

Findings: The design standards apply to all non-single-family development in MU zoned properties. The multi-family residential zones (CMC 15.18.250.A). Additionally, CMC 15.96.040 references the Carnation Design Standards and Guidelines as required for new multi-family projects in Carnation.

See Section 5 City of Carnation Design Standards and Guidelines below for compliance with applicable design criteria.

Conclusions: The subject property is situated within the MU zone and within the Design Overlay area shown in Figure 1 of the Carnation Design Standards and Guidelines. As a result, the project is subject to the requirement for design review.

5. City of Carnation Design Standards and Guidelines

The proposed development consists of a mix of multi-family live-work units and townhouse units. Buildings A, B, and C fronting along Tolt Avenue are designed as live-work units in compliance with CMC Chapter 15.40, with taller floor-to-ceiling heights and minimum building depths. In order to satisfy the intent to allow future potential conversion of these live-work units to non-residential uses, the live-work buildings would need to comply with the design criteria applicable to non-residential uses.

Section 1.1.1 – Building location and orientation for non-residential uses

Findings: Non-residential uses may be placed up to the end of the sidewalk only if they feature a pedestrian-oriented façade. Buildings not placed up to the sidewalk must feature landscaping or pedestrian-oriented space between the sidewalk and the building. This standard would apply only to the live-work buildings.

The proposed live-work buildings are set back from the edge of the sidewalk, and the setback areas are designed as pedestrian-oriented spaces. See Section 2.3.2 Pedestrian-oriented spaces below.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard by providing pedestrian-oriented spaces between the edge of sidewalk and the building.

Section 1.1.2 – Blank walls

Findings: Untreated blank walls visible from a public street or pedestrian pathway are prohibited. This standard would apply to the live-work and townhouse buildings.

All elevations for all buildings feature windows, doors, articulation or other detailing that do not result in any blank walls.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for blank walls.

<u>Section 1.1.5 – Building location and orientation for properties adjacent to Tolt Avenue, excluding properties between Eugene and Rutherford and Gateway Corridor properties</u> **Findings:** Parking lots and open storage of vehicles must be located to the side or rear of the building, and not between the building and Tolt Avenue. This standard would apply to the live-work and townhouse buildings.

All proposed parking is located away from Tolt Avenue, to the east of Buildings A, B, and C. There are no parking facilities located between the building and Tolt Avenue.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for the location of open parking facilities.

Section 1.1.6 – Multi-family residential buildings

Findings: Multi-family residential buildings must be oriented towards the street and must provide windows that face the street to provide "eyes on the street" for safety, or face onto a common open space that is oriented towards the street. This standard would apply only to the townhouse buildings.

The proposed townhomes along Eugene Street (Buildings D and E) and Myrtle Street (Buildings M, N, and P) have entrances facing the street. The block of townhomes towards the interior of the site (Buildings F, G, H, J, K, and L) have entrances facing a common open space along a pedestrian path that is accessed via McKinley Avenue, with the western terminus leading to the central plaza along Tolt Avenue between Buildings B and C. The pedestrian entrance to the open space at McKinley Avenue will feature a small plaza area with wayfinding signage, decorative landscape boulder, and a raised planter to enhance this as a prominent pedestrian entry point.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard by orienting buildings to face the public street or common open space that is oriented towards the street.

Section 1.2.1 – Sites over 2 acres

Findings: Large developments should take advantage of opportunities to create a connected circulation system, design buildings to complement adjacent activities and visual character, design landscaping and open space as a unifying feature, and incorporate screening, environmental mitigation, utilities, and drainage as a positive element. This standard would apply to the live-work and townhouse buildings.

As described in Section I Description of Proposal above, the proposed internal circulation system would provide vehicular and pedestrian connections to adjacent public streets. The proposed buildings are designed

The proposed live-work buildings and plazas along Tolt Avenue is consistent with the commercial character of this section of Tolt Avenue, while the design of the townhouses on

the eastern portion of the site complement the residential nature of uses along the side streets. Open space is well integrated into the site design and enhance both the site's function and aesthetics.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design guideline by creating a connected circulation system, integrated landscape and open space features, and designing the buildings to complement adjacent uses.

Section 1.3 – Service and storage elements

Findings: Trash enclosures and other service areas shall be screened from a public area, not including alleys. Enclosures should be made of masonry or ornamental metal or wood. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall not be visible from the street, public space, or ground level of adjacent properties. This standard would apply to the live-work and townhouse buildings.

A shared trash enclosure to serve the live-work buildings is located along the internal alley and not adjacent to a pedestrian-oriented space. The enclosure is seven feet tall, with hardieplank horizontal siding, a decorative metal pedestrian door, and a decorative metal gate. The enclosure would have landscaping along three sides to screen it from view. Solid waste management for the townhouse units will consist of residential carts for each unit that will be stored inside private garages.

Mechanical equipment consists primarily of heat pumps for individual units. For the live-work units, heat pumps are shown at the rear (east elevation) of the buildings. The heat pumps are not screened, and while they will be minimally visible from the public street, they are adjacent to pedestrian paths. Guideline 1.3.4 address the screening of roof-mounted equipment, and while no roof-mounted equipment is proposed, the intent is for all mechanical equipment to be located and/or screen to minimize their visibility. For the townhouse units, all heat pumps are proposed to be located within private porches, and would be either partially or fully screened from views from the street.

Conclusions: The proposal will need to be modified to ensure full compliance with this design standard. Condition 57 has been added to address necessary design changes to ensure compliance.

Section 2.1 – Sidewalks and pathways and Section 2.2 – Pedestrian network

Findings: Interior pathways must be of sufficient width to accommodate the anticipated number of users and at a minimum, walkways shall feature five feet of unobstructed width and meet the construction standards of CMC Chapter 12.06. This standard would apply to the live-work and townhouse buildings.

As described in Section I Description of Proposal above, proposed pedestrian paths provide north-south and east-west pedestrian connections to surrounding public streets. Where these paths are intersected by alleys, crosswalks are provided and design to provide a clear and safe path for the pedestrian to negotiate through.

All paved pedestrian paths throughout the site that serve multiple units and paths serving individual unit entrances have a minimum unobstructed width of five feet. The only pedestrian

paths that are not at least five feet wide are short paths leading to up to two uncovered parking spaces, and narrower paths in these locations are appropriate since these are not paths serving building entrances.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard by providing a connected network of pedestrian paths with sufficient unobstructed widths.

Section 2.3.2 Pedestrian-oriented spaces – all non-residential uses

Findings: The minimum amount of pedestrian-oriented space provided must be 1% of the lot area plus 1% of the non-residential building area. This standard would apply only to the live-work buildings.

Proposed pedestrian-oriented spaces are provided in three plazas as well as the areas between the back of sidewalk and the buildings, and are located in areas with significant potential pedestrian traffic. Elements provided in all pedestrian-oriented spaces include pedestrian access to abutting structures from the sidewalk or pedestrian path, paved walking surfaces, pedestrian-scaled lighting, seating, and landscaping. Additional pedestrian amenities in the plazas include the display of a piece of farm equipment, trellises, tables and chairs, and bike racks.

The only area without paved walking surfaces is the central plaza where a floating deck will be installed per the recommendation of the project arborist to minimize impacts to tree #3 (giant sequoia). Staff believes the use of the floating deck fulfills the intent to provide a hard surface while helping to preserve a prominent significant tree.

The amount of required seating for pedestrian-oriented spaces is 3 feet or one individual seat per 60 square feet of plaza area or open space. The proposed plans show sufficient seating to satisfy the overall requirement for all pedestrian-oriented spaces, but with more seating allocated in the central plaza and fewer in the south plaza. As proposed, the central plaza has 43 seats where 27 are required, and the south plaza has 27 seats where 37 are required. The applicant requests that the excess seats in the central plaza be credited towards required seating in the south plaza. Staff believes this reallocation of seating is appropriate given that the central plaza will likely experience incrementally more pedestrian activity due to its centralized location, as compared to the south plaza which is relatively more isolated. Such a reallocation still fulfills the intent of creating an inviting gathering space and encouraging pedestrian activity.

The proposal provides a total of 5,701 square feet of pedestrian-oriented spaces, which far exceeds the minimum required of 362.3 square feet. Calculations for the pedestrian-oriented space areas are as follows:

Minimum Required Pedestrian-Oriented Space	Proposed Pedestrian-Oriented Space
Live-work area: 25,300 sq.ft. 1% of 25,300 = 253 sq.ft.	North Plaza: 1,480 sq.ft.
	Central Plaza: 1,486 sq.ft.
Live-work combined building area: 10,928 sq.ft. 1% of 10,928 = 109.3 sq.ft.	South Plaza: 2,208 sq.ft.
253 sq.ft. + 109.3 sq.ft. = 362.3 sq.ft	Areas between sidewalk and
Minimum Required: 362.3 sq.ft.	building: 527 sq.ft.
	Total Proposed: 5,701 sq.ft.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for pedestrian-oriented spaces.

<u>Section 2.4.1 – Open space and recreation for residential uses – townhouses and other</u> <u>ground based multi-family residential units with individual exterior entries</u> **Findings:** Townhouses must comply with usable open space provisions in Standard 5.7. This standard would apply only to the townhouse buildings.

See Section 5.7 Townhouse design – usable open space below.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for usable open space for townhouses.

Section 2.5.1 – All primary building entries

Findings: Weather protection at least 4'-6" wide is required over all individual entries. This standard would apply to the live-work and townhouse buildings.

The live-work Buildings B and C have separate metal canopies over individual entries that are each at least 21 feet wide, and Building A has a covered porch area that is approximately 15 feet wide. All entries for townhouse units have covered entries that are integrated with the porch and spans the width of each unit, with widths that are approximately 18 to 20 feet.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for covered building entries.

Section 2.5.2 – All primary non-residential building entries

Findings: At least one additional pedestrian amenity is required to enhance building entries. This standard would apply only to the live-work buildings.

In addition to covered building entries, each of the entrances for the live-work units feature pedestrian-scaled lighting through downlights in the canopy and/or porch. Some of the entries have seat walls along the back of the sidewalk, although the seat walls appear to encroach into the public right-of-way, which is not allowed.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for pedestrian amenities to enhance building entries, although proposed seat walls must be relocated to ensure that they are not within the public right-of-way, and would be enforced through condition 58.

Section 3.1 – Access roads

Findings: Developments should provide a safe and convenient network of vehicular circulation that connects to the surrounding road/access network. This standard would apply to the live-work and townhouse buildings.

The proposed development occupies an entire city block, and the proposed site layout provides a safe and convenient network of vehicular circulation that connects to the surrounding road network. The proposed internal alleys and pedestrian paths help break up the block to a more pedestrian scale.

Conclusions: The proposal will meet the design standard for vehicular circulation.

Section 3.2 Vehicular entrances and driveways

Findings: The intent of this section is to minimize the negative impacts of vehicular access on the streetscape and pedestrian environment by minimizing the number of vehicular access points along Tolt Avenue through private access roads that serve multiple properties. This standard would apply to the live-work and townhouse buildings.

The proposed site design avoids driveways along Tolt Avenue. All vehicular access is along the side streets, with alley entrances along Myrtle Street and McKinley Avenue.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for vehicular entrances and driveways.

<u>Section 3.3.2 – Parking layout and design – other properties adjacent to Tolt Avenue</u> **Findings:** Parking lots or open storage of vehicles may not be located between a building and Tolt Avenue. This standard would apply to the live-work and townhouse buildings.

The proposed site layout provides a small linear parking lot to the east of Buildings A, B, and C, and there are no parking lots or open parking located directly along Tolt Avenue. A few parking spaces near the Myrtle Street alley entrance may be visible along Tolt Avenue, and these spaces are screened with a landscaped area that includes a raised planter, trees, shrubs, and groundcover. Open parking spaces that are not in the linear parking lot are distributed throughout the site, and there are no parking spaces along Tolt Avenue.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard to avoid open parking along Tolt Avenue.

