

ASSOCIATED PROJECT CONSULTANTS, INC., P.S.

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTING ENGINEERS • LAND USE • CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS

October 22, 2007

Clarification regarding the August 27, 2007 City of Blaine Planning Commission's Findings and Conclusions regarding East Maple Ridge PUD and Preliminary Plat; Specifically Item 20, A through K.

Prepared by Doug Campbell, P.E.; planner and engineer for East Maple Ridge.

- A. While it is literally true that the applicant did not produce a "guidebook", the code does not discuss it and staff was unwilling to provide any guidance. It was suggested that the "guidebook" would be a road map for future planners to use when reviewing each successive phase of the project. We were quite confused how such a document could be developed without knowing where in the code it is required. In any event, we were completely blindsided by most of these requests in light of the events, which proceeded as discussed below.

The applicant was directed by Russell Nelson, Brent Baldwin and eventually Elizabeth Anderson EA, Terry Galvin TG, to specifically include in a binder the information pertinent to the application as follows (see attached email):

- a. EMail from EA to APC; Oct 26, 06; Brent Baldwin is moving application forward and needs five (5) items and then the city schedules a hearing on Nov 17, 06 or Jan 11, 07.
- b. EMail from EA, Oct 26, 06; Send 5 items and we have a date certain for PC hearing.
- c. EMail from EA, Oct 31, 06; same request for 5 items with specific dates for the hearing and dates for the city to be finished with their review.
- d. EMail from TG, Nov 13, 06; email saying Alex Wenger is the planner assigned to project and there is significant delay due to public works.
- e. Email from EA, Dec 21, 06; thanks for the added info (delivered as promised by APC Dec 13th); will be able to firm up the schedule.
- f. Email from EA, Jan 9, 07; extensive list from the code (APC already had), only thing missing is the landscaping and vicinity plans. Much of the rest of it has been submitted.
- g. Email to EA from APC, Jan 29, 07; date of Jan 25th does not work (with no explanation what so ever), request March 8th date.
- h. Email from EA Jan 29, 07; thanks for more information, may need to add more detail after I talk with TG today.
- i. Email from EA Feb 7, 07; need more info....with no explanation.
- j. Email from TG Mar 3, 07; PC hearing date set for March 22, 07, no mention of any more info needed.

- k. Email from TG Mar 12, 07; not sure on submittal? Will have staff report by Friday Mar 16th,
- l. Email to TG from APC Mar 12, 07; what are you missing from application? No response from TG.
- m. Email from Sitkin; Mar 13, 07; not sure about 20 year window, will have staff report by Friday.
- n. Email from TG Mar 16, 07; waiting for Sitkin, want applications binders ASAP, no mention of needing any more information what so ever.
- o. Email from TG Mar 17, 07; waiting for applications binders ASAP, no mention of needing any more information what so ever.
- p. Email from TG Mar 20, 07; 2 days before the March 22nd a hearing huge list of additional materials is needed. No staff report completed.
- q. Email from TG April 4, 07; draft letter prepared by TG for the PC.
- r. Email from TG May 2, 07; TG refuses to meet with applicant regarding the project.
- s. Email from Gary Tomsic May 8th 08; can't expect any help from his office.

There is no mention in the code of a "guidebook" and the planning commission was confused. They suggested the application binder should be considered the "guidebook". No one had ever seen a "guidebook" presented at other planning commission meetings!

- B. The applicant demonstrated how the purpose statements in the code referenced by TG's requests (BMC 17.42, 17.48, and 17.56) are being met with this project. See Introduction sections in the binder, multiple slides in the PowerPoint presentation (Footnote 1) and the July 15th, 2007 letter from APC. Any question about compatibility with the goals and objectives of the code was resolved in 1996 with the annexation of East Blaine and the adoption of the development agreement. This project is exactly what was contemplated by that effort.
- C. Compatibility with the East Blaine area was explained in the notebook in Sections 3,4,7,20, the PUD plan and the PowerPoint presentations. All the elements of this section of the code are reflected in the quality of the project.
- D. The benefits of the project are covered in Introduction sections of the binder. The code requires use of the PUD mechanism. Since other options are not available, discussion of them seems irrelevant. Nevertheless, the applicant did attempt to provide that discussion in its submission to the planning commission dated June 15, 2007, which responded to the April 4, 2007, request for additional information.

Footnote (1); Slide No. 4,6,14,45,16,19,20,21,22,24,28,29,32,33,34,35,42,48,51,52,53,55,56,57.

- E. The applicant provided specific examples of the level of detail requested in this code section. The single family, multiple family and commercial examples were well defined in the power point presentation. Many specific examples of how the single-family homes are placed with reference to the garage, street, and neighbor's homes were shown to the Planning Commission. The placement of footprints on the site plan for the multi family and commercial development was clearly shown on the PUD plan. The floor size and unit type were presented in the application binder along with the density of building types and floor areas. Development standards were submitted in the binder in the form of architectural guidelines, building lot standards, landscape guidelines, and sign standards, street standards, and lighting standards.
- F. The code allows for other studies for a means of meeting these requirements. The applicant submitted a narrative discussion and several studies related to fiscal impact, including one specific to the City of Duvall, which is similar in size to Blaine. That study, as well as the others, demonstrates that a project like East Maple Ridge will result in a positive fiscal impact. We hoped that the materials would meet the planning commission's needs, and if not that there would be a dialogue to establish the specific needs and level of detail required, since studies of this type vary widely. Unfortunately, we were not given any opportunity for dialogue or clarification on this issue.
- G. The history of the property was well defined in the July 15th letter from APC to the Planning Commission.
- H. This is a repeat of the previous element E. The applicant provided architectural standards for the building as well as details for signage, landscaping, street and lighting standards and lot utilization that when applied will create quality housing in the future. The standards proposed specifically go beyond the requirements of the Blaine City Code.
- I. The "general" landscape plan called for in the code is included in the application binder in Section 14. In addition, we provided detailed standards for landscaping public and private areas of the project that would provide definite control of the development to ensure quality design, beyond the City Code's minimum requirements. The Blaine City Code is pretty much silent on the standards for architectural landscaping requirements.
- J. A phasing plan provided to the Planning Commission for this preliminary plat shows the essential concepts for extension of utilities to the next phase and is very simple to understand. As each phase is completed, the plan clearly demonstrates how the street and utility plan will accommodate the next phase(s). The plan accommodates the need for safety, access, and essential emergency response with a clear and simple extension of City service to the next phase. The overall plan has been in the process of third party review by CHS Engineers for upwards of 2 years. Planning and coordination with Public Works, Police, Fire and Planning have taken place over dozens of meetings and communication. The site plan is essentially approved defacto by the staff. Remember, the preliminary plat as proposed is a plan concept, with clear and

intentioned flexibility provided by RCW 58.17.020 (4) (Footnote 2). Any project proposed in the future is subject to revision as the final design comes to the City for final review via existing codes and routine processing. The statement that the sizing of utilities and transportation elements has not been considered is incorrect.

- K. To our knowledge, Blaine has no Concurrency Ordinance in place. We had hoped to identify the nature of the "concurrency concerns" vaguely referred to by the PDS Staff, but were not allowed to have any dialogue with the Staff or the Planning Commission during the work sessions, that would have allowed us to understand the request.

Note: APC's letter of June 15, 2007, addresses many of these questions in more detail.

Footnote 2; RCW 58.17.020 (4) Definition of a " preliminary plat is a neat and approximate drawing of a proposed subdivision showing the general layout of the streets and alleys, lots, blocks, and other elements of a subdivision consistent with the requirements of this chapter. The preliminary plat shall be the basis for the approval or disapproval of the general layout of a subdivision" The legislature anticipated changes would take place during the process with final details resolved prior to final plat approval.

P:\Projects\93-167 Connelly - East Maple Ridge Plat\GenCorrespondence\101607 dnc cc meeting 10-22-07.doc
Enclosures: Email copies a through s.

10-26-06

Mr. Doug Connolly
8154 Comox Road
Blaine, WA 98230

Subject: Scheduling for East Maple Ridge Review
MDR-1005, PUD-1-05, SEP-4-05, LOP-2-05

We are working to schedule the East Maple Ridge permit review with the planning commission at the next possible date. In accordance with advice from Brent Baldwin, community planner, in the amended determination of complete application, additional information will be required prior to final review for public hearing.