<u>Section 3.3.3 – Parking layout and design – site located on intersections</u> **Findings:** Parking lots shall not be located adjacent to intersections. This standard would apply to the live-work and townhouse buildings.

Conclusions: There are no parking lots or open parking that are adjacent to street intersections. All open parking areas are set back from intersections and more interior to the

block. Furthermore, no on-site parking spaces back out onto the adjacent public streets as they all take access from the internal alley.

<u>Section 3.3.4 – Parking Layout and Design – sites not adjacent to Tolt Avenue</u> **Findings:** Off-street parking areas must be located to the rear or side of buildings to the extent reasonably possible. This standard would apply only to townhouse buildings.

All of the off-street parking facilities are located at the back or sides of buildings. All of the garages are located at the rear of the building and take access from the internal alley, and open parking spaces distributed throughout the site are located either to the rear or side of buildings.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for the location of parking areas.

Section 4.2 – Architectural style/character

Findings: Applicants are encouraged to base a building's architectural character on building form and elements common to early 20th century Carnation structures. For sites outside of the Downtown Core area, applicants are encouraged to consider form common to Carnation's early 20th Century residential structures. Non-residential buildings are encouraged to employ a variety of colors, building materials, and architectural treatments, but avoid building details that make a building look fake or contrived. This standard would apply the live-work and townhouse buildings.

The proposed architectural style for both the live-work and townhouse buildings incorporate many of the traditional forms and architectural elements of early 20th century structures in Carnation.

The live-work buildings have a mix of flat and gable roofs, where the flat roof façade design derives from many of the older buildings in the downtown core, while the gable roofs provide roofline variation and are reminiscent of the residential buildings in and near downtown. These buildings are clad in horizontal and vertical lap siding with textural variations, smooth paneling to emphasize pop-outs at building corners and some windows, and simple trim that is not overly ornate. The exteriors of each unit would be painted a different color to reduce monotony and reinforce the small scale and independent character. Ground floor treatment includes transom windows, decorative doors, recessed entries, and canopies over the storefront. Units in Buildings B and C are modulated by approximately two feet from the adjacent unit to further emphasize the individuality of each unit.

The townhouse buildings all have gable roof forms and are clad in horizontal and vertical lap siding, and smooth paneling to emphasize groupings of upper story windows. The proposed color schemes feature a primary cladding color and an accent color for architectural features such as pop-outs/insets or elements with different cladding, which provides visual interest. Many of the windows are gridded and are vertically proportioned. On the ground floor, each unit features a front entry porch with decorative porch columns, decorative entry doors, and end units feature decorative molding at the windows and doors.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for architectural style and character that draws from early 20th century structures in Carnation.

<u>Section 4.3.3 – Architectural scale and building mass – all non-residential buildings</u> **Findings:** Rooflines must be varied if visible from a public street, open space, or public parking area. Flat rooflines should not extend more than 100 feet without modulation. This standard would apply only to the live-work buildings.

There are no flat rooflines that extend for more than 100 feet. The roofline for each of the live-work units in Buildings B and C are varied and alternate between flat and gable roof forms. Each of the units are modulated as well every other unit set back an additional two feet to reinforce the change in rooflines. There is approximately an 8-foot vertical variation between the gable and flat roofs, as measured from roof eave of gable roof to top of flat roof. Building A features a cross gable roof, where the two with gable ends facing Tolt Avenue and Myrtle Street.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for a varied roofline.

<u>Section 4.3.4 – Architectural scale and building mass – multi-family residential buildings</u> **Findings:** New building facades visible from the street/alley and common open space shall be articulated with windows, balconies, bay windows, or other architectural elements. This standard would apply only to the townhouse buildings.

See Section 5.8 Townhouse design – building design below.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for architectural scale and mass.

Section 4.4.1 – Building details – all non-residential buildings

Findings: Non-residential buildings shall be enhanced with at least three appropriate design details and small-scale elements that are attractive at a pedestrian scale. This standard would apply only to the live-work buildings.

Each unit in the live-work buildings incorporate recessed entries, transom windows, and decorative entry doors into the buildings' designs.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for non-residential building details.

Section 4.4.2 – Building details – all residential buildings

Findings: Residential buildings shall be enhanced with architectural details that add visual interest to the neighborhood and are well proportioned to achieve good human scale and must incorporate at least three detail elements. This standard would apply only to the townhouse buildings.

Each unit in the townhouse buildings incorporate decorative porch columns, decorative entry doors, and textural and color variation in building cladding materials. The end units of each building also feature decorative molding around doors and windows.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for residential building details.

Section 4.4.3 – All residential buildings and upper floors of commercial/mixed-use buildings – window design

Findings: Windows shall feature trim at least four inches wide painted a color that contrasts with the façade. This standard would apply to the live-work and townhouse buildings.

The proposed window designs are compatible with the proposed traditional architectural styles. The proposed color palette shows that all proposed trims are white, with a variety of compatible dark and muted earth tones for the façade. All windows would feature trims that are at least four inches wide, and the trim colors would stand out from the color of the façade.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for window design and color.

Section 4.5 – Exterior building materials and color

Findings: High-quality building materials are encouraged and materials and colors that are not compatible with the character and scale of Carnation are discouraged. This standard would apply to the live-work and townhouse buildings.

The applicant proposes to use high-quality building materials that add visual interest and detail and are durable and easily maintained. No prohibited building materials are proposed. The exterior body of each building will be painted with muted and dark saturated background colors. Larger buildings also feature an accent color for an architectural element of the façade. All trims would be white to contrast with the muted and dark saturated background colors. The color palette includes five color schemes that complement each other and are in a classic style inspired by early 20th Century construction typical of Carnation.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for exterior building materials and colors. Any change to the building colors will require approval by the City Planner per condition 59.

Section 5.1 – Townhouse design - landscaping

Findings: Townhouses are subject to landscaping requirements in CMC 15.76. This standard would apply only to the townhouse buildings.

See discussion of conformance with setbacks described in CMC Chapter 15.76 above.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for landscaping.

Section 5.2 – Townhouse design - setbacks

Findings: Setbacks in CMC 15.48 apply to the development frontage and external side and rear setbacks of the entire townhouse development. This standard would apply only to the townhouse buildings.

See discussion of conformance with setbacks described in CMC Chapter 15.48 above.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for setbacks.

Section 5.4 – Townhouse design - façade transparency

Findings: Transparent windows and doors are required on at least 8% of the façades. This standard would apply only to the townhouse buildings.

All townhouse building with vertical surfaces of street facing elevations have transparent windows and doors on at least 8% of the facades.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for façade transparency.

<u>Section 5.5 – Townhouse design – private garages facing the street</u>

Findings: Private garages facing the street may be a maximum of 12 feet wide or may not be allowed. This standard would apply only to the townhouse buildings.

All of the private garages take access from the internal alleys, with no garages facing the street.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for private garages.

Section 5.6 – Townhouse design – access and parking

Findings: Off-street parking is subject to multi-family parking standards in CMC 15.72 and standards for internal driveways. This standard would apply only to the townhouse buildings.

See discussion of conformance with setbacks described in CMC Chapter 15.72 above. The proposal meets the minimum parking requirement. The internal alleys are designed with sufficient width and vertical clearance to comply with International Fire Code requirements for emergency vehicle access.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for access and parking.

Section 5.7 – Townhouse design – usable open space

Findings: Townhouse dwellings must provide open space at least equal to 10% of habitable floor area, which may take the form of balconies, roofs, decks, or porches. Such space must have minimum dimensions of at least 12 feet on all sides and be configured to accommodate human activity. This standard would apply only to the townhouse buildings.

Each townhouse unit is either 1,141 square feet or 1,601 square feet in size, with private open spaces of 156 square feet or 174 square feet, respectively. The open spaces are provided in the front entry porches of each unit, with minimum dimensions of 12 feet on all sides and are at least 10% of habitable floor area for each unit.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for usable open space.

Section 5.8 – Townhouse design – building design

Findings: New building facades visible from the street and common open space shall be articulated with windows, balconies, bay windows, or other architectural elements. Articulation intervals may be no wider than the width of units in the building. Repetition with variety is required. This standard would apply only to the townhouse buildings.

The proposed design incorporates building modulations by popping out the ground floor patios and gable ends on the second floor and recessing the plane with the main entrances. Designs for the interior units vary in the 3- and 4-unit buildings, with changes to the roof line or form, articulated window paneling on the upper floors, and change in cladding materials in conjunction with the application of an accent color for the façade. Individual units are between 18 to 20 feet in width, and the articulation intervals are no wider than these widths. The combination of these features achieves the desired intent of providing visual interest and reducing the perceived scale of the building.

The proposed design demonstrates repetition with variety in that the townhouse buildings incorporate features that sufficiently distinct from each other while still having many elements in common that serve to unify the building design. The elevations of end units and the interior units in a building have distinctly different forms, with the end units being mirrors of each other. Other design treatments that add variety include changes in the roof forms, window gridding, and different cladding materials that offer different textures.

Conclusions: The proposal meets the design standard for building design.

6. SEPA (CMC Chapter 14.04)

Findings: The proposed project includes the construction of 43 residential units; therefore, it exceeds the threshold of four residential units for a categorical exemption per WAC 197-11-800. A SEPA Likely Determination of Non-Significance was issued for the proposed project in conjunction with the Notice of Application on July 31, 2020 with a fourteen day comment period that ended on August 14, 2020. The public comments received are discussed in Section II Background above.

Conclusions: A Mitigated Determination of Non-significance (MDNS) was issued for the proposed project on July 26, 2021 pursuant to WAC 197-11-350.

7. City of Carnation Street and Storm Sewer System Standards; City of Carnation Water and Sewer Technical Standards

Findings: The City Engineer has reviewed the conceptual plans for compliance with the Street and Storm Sewer System Standards as well as the Water and Sewer Technical Standards. Relevant conditions of approval have been incorporated in Section IV Decision, and compliance with these requirements will occur with the review of detailed site improvement plans as part of the civil permits.

Conclusions: The conceptual plans are generally consistent with the requirements for street and utility system design standards. Full compliance will be ensured through review of detailed site improvement plans as part of the civil permits.

IV. DECISION

1. This application for Site Development Review has been consolidated and reviewed concurrent with the Design Review as a Type II permit in accordance with CMC 15.09.050,

CMC 15.18.160.A.1, and CMC 15.18.250. A Type II permit is administrative requiring a decision by the City Planner after public notice is provided.

- 2. This application for Site Development Review and Design Review have been reviewed by the City Planner and, as conditioned, determined to be in conformance with the City of Carnation Comprehensive Plan and Title 15 of the Carnation Municipal Code.
- 3. This application for Site Development Review and Design Review have been reviewed under this Type II Permit process and were also reviewed for consistency with the Carnation Design Standards and Guidelines and have been found to comply with the intent, standards, and guidelines for a 43-unit townhouse development with live-work units along Tolt Avenue.
- 4. As conditioned, the submitted Site Development Review and Design Review applications have been reviewed for and found to be in conformance with the criteria for approval in CMC 15.18.220. and in CMC 15.18.390, respectively.

Following review of the subject Site Development and Design Review applications for conformity with the City of Carnation Comprehensive Plan, Municipal Code, and other applicable ordinances, laws, and policies, applications SPR-20-0001 and DR-20-0001 are hereby granted **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The proposed use shall be developed in substantial conformance with the submitted site plans and elevations included with the application for Site Development Review and Design Review as modified through this review process.
- 2. The Site Development Review and Design Review approval automatically expire and are void if the applicant fails to file for a building permit or other necessary development permit and fails to make substantial progress towards completion in accordance with the applicable permit expiration provisions in CMC Chapter 15.18.
- 3. Where conditions do not specifically address an element of the proposed development, the content of the findings and conclusions in this report shall be used together with the applicable Municipal Code provisions to determine what is required.
- 4. All construction and site development activities related to the Site Development Review and Design Review approval are prohibited until the decision becomes effective and until authorized by any subsequent required permits. [CMC 15.18.220.F and 15.18.320.F]
- 5. All permit requests will be reviewed for compliance with applicable codes, ordinances, laws, rules, and regulations prior to issuance of approval.
- 6. The applicant shall comply with all mitigation measures in the SEPA Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance (File No. ECF-20-0001) issued on July 26, 2021.
- A School Impact Fee as imposed by the Riverview School District shall be assessed at the time of building permit issuance and paid for prior to final certificate of occupancy for any new residential unit. [CMC 3.48.050]

- 8. A Park Impact Fee shall be assessed at the time of building permit issuance and paid prior to final certificate of occupancy for any new residential unit. [CMC 3.70.110]
- 9. A Transportation Impact Fee shall be assessed at the time of building permit issuance and paid prior to final certificate of occupancy for any new residential unit. [CMC 3.50.110]
- 10. The applicant shall submit a Construction Mitigation Plan (CMP) shall be prepared in accordance with the City's Construction Mitigation Plan Requirements. The CMP shall be approved prior to issuance of the first construction permit. Changes to construction activity may necessitate updating the CMP.
- 11. Prior to construction activities the applicant shall obtain an approved civil and building permits from the City of Carnation including, but not limited to, the following:
 - a. A Public Utility Extension permit is required for the sewer and water main improvements which shall be constructed per the City of Carnation Utility Standards. [CMC 13.100.070]
 - b. A drainage permit is required for the stormwater management systems. [CMC 15.64.230]
 - c. Sanitary sewer facilities shall be constructed per City of Carnation Sewer Standards. Side sewer permits are required prior to commencing side sewer construction. [CMC 13.70.040]
 - d. A right-of-way permit is required for work within the City right-of-way [CMC 15.60.030]. An on-site pre-construction meeting shall be held before commencing work within the right-of-way.
 - e. An application for Clearing, Filling & Grading is required [CMC 15.40.070]. A spill prevention and control plan is also required. [CMC 15.64.230]
 - f. A separate building permit is required for each building.
- 12. All construction and site development activities shall comply with all applicable fire codes and regulations.
- 13. Address monument signs shall be provided.
- 14. The live-work units shall comply with allowable uses in the MU zone. The buildings may be constructed in compliance with IRC standards, which may limit the types of non-residential uses that may be permitted. Future conversion of the live-work units or buildings to non-residential uses may require modifications to the unit/building and/or site in order to comply with applicable development standards and building code requirements.
- 15. The proposed internal alleys shall be signed "No Parking", MUTCD standard, spaced at a maximum 100 feet.
- 16. The applicant shall satisfy the requirements of the City Engineer unless otherwise waived or modified through the development phase of this project (attached and incorporated by reference). All permits required therein shall be obtained prior to the conduct of work subject to each respective permit.

- 17. A DOE Construction Stormwater General Permit is required. Conformance with the DOE Construction Stormwater General Permit shall be ensured with weekly monitoring and reporting of the site's best management practices for conformance of the Stormwater General Permit and SWPPP requirements including water sampling of stormwater discharged from the site. [DOE Stormwater Manual]
- 18. A geotechnical report is required and shall include recommendations for: earthwork, reuse of existing soils, compaction, temporary and permanent slopes, utility construction, erosion and sediment control, wet weather work, hazardous material studies, groundwater levels at stormwater flow-control and water quality facilities, and stormwater infiltration capabilities including applicable correction factors for infiltration facilities as recommended in the DOE Manual. [DOE Stormwater Manual]
- 19. Construction performance and maintenance guarantees shall be provided in accordance with City of Carnation Street and Storm Sewer System Standards. Before utility extension and right-of-way permits are issued, the applicant shall furnish the City a performance bond to guarantee the full and complete construction and installation of the right-of-way improvements. [CMC 15.16.740]
- 20. A topographic survey sealed by a licensed professional land surveyor is required. The survey shall include underground utilities and the adjacent city streets fronting the parcel. [CMC 15.16.350]
- 21. Street and storm sewer system improvements shall be consistent with the City's 2018 Street and Storm Sewer System Standards and the 2014 DOE Stormwater Manual for Western Washington.
- 22. The proposed 24-foot-wide internal streets shall have a pavement section consistent with the city's standard pavement section for a local access street 4" HMA, 4" CSTC, 4" CSBC. A minimum 2-foot-wide cement concrete valley gutter shall be installed between the travel lanes.
- 23. Frontage improvements along Tolt Ave (SR-203) are required and shall be consistent with the recommendations of the City of Carnation Tolt Ave Action Plan, February 2013 and the planned Tolt Ave (SR-203) improvements. The Tolt Ave frontage improvements consist of but are not limited to half street improvements, grind and overlay from the Tolt Ave centerline to the face of curb, channelization markings, signage, curb and gutter, storm drain facilities, illumination, grading, a minimum 2.5-foot-wide landscaped planting strip and a 10-foot wide non-permeable concrete shared-use path (greenway) with a minimum two-foot graded area on the east side of the path. Existing overhead utility lines shall be undergrounded along the project's Tolt Avenue frontage. The developer shall be responsible for obtaining necessary permits from WSDOT including compliance with CMC 12.10.030.
- 24. Street lighting system shall be a complete system which is typically designed by Puget Sound Energy. All new wiring, conduit, and service connections shall be located underground. LED street illumination design shall be submitted conforming to City and PSE/Intolight requirements. Streetlights shall be provided at internal streets, street frontage and intersections, all street lighting fixtures shall meet standards to prevent light

spill. Streetlight fixtures along Tolt Avenue shall be the same type as used for the Tolt Avenue improvement project. Developer shall submit proposed streetlight locations and system design to the City for review and acceptance. Maintenance and payment for illumination along the internal streets shall be the responsibility of the property owner, any future Homeowners Association, or jointly shared by the owners of the development. [CMC 15.60.300]

- 25. In addition to Tolt Avenue, the Development also fronts Eugene Street, McKinley Ave and Myrtle Street, classified as Collectors. Half-street improvements are required along the frontage of these streets and shall consist of but are not limited to grind and overlay from the street centerline to the face of curb located 19 feet from the street centerline, channelization markings including 10-foot-wide travel lane and 9-foot of parking, signage, curb and gutter, storm drain facilities, illumination, new 6-foot wide sidewalks and ADA curb ramps.
- 26. The two new access connections to McKinley Ave and the access connection to Myrtle Street shall be cement concrete driveway Type 1 consistent with WSDOT Standard Plan F-80.10-4. Driveway widths shall not exceed 22-feet or be less than 10-feet wide. [CMC 15.56.050].
- 27. Mitigation for Level of Service, access, sight distance and collision analysis deficiencies shall be as recommended by the Project's final Traffic Impact Analysis and accepted by the City.
- 28. Prior to permit issuance for frontage improvements, any proposed pavement and channelization work along SR 203/Tolt Avenue shall be submitted to the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) for review and approval.
- 29. Internal underground electrical and communication lines shall be installed in utility easements a minimum 10 feet wide.
- 30. Site distance triangles shall be provided showing site distance at all internal and access intersections. Areas within the triangles shall be clear of sight-line obstructions.
- 31. Placement of mailbox structures, if allowed by the Post Master, shall be in conformance with Postal Service requirements, Post Master's approval of mailbox type and locations is required prior to construction start.
- 32. Covenants, conditions, and restrictions shall be recorded requiring the future Homeowners Association (HOA) responsibility to maintain the Developments common areas and landscaping.
- 33. Stormwater quality and flow-control best management practices are required for the proposed subdivision. A Technical Information Report is required and shall comply with the 2014 DOE Stormwater Manual for Western Washington. [CMC 15.64.190.C] Infiltration stormwater facilities shall be designed to infiltrate 100% of the 50-year developed runoff event.

- 34. Infiltration systems shall be located a minimum of 10-feet from building foundations and property lines. If the infiltration must be located within 10 feet of a property line, a maintenance/repair easement must be provided to provide a minimum 10-foot width from the edge of the infiltration facility. In-situ testing is required to determine the existing soils' infiltration capacity. [DOE Manual]. The infiltration rates shall include applicable correction factors for infiltration facilities as recommended in the DOE Manual but in no case shall the maintenance correction factor assume more than infiltration of 60% of its design capacity or a correction factor, CF_m of 0.6. Stormwater runoff from all adjacent street frontage shall be managed behind the sidewalks or on-site.
- 35. Temporary Sediment and Erosion Control and grading plans are required. Stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces shall not be directed towards City rights-of-way. [CMC 15.64.220]
- 36. The HOA shall be responsible to maintain the proposed stormwater facilities installed for the Development regardless if located within the Development or within city right of way. HOA shall also be responsible for payment of all maintenance costs associated with the stormwater facilities. Covenants, conditions, and restrictions shall be recorded requiring the HOA to contract with the City of Carnation or the City's designees or agents to maintain the Development's stormwater facilities consistent with the Department of Ecology's Stormwater Manual for Western Washington and as recommended in the Development's stormwater facility maintenance standards. The City and its designees shall be granted a permanent easement to access the drainage facilities for maintenance of the facilities.
- 37. The sanitary sewer improvements shall be designed by the Developer per the City of Carnation's Combined Water and Sanitary Sewer Utility Technical Standards and Aqseptence Group/Airvac's design manual. [CMC 13.100]
- 38. All buildings shall connect to the City of Carnation vacuum sewer system. The Developer shall acquire side sewer permits for each side sewer connected to the City sewer system. [CMC 13.50 & CMC 13.70] Backflow valves shall be installed on all structures. [Carnation Utility Standards]
- 39. Proposed sewer mains and service lines shall maintain the required minimum separation from proposed and existing water lines. [Carnation Utility Standards]
- 40. Existing septic system(s) shall be properly decommissioned in accordance with King County Health Department requirements.
- 41. Water system improvements shall be consistent with the City's 2017 Combined Water and Sanitary Sewer Utility Technical Standards.
- 42. The existing water main less than 8-inch diameter between the intersections of Eugene and Myrtle shall be replaced with 8-inch ductile iron mains, a fire hydrant, associated valves, fittings and appurtenances. To provide water and fire services to the Development, a looped water system is required. The proposed eight-inch ductile iron main lines shall connect to the water mains on McKinley Ave and Tolt Ave. [CMC 15.60.200 & CMC 13.100]

- 43. A water main shall be installed within a minimum 15-foot-wide easement if not located within city right of way.
- 44. Proposed water mains and service lines shall maintain the required minimum separation from proposed and existing sanitary sewer lines. [DOE, Carnation Utility Standards]
- 45. Metered water service shall be provided to landscaped tracts to provide a means of irrigation within the tracts and the frontage improvements. Maintenance and payment for landscaping and irrigation shall be the responsibility of the Homeowner's Association (HOA) or jointly shared by the owners of the development. Installation of backflow prevention devices are required and shall conform to the requirements established by the Department of Health and the City. [Carnation Utility Standards]
- 46. New fire hydrant spacing and locations shall be in accordance with the International Fire Code and as directed by the Fire Marshal. Each new fire hydrant shall be fitted with a storz adapter. [Carnation Utility Standards]
- 47. Existing well (if present) shall be properly decommissioned in accordance with King County Department of Health requirements.
- 48. The geotechnical engineer of record shall observe stormwater infiltration facility, street and utility construction and shall conduct on-site material sampling and compaction testing to verify compaction for roadway and utility trenching meets recommended compaction criteria. Stormwater infiltration facilities must be constructed over native gravely soils.
- 49. Effective erosion control and sediment measures shall be designed, installed, and maintained to minimize the discharge of pollutants. A temporary sediment pond shall be designed and constructed as part of the sediment control measures.
- 50. Dust generated during construction activities shall be controlled by wetting the dust sources of exposed soils and washing truck wheels before trucks leave the site. Mud and dirt shall not be tracked onto public rights-of-way.
- 51. All existing and proposed electric, telephone, cable, and communication lines shall be placed underground, overhead extensions are not allowed [CMC 15.60.350]. The utility designs shall include a trench detail and continuous underground warning tapes installed 12-inches above each utility line.
- 52. The applicant shall work with Puget Sound Energy regarding electrical service for the project. The location(s) of surface and above-grade utility facilities, including but not limited to, meters, cabinets, vaults, boxes, etc., are subject to City approval.
- 53. Temporary construction fencing shall be installed around the perimeter of the site. The temporary fencing may be a combination construction/silt fence.
- 54. Maintenance for on-site lighting in common areas, including, but not limited to, common open space, plazas, pedestrian paths serving the site or multiple residential units, uncovered parking areas, internal alleys, etc. shall be the responsibility of the HOA or jointly shared by the owners of the development.