SEPA checklist

Please updated and completed the SEPA checklist with all information available at this time. The completed checklist will be necessary for the Planning Director to make a determination and for staff to publish it in accordance with state and city law. Let me know if you need a copy of the checklist provided to our office earlier. Please complete or update the following:

A. Background

- #6- Proposed timing or schedule, including phasing.
- #8- Environmental information. Geotech and offsite stormwater analysis should be added, and any others that are now applicable or planned
- #10 – add long subdivision approval
- #11- confirm or adjust breakout of dwelling unit types

Updated site plan

Scheduling for public hearing before Planning Commission

Turnaround times include:

- SEPA checklist 22 days from the publication of the SEPA determination (deliver at least one additional week in advance for staff review and determination, and delivery to newspaper)
- Hearing scheduling and report. Three weeks prior to hearing for staff analysis and staff report, advance notice of the hearing, including site posting and newspaper notice.

For the December 14 meeting, please have all documents delivered by November 17,
For the January 11 meeting, please have all documents delivered by December 15.

10-26-06

Associated Project Consultants, Inc.

From: "Elizabeth Anderson" <EAnderson@cityofblaine.com>
To: "Associated Project Consultants, Inc." <apcengineers@nas.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2006 10:39 AM
Subject: East Maple Ridge

Doug: As noted in the draft letter, the following list includes the items to complete in order to schedule with the Planning Commission. We anticipate a hearing date of December 14, with a fallback date of January 11, if necessary.

I would like to get the SEPA determination made and that process underway ASAP, so please deliver the completed version as soon as you can.

Best regards,
Elizabeth

1. SEPA checklist

Please updated and completed the SEPA checklist with all information available at this time. The completed checklist will be necessary for the Planning Director to make a determination and for staff to publish it in accordance with state and city law. Let me know if you need a copy of the checklist provided to our office earlier. Please complete or update the following:

A. Background

#6- Proposed timing or schedule, including phasing.

#8- Environmental information. Geotech and offsite stormwater analysis should be added, and any others that are now applicable or planned

#10 – add long subdivision approval

#11- confirm or adjust breakout of dwelling unit types

2. Updated site plan and any other changes in supporting documents for accurate presentation and analysis.

10/16/2007

10.31.06



CITY OF BLAINE

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

344 H STREET • BLAINE, WA • 98230

PHONE: (360) 332-8311 • FAX: (360) 543-9978

www.cityofblaine.com

October 31, 2006

Mr. Doug Connolly
8154 Comox Road
Blaine, WA 98230

Subject: Scheduling for East Maple Ridge Review
MDR-1005, PUD-1-05, SEP-4-05, LOP-2-05

We are working to schedule the East Maple Ridge public hearing before the planning commission at the next possible date. As noted at the meeting held on October 19, 2006, and in the amended determination of complete application, additional information is necessary for permit processing and review for public hearing.

Please provide the following:

1. SEPA checklist

Update and complete the SEPA checklist with all information available at this time. The completed checklist will be necessary for the City to make a determination of significance (MDNS) and for staff to publish and process it in accordance with state and city law. On the checklist, complete or update these sections:

A. Background

#6- Proposed timing or schedule, including phasing.

#8- Environmental information. The Geotech and offsite stormwater analysis that have been completed should be added, along with any other environmental information directly related to this proposal

#11- confirm or adjust the numbers and types of dwelling units

2. Planned unit development submittal. Provide an updated site plan that includes the detail required in Chapter 17.42 and 17.48 of the Blaine Municipal Code (BMC).

3. A preliminary plat application in accordance with BMC Division 4, Code Requirements for Subdivision (Sections 17.50 through 17.70), if you are including an application for the first phase of development.

In order to schedule public review of the project, please be aware that turnaround times include:

- Review of final application submittal and determination of completeness: 7 days (can be up to 14)
- SEPA determination and publication: 15 days public review period (7 days appeal period): 15 additional days
- One final TRC meeting with follow up comments and clarification: 7 additional days
- Public Notice for public hearing must be posted on site and notices at least 10 days prior to the public hearing. No additional days are anticipated.
- The staff report must be finished and delivered to the planning commission and available for public view one week prior to the public hearing. Allow two weeks preparation time for the staff report after all materials are completed: Additional 14 days.