- 55. Prior to civil permit issuance, a landscape plan shall be submitted by the applicant and approved by the city planner for compliance with CMC 15.76. Prior to the building permit certificate of occupancy, the landscaping shall be installed as approved.
- 56. The applicant shall provide a maintenance assurance device (MAD) to ensure that landscaping will be installed and maintained for two years according to the approved landscape plans and specifications. This could be either a certificate of deposit in the City's name, a letter of credit from the developer's bank, or cash. The amount required must be 10 percent of the total cost of the materials. The MAD would be used by the City to hire a contractor to replace lost materials due to non-maintenance. [CMC 15.76.080.B]
- 57. Mechanical equipment, transformers, meters, cabinets, etc. shall be located to minimize their visibility from the street and pedestrian environments. If their location will be visible from streets and/or pedestrian environments, they shall be fully screened from view to the fullest extent feasible. Screening may consist of fencing, landscaping, affixed furniture, or other features.
- 58. Proposed seat walls along Tolt Avenue may not encroach into the public right-of-way.
- 59. Any changes to the proposed building color palette dated received on November 8, 2021 will require approval by the City Planner utilizing the Acceptable Building Colors of the Carnation Design Standards and Guidelines.
- 60. A minimum of 10 bicycle parking spaces shall be provided in compliance with CMC 15.72.120.
- 61. Any proposed non-exempt signage shall require a sign permit and corresponding building permit.

SIGNED THIS 31st DAY OF January, 2022.

Jean Lin, City Planner City of Carnation

Attachments:

- A. Project Plans Site plan, landscape concept, and architectural plans, dated received on November 8, 2021
- B. Impervious surface area calculation, dated October 26, 2021
- C. Building Color Palette, dated received on November 8, 2021
- D. Pedestrian-oriented space seating calculations, dated received on November 8, 2021
- E. Tree Inventory Report by Earth Dance Design, dated June 24, 2020

- F. Arborist Report and Tree Protection Site Plan by Earth Dance Design, dated April 26, 2021
- G. SEPA Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance (ECF-20-0001), dated July 26, 2021
- H. Public Comments Received
 - Adam Osbekoff, Snoqualmie Indian Tribes Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP), email dated July 30, 2020
 - Peter Alm, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Northwest Region Development Services, email dated August 4, 2020
 - Stephanie Lundeen, letter dated August 18, 2020 and received August 20, 2020
 - Kevin Crutchfield, email dated September 1, 2020
 - Jules Hughes, email dated September 4, 2020
 - Kevin Crutchfield, email dated October 2, 2020

RECEIVED City of Carnation 11/08/2021

SPR-20-0001 / DR-20-0001

Attachment A
























































Attachment B



TOLT VILLAS COLOR PALETTE

	BODY (SIDING)	ACCENT PANELS,	ALL TRIM, GARAGE		
		FRONT DOOR	DOOR		
1	Westchester Gray SW 2849	Naval SW 6244	Westhighland White SW 7566		
2	Van Dyke Brown SW 7041	Tricorn Black SW 6258	Westhighland White SW 7566		
3	Downing Stone SW 2821	Rojo Marron SW 9182	Westhighland White SW 7566		
4	Rosemary SW 6187	Colonial Revival Green Stone SW 2826	Westhighland White SW 7566		
5	Indigo Batik SW 7602	Empire Gold SW 0012	Westhighland White SW 7566		
Notes:	All colors Sherwin- Williams	Accent includes Hardie panels, front doors and louvered attic vents (per plan)	Trim includes fascia board, window and door trim, corner trim, porch post and garage door		
	Windows: White vinyl	Gutters: White	Metal awnings and light fixtures black metal		

TOLT VILLAS COLOR SCHEMES BY BUILDING













Calculations for required seating within Pedestrian-Oriented Spaces (Carnation Design Standards and Guidelines 2.1.2, 2.3.1, 2.5.2)

The following areas were provided by the City of Carnation as a tool to plan and design the seating. In all but one plaza (South Plaza), the city's area has exceeded our area calculation. We have designed seating based on the larger areas provided by the city. Our area calculations are noted in red below and outlined on the following page.

North Plaza: 1,500 sf/60 sf = 25 seats or 75' of bench

Central Plaza: 1,600 sf/60 sf = 27 seats or 81' of bench

South Plaza: 2,200 sf/60 sf = 37 seats or 111' of bench

Building C Sidewalk to Building: 540 sf/60 sf = 9 seats or 27' of bench

Building A & B Sidewalk to Building: 660 sf/60 sf 11 seats or 33' of bench

Location	Ped-Oriented Space	Required Seating	Provided Seating
North Plaza	1,500 sf	75' of bench	66' bench and 4
	(1,480 sf)		seats for total of 78'
Central Plaza	1,600 sf	81' of bench	130'10" bench
	(1,486 sf)		
South Plaza	2,200 sf	111' of bench	81' bench*
	(2,208 sf)		
Building C Frontage	540 sf	27' of bench	30' bench
	(440 sf)		
Buildings A & B Frontage	660 sf	33' of bench	33' bench
	(572 sf)		

*Request that 49'10" bench surplus from Central Plaza be applied to 29' bench deficit in South Plaza



Corinne R. Hollister

ISA CERTIFIED ARBORIST — *PN-6981A* ISA TREE RISK ASSESSMENT QUALIFIED American Society of Consulting Arborists, Member

Consulting Arborist Services

То:	Tolt Villas L.L.C., Shane Fortney
Reference:	Tree Inventory Report
Date:	June 24, 2020
Site Address:	4334 Tolt Ave, Carnation, WA 98014 Myrtle Street, McKinley Avenue, E. Eugene Street
Parcels:	8657300224, 8657300225, 8657300226, 8657300240, 8657300245, 8657300250



Dear Mr. Fortney,

You contacted me and subsequently contracted my services to develop a tree inventory report for the properties referenced above, and to identify all significant trees. I visited the site on Friday, June 19, 2020. I received a Demo Plan and a Site Plan developed by Hybrid Architecture of Seattle, dated June 9, 2020, prior to visiting the property. This report does not include tree retention calculations or development of tree protection guidelines.

Summary:

I visually inspected and measured the trees and identified twenty-seven (27) significant trees on the property and six (6) in the adjacent right-of-way (ROW). These trees are listed in the table on pages 4-7, along with ratings for both health and structure and limits of disturbance for all viable trees. The significant trees I measured are a mix of native and non-native conifers and fruiting deciduous trees.

Significant trees are defined by the city of Carnation as those over twelve (12) inches in diameter, measured 4.5 feet from the ground. I found no species on site which the city lists as exception to significant trees. A viable tree is defined by the city as "a significant tree…determined to be in good health, with a low risk of failure due to structural defects, is relatively windfirm if isolated or exposed, and is a species that is suitable for its location."

Total significant trees on site	27
Total significant trees in ROW	6

Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 June 24, 2020 Page 2 of 11

Limitations and Use of this Report

This tree report establishes existing conditions of the trees on the property, utilizing the most practical means available. This report is based solely on what is readily visible and observable, without any invasive means, at the time of my visit. Ratings for health and structure, as well as any recommendations, are valid only through project development and construction, and within a reasonable amount of time. No tree retention calculations, tree protection guidelines or formal tree risk assessments are included in this report.

There are several factors that can affect a tree's condition, which may be pre-existing and indeterminable with only a visual analysis. No attempt was made to establish the presence of hidden or concealed conditions which may contribute to the risk or failure potential of trees on or adjacent to the site. These conditions include root and stem (trunk) rot, internal cracks, structural defects or construction damage to roots, which may be hidden beneath the soil. In addition, construction and post-construction circumstances can cause a relatively rapid deterioration of a tree's condition.

Tree Inspection:

My visual inspection identifies both the health and the structure of each tree on the parcel, and in the adjacent ROW. Tree health assesses disease, insect infestation and old age. Tree structure is the manner in which a tree is constructed, along with observable defects, which can indicate if a tree is subject to failure.

The following table reflects the results of this inspection, including the following for each tree:

- Number as shown on the cropped base map attached.
- Species both common and Latin names.
- DBH stem diameter measured in inches, 4.5 feet from the ground, unless indicated otherwise.
- Dripline furthest branch extension from the trunk center, measured as radius in feet.
- Viability yes or no, as defined by the city of Carnation code, 15.08.010.
- Ratings from 1 to 3 (where 1 indicates no visible defects, in structure or health; 2 indicates minor problems that may require action; 3 indicates significant problems or defects and tree removal is recommended.

• Limits of Disturbance (LOD) – calculated for all the retained significant trees (and for trees on adjoining parcels with overhanging driplines). They are listed below as radii in feet from the trunk for the side of the tree to be impacted by construction. They are determined using rootplate ¹ and trunk diameter,^{2,3} and ISA Best Management Practices.⁴ These are the minimum distances from the trees for any soil disturbance, and

¹ Coder, Kim D. 2005. *Tree Biomechanics Series*. University of Georgia School of Forest Resources.

² Smiley, E. Thomas, Ph. D. Assessing the Failure Potential of Tree Roots, Shade Tree Technical Report. Bartlett Tree Research Laboratories.

³ Fite, Kelby and E. Thomas Smiley. 2009. *Managing Trees During construction; Part Two*. Arborist News. ISA.

⁴ Companion publication to the ANSI A300 Series, Part 5: Managing Trees During Construction. 2016. ISA.

represent the area to be protected during construction. These LOD are malleable and may be adjusted during the design and construction process.

• Visible defects – Visible structural defects or diseases:

Canker – disease cankers are established on trunk or branches.

Decay – a substance undergoing decomposition.

Foliage vigor – low foliage density may indicate stress, or early infection/declining health.

Included bark – bark that becomes embedded in a crotch (union) between branch and trunk or between codominant stems; lacks axillary wood and causes a weak structure.

Ivy – dense ivy prevents thorough inspection, and other defects may be present. Multiple or double leaders – the tree has multiple stem attachments, which may require maintenance.

Poorly pruned or neglected – pruning performed without following ANSI standards; can create weak attachments and watersprouts.

Sapsucker and woodpeckers (evidence of) – not a major concern; noted only as an indicator of possible decay or insect infestation.

Topped – the tree is previously topped and has poor structure and/or stem decay.

Watersprouts – upright, epicormic shoot arising from the trunk or branches of a plant above the root graft or soil line.

Tree protection

I recommend tree protection guidelines be developed and implemented under the direction of an ISA certified arborist. Tree size, age, and species tolerance to root disturbance from all construction activities – including demolition – in the critical root zones of retained trees should be addressed to ensure long-term tree health and stability.

4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 June 24, 2020 Page 4 of 11 Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney

Tree Inventory Table:

NOTES	Surrounded by pavement, low foliage vigor	Low foliage vigor, evidence of sapcuckers/woodpeckers	Located at edge of existing building.	Significant Japanese knotweed, on county noxious weed list.	Double leader starts at 20 feet, good attachment. Evidence of sap suckers/woodpeckers. May be located in ROW.	Possible past injury to lower trunk.		Topped previously, four main stems/sprouts. Ivy on trunk. DBH measured at 28 inches. Rated unviable as a tree due to shrub nature of structure.	lvy on trunk. Three (3) main stems, one removed.
LOD	10'	ō	18'	10'	17'	11'	12'	I	I
əldsiV	~	~	٨	~	~	7	7	Z	Z
Structure	Ļ	Ļ	L	Ļ	Ļ	L	L	2	2
Health	2	2	L	~	~	1	1	2	2
Drip Line	14'	12'	20.5'	-11	22'	15.5'	16'	13'	13'
DBH	21 "	16"	56"	20.5"	38 "	19.5"	21 "	22"	28 "
Species	Pinus mugo Mugo pine	Pinus mugo Mugo pine	Sequoiadendron giganteum Giant sequoia	Chamaecyparis lawsoniana Lawson cypress	Picea abies Norway spruce	Picea abies Norway spruce	Pseudotsuga menziesii Douglas-fir	llex aquifolium English holly	Malus sp. Orchard apple
Tree #	~	7	ε	4	2	ω	6	12	13
4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney June 24, 2020 Page 5 of 11

Tree #	Species	DBH	Drip Line	dfleэН	Structure	əldaiV	ГОД	NOTES
14	Sorbus aucuparia Mountain ash	6-12"	13'	2	e	Z	I	Cluster of seven (7) individual trunks, from 6 inches to 12 inches. Decay in several trunks. Removal recommended.
15	Pyrus sp. Orchard pear	13"	12.5'	2	2	Z	I	Neglected fruit tree, large water sprouts.
16	Malus sp. Orchard apple	27 "	13'	2	S	z	I	DBH measured at 28 inches, extensive decay. Will not survive root disturbance. Removal recommended.
17	Juglans regia English walnut	36"	22'	~	2	≻	18'	Five (5) trunks branching from base at 20 inches, 18.5, 10, 17, 17, 17 inches; included bark.
18	Tsuga heterophylla Western hemlock	19.5"	12'	2	2	Z	I	Three (3) major stems, one broken at top, evidence of canker. Will not withstand construction disturbance.
19	Juglans regia English walnut	55"	40'	,	, -	\succ	27'	
20	Chamaecyparis obtusa Hinoki cypress	14" *	12'	1	~	~	7'	Two (2) trunks, 8.5 and 11"
21	Pseudotsuga menziesii Douglas-fir	17"	22'	,	2	\succ	11-	Topped for wire clearance. Will require ongoing maintenance if retained.
22	Pinus nigra Black pine	19"	16'	L	2	≻	-11-	Double leader starts at 20 ft. Good attachment.
23	Pseudotsuga menziesii Douglas-fir	15"	18'	L	2	≻	10'	Topped for wire clearance in the past. Will require ongoing maintenance if retained.
24	Thuja plicata Western red cedar	28"	20'	L	, -	~	13'	

Seattle, WA 98102 117 E. Louisa St. #128

4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney

June 24, 2020 Page 6 of 11

	nance	to		f							
	ngoing maint	ngoing maint	ıgoing maint	going maint	ngoing maint	going maint	ngoing maint	ıgoing maint f its tendency		halt at base (idence of sap
	Vill require or	Vill require or le because o		achment. Asp	tachment. Ev						
	n the past. V	n the past. V lered unviab		et, good atta	eet, good at						
	re clearance i	re clearance i uld be consic		starts at 8 fe	starts at 20 f oeckers.						
NOTES	Topped for wi if retained.	Topped for wi if retained. Co creep.		Double leader trunk.	Double leader suckers/wood						
ГОР	10'	10'	10'	-	-	12'	12'	6		12'	17'
əldaiV	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~		~	~
Structure	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	7
htlaəH	~	-	-	-	-	-	-	1		-	~
Drip Line	19.5'	22'	18'	16'	22'	24'	24'	18-		16'	25'
DBH	15.5"	16"	18"	19"	17"	19.5"	20.5"	" / 1		28"	36.5"
Species	Pseudotsuga menziesii Douglas-fir	Populus alba White poplar	s located in the ROW	Picea abies Norway spruce	Picea abies Norway spruce						
Tree #	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	Tree	ъ	9

Earth Dance Design 117 E. Louisa St. #128 Seattle, WA 98102

4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney June 24, 2020

Page 7 of 11

Tree #	Species	DBH	Drip Line	Health	Structure	əldsiV	ГОР	NOTES
Tree	s located in the ROW							
7	Picea abies Norway spruce	38 "	22'	-	-	~	17'	Double leader starts at 20 feet, good attachment. Evidence of sap suckers/woodpeckers.
10	Populus alba White poplar	38 "	28'	~	2	~	17'	DBH measured at 28 inches, below branching. Eight (8) stems, included bark. Could be considered unviable because of its tendency to creep.
11	Quercus alba or garryana White oak	30"	23'	2	2	TBD	15'	Estimated DBH due to extensive ivy on trunk, and throughout tree. Requires further inspection to confirm viability and confirm species (either Q. garryana, or Q. alba).
33	Juglans regia English walnut	19.5"	25'	-	2	~	10'	One branch cut for wire clearance in the past.
*Ou	adratic mean calculation for DBF	H, standa	rd in indu	stry for	· multi-s	tem tre	SS	

Health and Structure ratings – '1' indicates none to minor visible health-related problems or structural defects, '2' indicates moderate to major visible problems or defects that may require attention if the tree is retained, and '3' indicates significant visible problems or defects and tree removal is recommended.

LOD – Limits of disturbance following ISA best management practices, assuming disturbance on one side of the tree. I recommend a review of these limits based on the final design. Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 June 24, 2020 Page 8 of 11

Attachment 1: Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

- 1. A field examination of the site was made on June 19, 2020. My observations and conclusions are as of that date.
- 2. Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data has been verified insofar as possible; however, I, the consultant/arborist, can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others.
- 3. I am not a qualified land surveyor, and this tree inspection is based on a site plan provided. Sketches and photographs in this report are not necessarily to scale and should not be construed as an accurate survey.
- 4. I, the consultant/appraiser, shall not be required to give testimony or to attend court by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made.
- 5. Unless stated other wise: 1) information contained in this report covers only those trees that were examined and reflects the condition of those trees at the time of inspection; and 2) the inspection is limited to visual examination of the subject trees without dissection, excavation, probing, or coring. There is no warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied that problems or deficiencies of the subject trees may not arise in the future.
- 6. Unless required by law otherwise, possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any other than the person to whom it is addressed, without prior written or verbal consent of the consultant.
- 7. All trees possess the risk of failure. Trees can fail at any time, with or without obvious defects, and with or without applied stress. Risk management is solely the responsibility of the landowner.
- 8. Construction activities can impact trees in unpredictable ways. All retained trees, including all right-of-way and off-site trees, should be inspected at the completion of construction, and regularly thereafter as part of ongoing maintenance.

Attachment 2: Certificate of Performance

I, Corinne Hollister, certify that:

- I have personally inspected the trees and the property referred to in this report and have stated my findings accurately.
- I have no current or prospective interest in the vegetation or the property that is the subject of this report and have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved.
- The analysis, opinion, and conclusions stated herein are my own and are based on current industry standards, scientific procedures and facts.
- My analysis, opinion, and conclusions were developed and this report has been prepared according to commonly accepted arboricultural practices.
- No one provided significant professional assistance to me, except as indicated within the report.
- My compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined conclusion that favors the cause of the client or any other party nor upon the results of the assessment, the attainment of stipulated results, or the occurrence of any subsequent events.

I further certify that I am a member in good standing of the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA), and the ISA PNW Chapter, I am an ISA Certified Arborist (#PN-6981A) and am Tree Risk Assessment Qualified. I also am a member of the American Society of Consulting Arborists (ASCA).

Signed,

Corinne follister

Corinne Hollister

Date: June 24, 2020

Seattle, WA 98102

Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 June 24, 2020 Page 10 of 11



Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 June 24, 2020 Page 11 of 11

Attachment 4: Selected photos of trees indicated for possible retention



Left: 56-inch Giant sequoia located next to an existing building along Tolt Avenue – tree #3.

Below: 55-inch English walnut located at northeast corner of development site – tree #19.



Earth Dance Design

117 E. Louisa St. #128

Corinne R. Hollister

ISA CERTIFIED ARBORIST — *PN-6981A* ISA TREE RISK ASSESSMENT QUALIFIED American Society of Consulting Arborists, Member

Consulting Arborist Services

То:	Tolt Villas L.L.C., Shane Fortney
Reference:	Tree Protection Guidelines
Date:	April 26, 2021
Site Address:	4334 Tolt Ave, Carnation, WA 98014 Myrtle Street, McKinley Avenue, E. Eugene Street
Parcels:	8657300224, 8657300225, 8657300226, 8657300240, 8657300245, 8657300250

Earth Dance Design gardens inspired by nature Corinne Hollister 206-779-3118 corinne@ earthdancedesign.com

ISA Certified Arbonst

Attachment F

Dear Mr. Fortney,

You contacted me and subsequently contracted my services to develop tree protection guidelines for three (3) retained trees on the Tolt Villas project. I completed a tree inventory report for the parcels, referenced above, on June 24, 2020. I met with you onsite to review tree protection requirement and pruning specifications on Friday, April 16, 2021. I received a site plan developed by DCG Engineering, dated April 1, 2021. The focus of this report is to establish tree protection guidelines based on that site plan.

Summary:

All limits of disturbance (LOD) and tree protection zones (TPZ) are based on best management practices established by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA). All tree protection zones are measured from trunk center. No root disturbance is allowed inside any TPZ.

Tree protection fencing shall be installed prior to site work as indicated here on page 9. Tree protection fencing shall consist of 6-foot tall chain link fencing secured to metal posts on piers, or driven into the ground to prevent movement. All fencing shall be marked with clear signage and remain throughout construction. Protection fencing around Tree #3 shall be installed in phases, timed with demolition of the existing adjacent structure, and may be moved following all other construction to install a floating deck.

At any point where excavation occurs inside a tree's dripline roots shall be exposed manually or using air excavation, with the project arborist monitoring onsite. Root shall be cut clean with sharp pruning tools, covered with burlap or arborist chips and kept moist in dry periods throughout construction.

A six-inch layer of arborist chips shall be placed within the dripline or TPZ of Trees #9 and Tree #19 prior to installing protection fencing. The natural layer of needles under Tree #3 shall remain undisturbed.

The project arborist shall be onsite for the installation of all tree protection measures, including pruning for clearance, root exposure and cuts at edges of excavation, demolition of the existing building and concrete water feature near Tree #3, and prior to construction of the floating deck. See specific details on pages 3 to 5.

Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney Tree Protection Guidelines 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 April 26, 2021 Page 2 of 18

Total significant trees on site	27
Total significant trees in ROW	6
Total trees retained	3

Contents Limitations Tree Inspection Limits of Disturbance Tree Protection Measures Tree Inventory Table – Retained Trees Attachments: Assumptions and Limiting Conditions Certificate of Performance Site Plan – Notes on Tree Protection Measures Photos of Retained Trees & Floating Deck Examples Pruning Specifications Tree Protection Fencing Detail

Limitations and Use of this Report

This tree report establishes existing conditions of the trees on the property and associated tree protection guidelines, utilizing the most practical means available. This report is based solely on what is readily visible and observable, without any invasive means, at the time of my site visits. Ratings for health and structure, as well as any recommendations, are valid only through project development and construction, and within a reasonable amount of time. No tree retention calculations, or tree risk assessments are included in this report.