Some of these processes can be undertaken concurrently, but each of them is contingent upon delivery of final plans and a complete/updated SEPA checklist. Upon delivery of the final plans, we project that it will take a minimum of 43 days to prepare for a public hearing. With these timelines in mind, we have developed a framework of dates for your delivery of materials to enable us to place the project on the Planning Commission Agenda for public review.

- For the December 14 meeting, have all documents delivered by November 1
- For the December 28 meeting, have all documents delivered by November 15
- For the January 11 meeting, have all documents delivered by November 29
- For the January 25 meeting, have all documents delivered by December 13 ←
- For the February 8 meeting, have all documents delivered by December 27

Please note that these timelines are predicated upon the submission of a full and complete application, no additional requests for information, no unanticipated

Please contact me if you have questions about the required materials or the scheduling.

Best regards,

Elizabeth Anderson
Community Planner

c: Doug Campbell, APC
Terry Galvin, Community Development Director
Steve Banham, Public Works Director

Nov-13-06

Associated Project Consultants, Inc.

From: "Terry Galvin" <TGalvin@ci.blaine.wa.us>
To: "Associated Project Consultants, Inc." <apcengineers@nas.com>
Cc: "Gary Tomsic" <GTomsic@cityofblaine.com>; "Steve Banham" <SBANHAM@cityofblaine.com>; "Sandy Petersen" <spetersen@cityofblaine.com>; "Elizabeth Anderson" <EAnderson@cityofblaine.com>; "Alex Wenger" <AWenger@cityofblaine.com>; "Rod Smith" <RSmith@cityofblaine.com>
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2006 10:02 PM
Subject: RE: Blaine East Maple Ridge

Because of work load re-adjustments, I have re-delegated our review of this application to Alex Wenger (and all other land disturbance applications). Alex works half time in my office and half time in the Public Works Department. After consulting with Elizabeth, Steve and Sandy, Alex sent you a letter relating the City's position on the status of the application. I have done what I can to make this thing work. But I have my limitations. In the final analysis, the project does need to address stormwater controls, tree retention requirements and other requirements in our regs. He has outlined those and requested additional information. Almost a month ago I asked for a tree study to address types and age of trees that need to be addressed with the application. Did we miss that submittal? There are other items that have not been included in the submittal. You need to get these in. We can't approve the application until you do so. Alex will respond to any formal correspondence or requests relating to this proposal.

Terry Galvin
 Community Development Director

-----Original Message-----

From: Associated Project Consultants, Inc. [mailto:apcengineers@nas.com]
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2006 4:48 PM
To: Terry Galvin
Cc: Elizabeth Anderson; Jack Swanson
Subject: Blaine East Maple Ridge

Terry,

I have not heard back from you regarding the clearing permit for Connelly. We assume you have all the information you need now to process the SEPA or prepare a letter for my DNR and NPDES permits. Please call to let us know how we can facilitate a quicker turn around.

Also, WE sent up an unofficial plan for the layout of the plat and wish to proceed with the hydrogeologic work and offsite drainage items left on the SEPA check list. Again, please facilitate a quick review to enable us to proceed with the work outlined above.

Thanks

cc: Doug Connelly

Douglas N. Campbell, P.E.
 Principal
 Associated Project Consultants, Inc., P.S.
 1401 Astor Street
 Bellingham, WA 98225
 671-1146 Fax: 360-671-1169
 apcengineers@nas.com
 website: www.apcengineers.com

This communication, including attachments, is for the exclusive use of addressee and may contain proprietary, confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, copying, disclosure, dissemination or distribution is strictly prohibited.

10/16/2007

12-21-06

Associated Project Consultants, Inc.

From: "Elizabeth Anderson" <EAnderson@cityofblaine.com>
To: "Associated Project Consultants, Inc." <apcengineers@nas.com>
Cc: "Karen Calvert" <KCalvert@cityofblaine.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2006 5:14 PM
Subject: East Maple Ridge

Hi Doug – thank you for supplying the additional review materials. We are forwarding the plans and technical reports to Public Works and will schedule a TRC on the revised layout in January. That will enable us to firm up the schedule.

Regards,

Elizabeth

Elizabeth Anderson, AICP
Community Planner
360.543-9981
eanderson@cityofblaine.com

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

10/16/2007

1-9-07

Associated Project Consultants, Inc.