There are several factors that can affect a tree's condition, which may be pre-existing and indeterminable with only a visual analysis. No attempt was made to establish the presence of hidden or concealed conditions which may contribute to the risk or failure potential of trees on or adjacent to the site. These conditions include root and stem (trunk) rot, internal cracks, structural defects or construction damage to roots, which may be hidden beneath the soil. In addition, construction and post-construction circumstances can cause a relatively rapid deterioration of a tree's condition.

Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney Tree Protection Guidelines 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 April 26, 2021 Page 3 of 18

Tree Inspection:

My visual inspection identifies both the health and the structure of each tree on the parcel, and in the adjacent ROW. Tree health assesses disease, insect infestation and old age. Tree structure is the manner in which a tree is constructed, along with observable defects, which can indicate if a tree is subject to failure.

Please see submitted Tree Inventory Report for inspection data on all trees.

Limits of Disturbance (LOD):

LOD measurements are calculated for each of the three retained trees. They are listed below as radii in feet from the trunk center for the side of the tree to be impacted by construction. They are determined using rootplate ¹ and trunk diameter,^{2,3} and ISA Best Management Practices.⁴ These are the minimum distances from the trees for any soil disturbance, and were used to calculate the areas to be protected during construction. These LOD may be adjusted only with review and approval of the project arborist and a city planner.

Location and Type of Protection Measures

All tree protection fencing shall consist of a minimum six-foot tall temporary chain-link fence, placed as close to the dripline as possible and no closer to the trunks than indicated on the site plan. Fencing shall be installed before any demolition or construction utilizing metal post on pier or metal posts driven into the ground to avoid movement. Fencing shall be extended around Tree #3 following demolition. Fencing recommendations may cross into ROW areas to establish maximum protection.

No stockpiling of materials, vehicular or pedestrian traffic, material storage or use of equipment or machinery shall be allowed inside the fencing and TPZs.

A 6- to 8- inch layer of arborist chips shall be installed at the edges of all excavation under the driplines and within TPZs of Tree #9 (Douglas-fir, *Pseudotsuga menziesii*) and #19 (English walnut, *Juglans regia*). The existing layer of needles under Tree #3, Giant sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*), shall remain undisturbed. Keep chips away from trunk edges.

A city planner or project arborist must approve any modifications to tree protection measures.

¹ Coder, Kim D. 2005. *Tree Biomechanics Series*. University of Georgia School of Forest Resources.

² Smiley, E. Thomas, Ph. D. *Assessing the Failure Potential of Tree Roots, Shade Tree Technical Report*. Bartlett Tree Research Laboratories.

³ Fite, Kelby and E. Thomas Smiley. 2009. *Managing Trees During construction; Part Two*. Arborist News. ISA.

⁴ Companion publication to the ANSI A300 Series, Part 5: Managing Trees During Construction. 2016. ISA.

Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney Tree Protection Guidelines 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 April 26, 2021 Page 4 of 18

Pre-site work – tree protection monitored by project arborist: Prior to any excavation work, trees shall be pruned for clearance, arborist chips shall be applied to TPZ areas as indicated, and tree protection fencing shall be installed. The project arborist shall inspect fencing prior to demolition or excavatoin. Soil piled up against trunk of Douglas-fir, Tree #9, shall be removed manually and grade leveled without heavy equipment.

<u>Special instructions</u> for Tree #3: Giant sequoia protection with arborist monitoring – Concrete water feature and existing structure shall be removed carefully, lifting debris up and away from the trunk and branches. No wheels or tracks of heavy machinery shall cross inside the dripline. Demo shall be done with caution as not to disturb existing concrete block foundation. If necessary, one eco block shall be placed against existing concrete block foundation to reinforce. Top courses of block wall may be removed to grade. Area shall be backfilled once analysis is made of any existing tree roots under the structure. Tree protection fencing shall be installed as indicated on site plan and remain throughout construction.

Additional demolition: All existing structures, adjacent fencing, foundations and retaining walls shall be demolished and removed in a direction away from any retained tree. All debris shall be lifted up and away from the trunks and branches for maximum protection. Any tracks or tires from heavy equipment shall remain outside the dripline areas. All trees targeted for removal shall be cut with caution as to avoid damaging any retained tree branches or trunks.

New foundations: Roots shall be exposed manually or with air excavation and cut clean with sharp pruning tools at the edge of new foundations within any dripline, plus two to three feet for room to work. Grade shall be sloped up gradually 1:1, retaining maximum roots. All exposed roots shall be covered with soil, burlap or arborist chips and kept moist.

New entrance around Giant Sequoia – Tree #3: When all construction is complete, tree protection fencing around Tree #3 may be removed for installation of a floating deck that crosses inside the dripline. The deck shall be constructed above ground, with ground clearance of at least 6 inches, supported on piers or posts installed with project arborist onsite. Support joists shall be as long as possible to reduce the number of necessary supports within the dripline. Any supports in areas of backfill may be closer together. Space between deck boards shall be sufficient to allow rainwater through. See sample photos on page 11.

ROW improvements: Any work on the sidewalks or the curbs shall be completed without heavy equipment or machinery crossing inside driplines with a focus on protecting tree roots. Concrete or asphalt shall be broken carefully and lifted up and away from the tree manually or with machinery located outside the driplines. The project arborist shall be on site to inspect any exposed roots and monitor for maximum protection. Roots shall be cut clean, if necessary, covered and kept moist while new sidewalks, curbs and roadways are installed.

All stormwater management shall be directed outside the driplines and away from any retained tree.

Landscaping: Soil amendment and planting within the dripline of all retained trees shall be kept to a minimum to limit root disturbance. Irrigation lines should not cross into undisturbed areas and increased watering added only as part of a long-term management plan for tree survival. No planting shall occur under Tree #3, the Giant

Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney Tree Protection Guidelines 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 April 26, 2021 Page 5 of 18

sequoia. Nothing larger than a 4-inch plant may be installed within the TPZ of Tree #19, the English walnut, and planting shall be kept to a minimum with species that spread with time.

See pruning specifications on pages 14 to 17 for canopy clearance guidelines. All pruning shall be in accordance with ANSI Standards and BMPs from the ISA and completed by a certified arborist, with the project arborist monitoring on site.

A post-construction monitoring and maintenance plan shall be developed, including strategies for mulch, fertilization, irrigation, soil aeration and pruning, where necessary. Trees shall be inspected annually for at least five years after construction is complete to assess changes in condition and signs of stress or disease.

Tree protection is required throughout construction.

Tree Inventory Table:

Tree #	Species	DBH	Drip Line	Health	Structure	Viable	LOD	NOTES
3	Sequoiadendron giganteum Giant sequoia	56"	20.5'	1	1	Y	18'	Concrete water feature located at edge of dripline, west. Concrete block foundation on existing building at trunk edge, east. Pre-site work required to set tree protection with arborist onsite. Demo existing building without disturbing block foundation – no wheels or tracks in dripline. Set eco block to reinforce existing block foundation. Backfill and set fencing. Leave in place throughout construction. Water during dry periods. Fencing may be moved to allow floating deck construction after all other construction is complete.
9	Pseudotsuga menziesii Douglas-fir	21"	16'	1	1	Y	12'	Recent root disturbance to west and north of trunk. Remove soil piled at base of trunk. Level carefully with manual grading. Apply arborist chips under dripline or within TPZ. Set fencing and leave in place throughout construction. Water during dry periods.
19	Juglans regia English walnut	55"	40'	1	1	Y	27'	Located on NE corner of project. Prune for clearance. Expose roots manually or with air excavation at edges of construction. Apply arborist chips under dripline or within TPZ. Set fencing and leave in place throughout construction. Water during dry periods. Limit landscaping to 4-inch pots, native shade groundcovers with no or limited added irrigation.

Health and Structure ratings – '1' indicates none to minor visible health-related problems or structural defects, '2' indicates moderate to major visible problems or defects that may require attention if the tree is retained, and '3' indicates significant visible problems or defects and tree removal is recommended.

LOD – Limits of disturbance following ISA best management practices, assuming disturbance on one side of the tree. Please see notes on page 9 and final site plan for tree fencing placement.

Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney Tree Protection Guidelines 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 April 26, 2021 Page 7 of 18

Attachment 1: Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

- 1. A field examination of the site was made on June 19, 2020, for a tree inventory. A meeting to discuss tree protection occurred on April 16, 2021. My observations and conclusions are as of that date.
- 2. Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data has been verified insofar as possible; however, I, the consultant/arborist, can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others.
- 3. I am not a qualified land surveyor, and this tree inspection is based on a site plan provided. Sketches and photographs in this report are not necessarily to scale and should not be construed as an accurate survey.
- 4. I, the consultant/appraiser, shall not be required to give testimony or to attend court by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made.
- 5. Unless stated otherwise: 1) information contained in this report covers only those trees that were examined and reflects the condition of those trees at the time of inspection; and 2) the inspection is limited to visual examination of the subject trees without dissection, excavation, probing, or coring. There is no warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied that problems or deficiencies of the subject trees may not arise in the future.
- 6. Unless required by law otherwise, possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any other than the person to whom it is addressed, without prior written or verbal consent of the consultant.
- 7. All trees possess the risk of failure. Trees can fail at any time, with or without obvious defects, and with or without applied stress. Risk management is solely the responsibility of the landowner.
- 8. Construction activities can impact trees in unpredictable ways. All retained trees, including all right-of-way and off-site trees, should be inspected at the completion of construction, and regularly thereafter as part of ongoing maintenance.

Attachment 2: Certificate of Performance

I, Corinne Hollister, certify that:

- I have personally inspected the trees and the property referred to in this report and have stated my findings accurately.
- I have no current or prospective interest in the vegetation or the property that is the subject of this report and have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved.
- The analysis, opinion, and conclusions stated herein are my own and are based on current industry standards, scientific procedures and facts.
- My analysis, opinion, and conclusions were developed and this report has been prepared according to commonly accepted arboricultural practices.
- No one provided significant professional assistance to me, except as indicated within the report.
- My compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined conclusion that favors the cause of the client or any other party nor upon the results of the assessment, the attainment of stipulated results, or the occurrence of any subsequent events.

I further certify that I am a member in good standing of the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA), and the ISA PNW Chapter, I am an ISA Certified Arborist (#PN-6981A) and am Tree Risk Assessment Qualified. I also am a member of the American Society of Consulting Arborists (ASCA).

Hollister Hollister Hollister Date: 2021.04.26	
Hollister Hollister Hollister Date: 09:28	ter 2021.04.26 :20 -07'00'

Date: April 26, 2021

Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney Tree Protection Guidelines 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 April 26, 2021 Page 9 of 18

Attachment 3: Annotated Site Plan Details, Tree Protection Notes



Orange line indicates protection fencing placement. Expose roots manually before cutting with sharp pruning tools. Monitoring by project arborist required during pruning, cuts to roots within driplines, and demo on structure adjacent to Tree #3.

Fencing placement shall be reviewed and approved by project arborist prior to site work.







Earth Dance Design

117 E. Louisa St. #128

Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney Tree Protection Guidelines 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 April 26, 2021 Page 10 of 18

Attachment 4: Photos of retained trees



Left: 56-inch Giant sequoia located next to an existing building along Tolt Avenue – Tree #3. View looking SW.

Below: Trunk of Tree #3 is located at edge of existing concrete block foundation. Concrete slab to north is outside of the dripline. Concrete water feature is located to the right and crosses inside the dripline. See complete tree protection guidelines for notes on demolition and tree protection, and pruning specifications. View looking south.



Left: Layer of natural needles under dripline shall remain in place. Set tree protection fencing as indicated for maximum protection. Floating deck shall be constructed with minimal root disturbance; space between deck boards shall be sufficient to allow flow of rainwater. See examples next page. View looking east.

Corinne Hollister

Earth Dance Design

117 E. Louisa St. #128 Seattle, WA 98102

Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney Tree Protection Guidelines 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 April 26, 2021 Page 11 of 18

Attachment 4: Photos of retained trees continued – Floating walkway/ deck examples, around Tree #3



Left: Floating walkway constructed next to large Douglas-fir at Kruckeberg Botanical Garden in Shoreline, WA. Supports are set at least 8 feet apart, using long timbers to minimize root disturbance. Openings between deck boards allow rainwater to flow to roots.

Right: Floating deck built around tree, featured on nextluxury.com. Used only as example for reference. No copyright infringement intended.



Earth Dance Design

117 E. Louisa St. #128

Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney Tree Protection Guidelines 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 April 26, 2021 Page 12 of 18

Attachment 4: Photos of retained trees continued

Right: 55-inch English walnut located at northeast corner of development site – Tree #19. Proposed new foundation at or west of existing foundation. See pruning specifications on page 16. View looking north.

Below: Set tree protection fencing at edge of existing asphalt or two feet away from new sidewalks. View looking south.



Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney Tree Protection Guidelines 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 April 26, 2021 Page 13 of 18

Attachment 4: Photos of retained trees continued



Left: 21-inch Douglas-fir, Tree #9, located at the southeast corner of the development. Remove soil piled at base of trunk. Manually grade soil. Apply arborist chips and protection fencing. See pruning specifications. View looking east.

Seattle, WA 98102

Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney Tree Protection Guidelines 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 April 26, 2021 Page 14 of 18

Attachment 5: Pruning Specifications



Objective: Clearance for pedestrian entrance, and construction of new building to the north – Tree #3, 56-inch Giant Sequoia.

Method: Thinning cuts at branch unions to remove branches, lift and balance canopy. Use five (5) to six (6) cuts where branches meet trunk, primarily on west side of tree to create 10 feet of clearance from grade. Remove dead twigs to clean canopy. Minimal pruning required above existing structure.

All pruning of retained trees shall be completed by an ISA certified arborist, following ANSI standards and best management practices of the industry, monitored by the project arborist onsite.



Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney Tree Protection Guidelines 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 April 26, 2021 Page 15 of 18

Attachment 5: Pruning Specifications continued





Objective: Pedestrian clearance and removal of broken branches – Tree #9, 21-inch Douglas-fir.

Method: Thinning cuts at branch unions to lift and balance canopy. Use three (3) to four (4) cuts where branches meet trunk, to create 10 feet of clearance from grade. Remove broken branches in lower canopy. Branches are approximately 2 inches in diameter. Minimal pruning required.

Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney Tree Protection Guidelines 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 April 26, 2021 Page 16 of 18

Attachment 5: Pruning Specifications continued



Objective: Clearance for new two-story structure, sidewalk and roadway – Tree #19, 55-inch English walnut.

Method: Limit cuts to branches smaller than one inch in diameter to fullest extent possible directly over existing home and roadway. Utilize six (6) cuts on lateral branches 1.5 inches in diameter to create clearance for new building. Branch cuts and/or removal should not cross inside LOD – 27 feet from trunk center, unless approved by project arborist. Utilize 10 to 12 cuts on branches up to one-inch in lower canopy for balance and clearance over sidewalk and roadway (see next page). Up to 20 cuts may be made on branches less than 1/2 inch to life and balance canopy. Verification of cuts and clearance to be confirmed onsite with pruning team and project arborist.



Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney Tree Protection Guidelines 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 April 26, 2021 Page 17 of 18

Attachment 5: Pruning Specifications continued



Objective: Clearance for pedestrian and vehicle traffic. Utilize thinning cuts on secondary branches to create clearance of 10 feet above new sidewalk and 14 feet over new roadway.

Method: Limit cuts to branches smaller than one inch in diameter directly over new sidewalk and roadway to lift canopy. Ten (10) to twelve (12) cuts should be sufficient. Verification of cuts and clearance to be confirmed onsite with pruning team and project arborist. Tolt Villas, LLC, Shane Fortney Tree Protection Guidelines 4334 Tolt Ave and others, Carnation, WA – 865730024, 865730025, 865730026, 865730040, 865730045, 865730050 April 26, 2021 Page 18 of 18

Attachment 6: Protection Fencing Detail







MITIGATED DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE (MDNS) ECF20-0001 Tolt Villas File No.: SPR20-0001, DR20-0001

Description:	The applicant is proposing a mixed-use development consisting of 43 new multi-family residential dwelling units. The 43 units are spread over 14 buildings with none live/work units along Tolt Avenue and 34 townhouse residences. Associated development includes frontage improvements along all public streets, open space, parking, pedestrian infrastructure, and new interior access roads. This SEPA determination applies to the entire project which will include, but is not limited to, additional permits to merge existing lots and a unit lot subdivision for the proposed residential units.
Applicant:	Shane Fortney, Tolt Villas LLC PO Box 522 Woodinville, WA 98072

Location: 4210 Tolt Avenue (APN 8657300250) Unaddressed (APN 8657300255) 4240 Tolt Avenue (APN 8657300224) 31750 Tolt Avenue (APN 8657300225) 31803 E. Eugene Street (APN 8657300226) 4215 McKinley Avenue (APN 8657300240) 31822 E. Myrtle Street (APN 8657300245)

Lead Agency: City of Carnation

Staff Contact: Jean Lin, City Planner (425) 333-4192 jean.lin@carnationwa.gov

The Responsible Official of the City of Carnation hereby makes the following decision on this proposed development based upon the impacts identified in the documents and information obtained by the Responsible Official, including without limitation:

- SEPA Environmental Checklist with city staff's annotations, dated received on June 26, 2020;
- Revised architectural drawings by Nash & Associates Architects, dated April 20, 2021;
- Revised civil drawings by DCG, dated April 30, 2021;
- Revised landscape drawings by Root of Design, dated May 4, 2021;
- Revised site plan drawings by DCG, dated June 15, 2021;
- Soils testing report by Friedman & Bruya, Inc., dated November 4, 2019;

- Soils testing report by Friedman & Bruya, Inc., dated November 6, 2019;
- Limited Infiltration Evaluation by Robinson Noble, dated November 11, 2019;
- Critical Area Review Memo by Re-Align Environmental, dated December 6, 2019;
- Traffic Impact analysis by Gibson Traffic Consultants, Inc., dated June 2020;
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment by SoundEarth Strategies, Inc., dated June 16, 2020;
- Tree Inventory Report by Earth Dance Design, dated June 24, 2020;
- Technical Information Report by Davido Consulting Group, Inc., dated June 2020;
- Tree Protection Guidelines and associated Tree Protection Site Plan by Earth Dance Design, dated April 26, 2021; and
- Drainage Report by Davido Consulting Group, Inc., dated May 3, 2021.

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that this project does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment and an environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c), if the mitigation measures listed below are met. This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the City. Further information regarding this action is available to the public upon request at City Hall.

Public Comments Received:

A notice of application and likely SEPA DNS was issued and published on July 31, 2020 as part of the SEPA optional DNS process, with the comment period ending on August 14, 2020. A total of six comments were received, of which two were received within the SEPA comment period and four were received after the close of the comment period, as follows:

- Snoqualmie Indian Tribes, dated July 30, 2020, requesting the opportunity to be on site during ground disturbing activities;
- Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT), dated August 4, 2020, requesting review of any pavement or channelization work on SR 203/Tolt Avenue.
- Stephanie Lundeen, received August 20, 2020, commenting on frontage improvements, the need for diverse housing options, and requesting the retention of some of the trees on the project site.
- Kevin Crutchfield, dated September 1, 2020, requesting that one mature tree on the site be retained.
- Jules Hughes, dated September 4, 2020, commenting on the proposed architectural design, retention of mature trees, the affordability level of the proposed residential units, and tying the project to the site's and City's history.
- Kevin Crutchfield, undated letter, commenting on the retention of a mature tree, architecture of the proposed storefronts along Tolt Avenue, and parking.

The issues raised in these comments have been considered in this determination.

Mitigation Measures:

1. During construction, the applicant shall implement the tree protection measures as identified in the Tree Protection Guidelines and associated Tree Protection Site Plan by Earth Dance Design, dated April 26, 2021.

- 2. The applicant shall contact and allow Snoqualmie Indian Tribes Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation representative(s) to be on site for any ground disturbing activities.
- 3. During construction, the applicants and/or any contractor(s) or agents performing construction or site development work shall immediately cease operation and notify the City upon discovery/disturbance of any cultural resources or archeological materials. The City will refer the owner to the appropriate state or federal agency for direction. Compliance with any such direction, including without limitation any required site monitoring, shall be at the applicant's sole expense.
- 4. Prior to permit issuance for frontage improvements, any proposed pavement and channelization work along SR 203/Tolt Avenue shall be submitted to the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) for review and approval.

SEPA Appeal Procedure:

No determination made pursuant to Chapter 14.04 Carnation Municipal Code (SEPA) shall be administratively appealable. Any appeal of a determination made pursuant to said chapter shall be filed in King County Superior Court pursuant to applicable state law.

Responsible Official:	Jean Lin
Title:	City Planner
Address:	4621 Tolt Avenue - PO Box 1238
	Carnation, WA 98014

Date Issued: July 26, 2021

pomli Signature:

Hello Amanda

The Snoqualmie Indian Tribes Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation would like the opportunity to be onsite during any ground disturbing activities regarding the above mentioned project.

Thank you

Adam Osbekoff

Good morning Amanda,

WSDOT will need to review and approve any pavement or channelization work on SR 203. Thanks.

Thank you, **Peter Alm** WSDOT – NW Region Development Services **206-440-4711** PO Box 330310 MS 240 15700 Dayton Avenue North Seattle, WA 98133-9710

From: Amanda Smeller <amanda.smeller@carnationwa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2020 7:31 AM

To: lara.thomas@duvallwa.gov; Laura Murphy (laura.murphy@muckleshoot.nsn.us) <laura.murphy@muckleshoot.nsn.us>; Mike Middleton (mike.middleton@muckleshoot.nsn.us) <mike.middleton@muckleshoot.nsn.us>; Zachary Lamebull <zlamebull@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov>; Nelson, Kurt <knelson@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov>; McLean, Jordan <Jordan.McLean@pse.com>; Ifaulconer@agr.wa.gov; Meisha Robertson <robertsonm@rsd407.org>; cindy@snoqualmienation.com; jacob.sheppard@kingcounty.gov; gillian.zacharias@kingcounty.gov; Tan, Shirlee <Shirlee.Tan@kingcounty.gov>; Rose, Richelle <Richelle.Rose@kingcounty.gov>; Lewis, Teresa <Teresa.Lewis@kingcounty.gov>; McCarthy, Sarah <Sarah.McCarthy@kingcounty.gov>; mark.carey@dhs.gov; phyllis.meyers@kingcounty.gov; Mark Lawrence (ESFR) <mlawrence@ESF-R.org>; Meisner, Jennifer <Jennifer.Meisner@kingcounty.gov>; mark.wilgus@kingcounty.gov; kelly@snovalley.org; Bolotin, Leah <BolotiL@wsdot.wa.gov>; Alm, Peter <AlmP@wsdot.wa.gov>; info@wildfishconservancy.org; knoll@igc.org; Jim Ishimaru (jim.ishimaru@kingcounty.gov) <jim.ishimaru@kingcounty.gov>; jim.chan@kingcounty.gov; Matthew Baerwalde <Mattb@snoqualmietribe.us>; Steven Mullen-Moses <steve@snoqualmietribe.us>; cindy@snoqualmietribe.us; cynthia@svwid.com; sepaunit@ecy.wa.gov; sepadesk@dfw.wa.gov; sepacenter@dnr.wa.gov; sepa@pscleanair.org; sepa@dahp.wa.gov; DOH EPH SEPA <SEPA.reviewteam@doh.wa.gov>; Jamie Glasgow (jamie@wildfishconservancy.org) <jamie@wildfishconservancy.org>; Erika Harris <eharris@psrc.org>; ty.peterson@kingcounty.gov Subject: [EXTERNAL] City of Carnation Tolt Villas Mixed Use Development - Notice of Application and Likely DNS

WARNING: This email originated from outside of WSDOT. Please use caution with links and attachments.