From: "Elizabeth Anderson" <EAnderson@cityofblaine.com>
To: "Associated Project Consultants, Inc." <apcengineers@nas.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2007 6:25 PM
Attach: PUD&LOP_requirements.doc
Subject: East Maple Ridge

Hi Doug.

I am attaching the checklists that I have pulled out of the code. In going over them myself, I think the landscape and vicinity plans may not yet be done. Much of the rest of it has, and needs transferral to the current set of plans. On the subdivision plan, I don't think that the land disturbance plan is necessary until the plat is approved.

Let me know if you have questions or ideas on this. I am trying to ensure that we have a complete and coordinated set of plans for each permit to review and support findings that the project is in compliance with the code and should be approved.

Elizabeth
Elizabeth Anderson, AICP
Community Planner
360.543-9981
eanderson@cityofblaine.com

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

10/16/2007

REVIEW DOCUMENTS CHECKLIST FOR EAST MAPLE RIDGE PUD & LOP

For PUD analysis (from BMC 17.48.060)

Site plans prepared and certified by a land surveyor registered by the state, which include the following:

- ☐ The existing site conditions, including contours at five-foot intervals, watercourses, unique natural features and forest cover;
- ☐ Proposed lot lines and plot designs;
- ☐ The location and floor area size of all existing and proposed buildings, structures and other improvements, including maximum heights, types of dwelling units, density per type and nonresidential structures including commercial facilities;
- ☐ The location and size in acres or square feet of all areas to be conveyed, dedicated or reserved as common open spaces, public parks, recreational areas, school sites and similar public and semipublic uses;
- ☐ The existing and proposed circulation system of arterial, collector and local streets including off-street parking areas, service areas, loading areas and major points of access to public rights-of-way, including major points of ingress and egress to the development. Notations of proposed ownership, public or private, should be included where appropriate (detailed engineering drawings of cross-sections and street standards should be handled in the final development stage);
- ☐ The existing and proposed pedestrian circulation system, including its interrelationships with the vehicular circulation system, indicating proposed solutions to points of conflict;
- ☐ The existing and proposed utility systems including sanitary sewers, storm sewers and water, electric, gas and telephone lines;
- ☐ A general landscape plan indicating the treatment of materials used for private and common open space (this landscape plan should be in general schematic form at this stage);
- ☐ Enough information on land areas adjacent to the proposed PUD to indicate the relationships between the proposed development and existing and proposed adjacent areas, including land uses, zoning classifications, densities, circulation systems, public facilities and unique natural features of the landscape;
- ☐ The proposed treatment of the perimeter of the PUD, including materials and techniques used such as screens, fences and walls;

To supplement the site plans, provide:

- Provisions for maintenance of common space or common property;

FOR PRELIMINARY PLAT ANALYSIS (BMC 17.36.030):

- ☐ **Subdivision Title Report** - Provide a Title Report current to within 30 days of the date of application.

- ☐ **Assessor's Map & List of Property Owners**

Provide an Assessor's Map(s) showing the location of the subject property and all properties, partially or completely within 300 feet of the external boundaries of the subject property. The Applicant must also provide a mailing list of all property owners who are included within the 300-foot radius.

- ☐ **Legal Description**

All subdivision applications shall have a legal description of the entire parcel to be subdivided and shall be stamped by a registered land surveyor.

- ☐ **Vicinity Map**

A location and vicinity map, drawn to a sufficient scale, that clearly locates the proposed project in relation to streets, intersections, other rights-of-way, natural features and other prominent landmarks.

- ☐ **Existing Conditions Plan**

An existing conditions plan, that extends at least 50 feet beyond the boundaries of the subject site and is accurately drawn to 1" = 20', 30' 40' or 50' scale, shall include the following information:

- A professionally prepared topographic map based upon a site survey delineating existing contours at no less than five-foot intervals, and which locates all surface water features streams, wetlands and marine waters, along with their associated ordinary high-water lines and/or required setback/buffers, location of drainage patterns and drainage courses, and other critical environmental areas, such as unstable slopes, slopes in excess of 15%, 100-year floodplain and significant wildlife habitat;
- The site size, dimensions and orientation relative to north;
- The location of existing structures and other improvements on the site, including but not limited to buildings, fences, landscaped areas, culverts, in ground and above ground storage tanks, pedestrian walkways and areas, bikeways, bridges, roads, streets and other internal circulation, parking, loading, open space and utility structures and lines, including fire hydrants; and
- The location and dimensions of existing easements.