Good Morning, All.

Attached is a Notice of Application and Likely SEPA DNS for Tolt Villas, a mixed use

development along Tolt Avenue. Comment deadline is August 14, 2020. Please let me know if you have questions.

-Amanda

Amanda Smeller

City Planner, City of Carnation 4621 Tolt Avenue | PO Box 1238 | Carnation, WA 98014-1238 (425) 549-0400 direct | (425) 333-4192 office | (425) 333-4336 fax www.carnationwa.gov | amanda.smeller@carnationwa.gov Amanda Smeller, City Planner

City of Carnation

PO Box 1238

Carnation WA 98014-1238



August 18, 2020

Dear Ms. Smeller,

I am writing in response to the Notice of Application for the development of the parcel along Tot: Avenue bounded by Eugene & Myrtle Streets and McKinley Avenue, as presented by Shane Fortney of Tolt Villas, LLC (SPR 20-0001). I live at the intersection of Myrtle and McKinley and thus will be greatly impacted by the proposed development.

I would like you to know that I am in favor of the development.

I applaud any and all efforts to improve our little downtown and to mitigate the empty lots and abandoned buildings. I feel the current state of our downtown reflects very poorly on the vibrancy of our community and discourages patronage of local businesses. I suspect that there would be more businesses (current global-pandemic-related issues aside) if there were more places to house them.

I am particularly encouraged to see that pedestrian infrastructure is part of the proposed development, as the current lack of sidewalks on McKinley is a constant issue for my neighborhood, including for my children and myself.

i also understand that this area of Carnation is meant to have more housing density and feel this is a reasonable move in that direction. I support diversification in housing for our area and hope that such developments as this one will serve to assist lower-income people who have so few options in the Snoqualmie Valley.

I would urge the City of Carnation to seek protection for at least some of the trees currently on the parcel, as they are a true asset. I would also like to know how tall the buildings will be and what the design looks like. I hope the craftsman aesthetic of our town might be maintained, as was so nicely done in the Riverwalk Cottages.

Please do notify me of the city's decision regarding this development, provided you receive this in time.

Appreciatively,

Stephanie T. Lundeen P. O. Box 1221 Carnation WA 98014

From:	Kevin Crutchfield
То:	Bob Jean
Cc:	Mary Madole; Amanda Smeller
Subject:	Tolt Villas 43-unit mixed development on Tolt between Eugene and Myrtle St (Files #SPR20-0001, DR20-0001, and ECF20-0001)
Date:	Tuesday, September 1, 2020 11:13:50 AM

Bob,

I see that we are going to have 43 units of mixed development in town (https://www.carnationwa.gov/index.asp?SEC=87DFD517-E123-46AD-A9B0-A041BB3778EF&DE=934E36A9-7BF6-4861-B7F2-AD31263437C8&Type=B_PR). Currently on the land is a large (L believe) Sequeia near Telt Avenue. Its right part to the

Currently on the land is a large (I believe) Sequoia near Tolt Avenue. Its right next to the empty home directly between Myrtle and Eugene. My hope is the city is going to require that the developer save this tree since its been here for nearly 100 years. The tree in question is located here

 $(https://www.google.com/maps/@47.6463144,-121.9153038,3a,75y,102.92h,104.62t/data=!3m7!1e1!3m5!1slHkKOeqWqVLFYH0QP3Fx7w!2e0!6s%2F%2Fgeo0.ggpht.com%2Fcbk%3Fpanoid%3DlHkKOeqWqVLFYH0QP3Fx7w%26output%3Dthumbnail%26cb_client%3Dmaps_sv.tactile.gps%26thumb%3D2%26w%3D203%26h%3D100%26yaw%3D44.725426%26pitch%3D0%26thumbfov%3D100!7i16384!8i8192).$

Thank you for your time on this matter

Kevin Crutchfield 206-856-5266

From:	<u>jules</u>
То:	jules; Amanda Smeller; Sam Kollar; Mary Madole
Subject:	Tolt Villas Comment Period
Date:	Friday, September 4, 2020 10:21:50 PM

Hello, Becky, Mary, and Sam,

I know Amanda is gone now, but please accept the following letter as a comment for this project. I'm sorry this is so late on the day it is due. There was some confusion about how long the comment period was extended and I was only able to get to my comments this evening.

Thank you so much, jules

Jules Hughes

Miller's cell: 206.437.8190 Mailing: PO Box 1272 Shipping: 4597 Tolt Ave Carnation, WA 98014

4 September 2020

First off, I want to applaud Shane Fortney for selecting Hybrid Architecture who has created an exceptional design for our small town.

Since this project will be the first of potentially several "mega-block" developments in Carnation, we want to make sure it follows our codes, the intent of our codes, & that the City and its residents will be getting benefits out of the development agreement that enhance the streetscape & overall effects of the project.

Just through its sheer size, it will have a significant visual and experiential impact on "Main Street" (Tolt Ave) and we want to be sure it's hitting as many high notes as it can in its development.

The fact that you clearly identify project objectives on page 7 of your design package that dovetail so nicely with what the City hopes for as it develops speaks to the sensitivity with which you've approached your development. This is so refreshing, as so many recent developers are not from here, are not as senstive to our existing vernacular and culture, and just come in, do their cookie cutter, anywhere USA, suburban house template with big garage doors greeting neighbors walking by, build not for the longevity or character of our town, get out and move on. There have been a few that care about scale, good materials, detailing, and the pedestrian friendly, alley filled old part of town that they're building within. Short term real estate profits have been prioritized over striving to add to the small town character and feel of Carnation.

Thank you for taking this context seriously and carefully into consideration as you design and propose to build.

I like the architecture you're proposing, the light/airy feel with gracious ground level

storefront/work spaces on Tolt Avenue with light filled living units above. The steep gables for the majority of the townhomes and the modern, with nod to classic, historic storefront architecture fits in well on Tolt Avenue. I'll be curious to see how the architecture evolves to include awnings and rain protection at all entries and along Tolt Avenue.

I appreciate the number of units chosen, in between the minimum and maximum allowed, for a change, responsive to what the site will comfortably allow. Also the variety in unit types, especially the live/work townhouses along Tolt Avenue providing living above storefronts/work spaces that front onto Tolt Avenue and keep the pedestrian experience lively. Love the front porch stoops on the townhomes orienting to the existing Carnation street grid, instead of being insular. And those townhomes that are in the site interior fronting onto a pedestrian spine/courtyard that takes residents to Tolt Avenue or to McKinley on foot/bike, also providing meaningful outdoor space. I applaud the thought put into the landscape amenties, P-patch, inviting and useful outdoor spaces, nice corner treatments greeting neighbors across the street. A landscape architect friend commended the project on its plant selection and overall landscape plan.

Saving mature and beautiful trees where possible, implementing smart growth principles. green infrastucture, energy efficient buildings, providing native plantings and varied sun/shade/protected area opportunities around the block are always appreciated. Anywhere in the project where you can exemplify these principles for other projects to learn from, we all benefit.

You've identified and are protecting two of the trees I was especially concerned about, the walnut and the sequoia, or redwood, as you've labeled it.

We're really protective of our mature trees and I'm not sure of the strength of our tree ordinance. I appreciate the efforts you've taken, above and beyond what most developers do, unless forced, to retain as many of the extraordinary trees that you have.

I would ask, though, is there any way to retain a few more of the perimeter firs at the SW corner of block, along Myrtle, and north of building E, the old house site, and one near the tool shed at the P-Patch? With global warming, the shade and bird and bee habitat these tall trees provide is irreplaceable. I know it's difficult to work around them, in terms of utilities for new development, but I'm hoping those that are in the public right of way could be preserved and worked around during construction.

I'm pleased you're protecting the giant walnut, but am disappointed to see the historic house go. I'm sure it's in terrible shape, but is there any way it could be restored and renovated into apartments, duplex or single residence? There are so few historic houses left in Carnation and holding onto that legacy is an important goal for many in this town. It would be a useful study to see if saving the house could simultaneously prevent a loss of your unit count, since its footprint is in a part of your future building E.

One question for you is affordability. While an important goal in planning, often we see the developer gearing units to upper income folks exclusively to maximize profits, leaving multi-generational Carnation folks, singles, elderly on a fixed income, seasonal farmworkers, college age and those new to the workforce unable to afford attractive new units added to our housing stock. If this can continue to be addressed in your plans, that would be ideal.

Another aspect of tackling such a large site in this small town, which you're not completely obliged to do, is to acknowledge and respond to the history of the site, from Snoqualmie Tribe origins through all of the 20th century development by loggers, farmers, merchants. The folks at the City, the Snoqualmie Tribe, and the Tolt Historical Society, among others could be good resources for stories and rituals pertaining to this whole huge block.

Since you're identifying trash enclosures on page 14, I'm not sure that you have enough or
that Recology can easily access them.

Silly minor typo for understanding: On page 13 of your proposal, you show a Building I, but in the written descriptions for each building, you opted to eliminate the use of "I" & "O", so we don't confuse it with numbers 0 and 1. You just need to revise the Site Map to show Building P. And page 31 should be for Building M. Anyway, you get the idea and I'm sure you've already fixed this in the drawings.

Thank you for taking the time to read my thoughts concerning your proposal.

I hope you will continue to seek community feedback and will work diligently with the City to make this the best possible project for Carnation. We are a small town, as you know, short staffed and can't always catch everything we'd like to regarding new developments, often before it's too late. This seems like a great start and I look forward to seeing the design process and project development continue.

Sincerely, Ms. Jules Hughes 31721 W. Rutherford Street (P.O. Box 815) Carnation, WA 98014

Jean Lin

From:	Mary Madole
Sent:	Tuesday, January 11, 2022 12:39 PM
То:	Jean Lin
Subject:	FW: SPR-20-001 and DR-20-001
Attachments:	SPR-20-001 Development project.docx

-----Original Message-----From: Kevin Crutchfield <kc59harley@me.com> Sent: Friday, October 2, 2020 12:30 PM To: City Clerk <clerk@carnationwa.gov> Cc: Mary Madole <mary.madole@carnationwa.gov> Subject: SPR-20-001 and DR-20-001

Attached are my comments to this development.

SPR-20-001 and DR-20-001

Dear Clerk

I have a few things to comment on this project SPR-20-001 and DR-20-001

- I know I was given a response to my question on the saving the very old Sequoia tree on the property by Sam Kollar (via email on September 8th) that the developer intends to keep the tree. My hope is they do. I also see in their preliminary plans they intend to keep a large tree on the northwest corner of the property.
- My other comment is the architecture of the storefronts on Tolt don't even try to take in the small-town look of Carnation. They appear to go to modern like its Redmond or Bellevue.
- Parking also was an issue for the developer and the requirements the city put forth in the density of this was taken care of. However, 1.5 parking spaces is unreal. It should be 2 at a minimum. Two parent's equals two cars. Have two kids they too will have two cars. Just look at the McKinley Apartment's. They fill every slot in their lot and then park along McKinley on both sides and Eugene.