- ☐ **SEPA Environmental Checklist**

A completed and signed SEPA Environmental Checklist, if applicable.

- ☐ **Sign Plan (if applicable)**

If applicable and proposed at time of site plan submittal, the sign plan shall include to-scale details of existing and proposed signs that are in accordance with Chapter 17.122, BMC, the Blaine Design Guidelines and Sign Ordinance Supplement and the provisions of the Resort Semiahmoo Master Development Plan; include their location

and type (e.g. fascia, freestanding, etc.). Please note that a separate Sign Permit is required.

❑ Preliminary Plat Map

The preliminary plat map, prepared and certified by a land surveyor registered by the State of Washington, shall be drawn to the same scale as the existing conditions plan and shall include the following:

- The location and dimensions of proposed lots, streets and other rights-of-way and public or private access and/or utility easements on and adjoining the site;
- All areas, if any, to be preserved as buffers or to be dedicated or temporarily reserved for a public, private or community use or for open space;
- An accurate and complete legal description of the subject property;
- Critical Areas pursuant to Division Five, of the City's Land Use & Development Code;
- Existing structures to be retained on the site and their distance from property lines of the subject site;
- Proposed structures on the site, including fences, etc., and their distance from property lines;
- Summary table which includes, total site area, gross floor area by use, (i.e., manufacturing, office, retail, storage), total lot coverage proposed, including residential density calculations.

❑ Landscape Plan

The proposed landscape plan shall be drawn to the same scale as the site plan and in accordance with the provisions, design standards and guidelines of the City's landscaping regulations, Chapter 17.126, BMC. The plan shall show location, height and material of fences, buffers, berms, walls and other proposed screening, if applicable, and the location and dimensions or area of terraces, decks, shelters, play areas and other recreation areas.

❑ Parking, Loading & Internal Circulation Plan

If applicable, the proposed parking, loading and internal circulation plan shall be drawn to the same scale as the site plan and in accordance with the provisions, design standards and guidelines of the City's regulations, Chapter 17.124, BMC

❑ Lighting Plan

If applicable, the proposed lighting plan shall show all existing and proposed lighting on site and within right-of-ways. Include light sources, patterns and illumination and other design standards, pursuant to the standards as articulated in the City's "Development Guidelines and Public Works Standards".

❑ Land Disturbance Plan

The proposed land disturbance plan shall be drawn to the same scale as the site plan and in accordance with the provisions, design standards and guidelines of the City's land disturbance regulations, Chapter 17.84, BMC.

❑ Reduced Copies of all Oversized Plans

If plans submitted are on paper larger than 11" x 17", than a reduced set, 11" x 17" or smaller, shall be provided.

❑ Engineering Plans

A complete set of preliminary civil engineering plans pursuant to the City's Code and the City's "Development Guidelines and Public Works Standards", including:

- **Utility Plan(s)**, showing source, location and size of all existing and proposed water, sewer and electrical lines and associated structures adjacent to the subject site and on-site, existing fire hydrants with 100 feet of site, and proposed hydrants off- and on-site.
- **Preliminary Stormwater Plan**, pursuant to the current edition (August 2001) of the Washington State Department of Ecology, Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington. Adequate calculations for the size of all storm conveyance and treatment facilities, from origin to destination, shall be provided.
- **Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plan** pursuant to the current edition (August 2001) of the Washington State Department of Ecology, Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington.
- **Conceptual Street Design Plan**, if proposed project requires street improvements, showing location/dimensions of existing and proposed rights-of-way, curbs and sidewalks, storm drains and catch basins, pavement section(s), sewer and water mains, power, street trees and all other elements between the pavement edge and property line.

❑ Other Applications, Plans, Studies, Etc.

Other information, such as wetland, traffic, geotechnical or other studies, shall be provided as requested by the Director, including related applications or studies, to show that the development complies with other applicable City Standards.

Since the reviews are related, where the same document is required for both PUD and LOP, a single document can be supplied for both reviews. Please label the it with both the PUD and LOP, if you want to use the single document for both reviews.

1-29-07

-----Original Message-----

From: Associated Project Consultants, Inc. [mailto:apcengineers@nas.com]

Sent: Monday, January 29, 2007 10:22 AM

To: Elizabeth Anderson; Terry Galvin

Cc: Jack Swanson

Subject: East Maple Ridge

Elizabeth,

Please forward the East Maple Ridge comments from Sandy. (I just got Prestwick Woods. thanks). I know we have had many many meetings on EMR and after meeting with Sandy we are even more confident that staff should be able to advance this project to the planning commission. We were informed that the January 25th planning commission date would work and then it failed to work!!!! Please consider the time line on this project as critical for the construction season and look at the work we have done to reorganize the file for the benefit of the project and staff - moving forward. As we discussed, our December 13th submittal re-started the clock on this project.

We look forward to the two dates we discussed, March 8th or the 22nd. March 8th is our target date.

Thank you for your consideration.

Douglas N. Campbell, P.E.

Principal

Associated Project Consultants, Inc., P.S.

1401 Astor Street

Bellingham, WA 98225

671-1146 Fax: 360-671-1169

apcengineers@nas.com

website: www.apcengineers.com

This communication, including attachments, is for the exclusive use of addressee and may contain proprietary, confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, copying, disclosure, dissemination or distribution is strictly prohibited.

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

10/16/2007

2-1-07

Associated Project Consultants, Inc.

From: "Elizabeth Anderson" <EAnderson@cityofblaine.com>
To: "Associated Project Consultants, Inc." <apcengineers@nas.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2007 9:43 AM
Subject: RE: East Maple Ridge

Doug- Thanks for sending it again.

Elizabeth Anderson, AICP
 Community Planner
 360.543-9981
 eanderson@cityofblaine.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Associated Project Consultants, Inc. [mailto:apcengineers@nas.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2007 8:05 PM
To: Elizabeth Anderson; Terry Gibson
Cc: Gary Tomsic
Subject: Fw: East Maple Ridge

Elizabeth and Terry,

Since I saw you tonight at the planning commission meeting and you had not seen this memo from Monday, please let me know you did get it by responding to the issues raised in Jack's email.

Thank you for your consideration.

Doug Campbell

----- Original Message -----

From: Jenny Hendricks
To: Associated Project Consultants, Inc.
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2007 10:16 AM
Subject: FW: East Maple Ridge

From: Jenny Hendricks
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2007 4:41 PM
To: 'EAnderson@cityofblaine.com'
Cc: 'tgalvin@ci.blaine.wa.us'
Subject: RE: East Maple Ridge

Elizabeth,

Thank you for copying me on the email to Doug.

The materials requested by the City in response to the Connelly PUD/Subdivision application were forwarded to the City on December 13, 2006. No response from the City was made within the fourteen time period established by your code. Thus the application became complete at the end of that fourteen days.

This is not the time to be thinking about additional information that you may desire. It is now time to schedule this matter for public hearing and complete your staff report. We can respond accordingly. If questions come up at the hearing which require additional response we can evaluate at that time what an appropriate response would be. We know there will be a work session which would be an appropriate time to deal with issues of that ilk.


With regard to your question relating to state regulations, the issue was whether or not phasing of the project beyond 5 years plus a 1 year extension was possible for this project. The answer to that question is yes

10/16/2007

and my letter analyzing the issue was sent to Doug for forwarding to you with his phasing plan.

The issue is not whether the entire infrastructure for the PUD must be built all at once. No ordinance or rule requires that. Phasing is the vehicle that we use to avoid having to make such an expensive commitment to infrastructure in the early stages of the project. Only infrastructure needed to service each phase is required in order for the plat approval of that phase. The phases of the plat approval match the PUD phases which essentially takes care of the problem. As we discussed with Sandy, there is also some additional consideration which needs to be made in terms of connecting up these phases insuring that each phase has some closure, i.e., stands on its own when it is complete. Also, it is quite common for infrastructure development to be bonded to allow final plat approval prior to actual construction. In that way, completion of infrastructure can be accomplished during the proper season and at more convenient and less expensive times than otherwise.

Kindly make these points to Terry when you discuss the matter with him. I am sending him a copy of this email so he will have advance notice of these issues.

Please follow up with any questions or concerns you may have. Once again, it is imperative that we get this matter to hearing ASAP. The City is already in material violation of both state law and your own ordinances as far as moving this project forward. 

Thanks,

JACK O. SWANSON
Belcher, Swanson, Law Firm, P.L.L.C.
900 Dupont Street
Bellingham, WA 98225
(360) 734-6390
(360) 671-0753
jos@belcherswanson.com

This e-mail is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and contains information belonging to Belcher Swanson, et al., which is confidential and/or legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this e-mail information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Elizabeth Anderson [<mailto:EAnderson@cityofblaine.com>]
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2007 12:16 PM
To: Associated Project Consultants, Inc.; Terry Galvin
Cc: Jack Swanson
Subject: RE: East Maple Ridge

Doug - thank you for revising multiple documents and providing much more of the level of detail required to analyze and advance the project to the planning commission.

I am going over all of Sandy's comments, some of which defer to CDS, and others which directly address those required items from the code that we discussed at our meeting on January 18. As you are probably aware, PW still has concerns with the site plan showing the existing and proposed utility systems including sanitary sewers, storm sewers, and water, electric, gas and telephone lines. (BMC 17.48.060.B.7)

I also anticipate Mr. Swanson's transmittal of state regulations that would allow the final plat approval of the entire PUD without infrastructure development. That could affect processing, including analysis and recommendations.

I will be discussing completion of the documents for review with Terry Galvin at our regular mid-day meeting today, and will provide you with a list of anything that may need further detail prior to scheduling. Thanks again for the more thorough documentation for review.

Elizabeth Anderson, AICP
Community Planner
360.543-9981
eanderson@cityofblaine.com

10/16/2007

2-7-07

Doug Campbell

From: Elizabeth Anderson [EAnderson@cityofblaine.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2007 12:18 PM
To: Associated Project Consultants, Inc.
Cc: Steve Banham; Sandy Petersen; Gary Tomsic; Terry Galvin; Karen Calvert
Subject: East Maple Ridge

Doug – here are our notes on the ongoing delivery of review materials. Thank you for those sent over this week. The project hearing date is set, as well.

Best regards,

Elizabeth

Elizabeth Anderson, AICP
Community Planner
360.543-9981
eanderson@cityofblaine.com

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

10/16/2007

3-6-07

Doug Campbell

From: Terry Galvin [TGalvin@cityofblaine.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2007 9:56 AM
To: Associated Project Consultants, Inc.
Subject: RE: East Blaine Servicing and Phasing Plan

Doug – we will add this to the application packet. The project is scheduled for a Public hearing on March 22 at 7pm. Do you have an address list of property owners around the property. If you do, would appreciate an electronic copy.

Terry Galvin
Community Development Director

-----Original Message-----

From: Associated Project Consultants, Inc. [mailto:apcengineers@nas.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2007 8:12 AM
To: Terry Galvin
Subject: FW: East Blaine Servicing and Phasing Plan

Douglas N. Campbell, P.E.
Principal
Associated Project Consultants, Inc., P.S.
1401 Astor Street
Bellingham, WA 98225
671-1146 Fax: 360-671-1169
apcengineers@nas.com
website: www.apcengineers.com

This communication, including attachments, is for the exclusive use of addressee and may contain proprietary, confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, copying, disclosure, dissemination or distribution is strictly prohibited.

-----Original Message-----

From: Associated Project Consultants, Inc. [mailto:apcengineers@nas.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2007 8:10 AM
To: Steve Banham (E-mail)
Subject: FW: East Blaine Servicing and Phasing Plan

Douglas N. Campbell, P.E.
Principal
Associated Project Consultants, Inc., P.S.
1401 Astor Street
Bellingham, WA 98225
671-1146 Fax: 360-671-1169
apcengineers@nas.com

10/16/2007

website: www.apcengineers.com

This communication, including attachments, is for the exclusive use of addressee and may contain proprietary, confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, copying, disclosure, dissemination or distribution is strictly prohibited.

-----Original Message-----

From: Associated Project Consultants, Inc. [<mailto:apcengineers@nas.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2007 8:07 AM
To: Jack Swanson (E-mail)
Subject: FW: East Blaine Servicing and Phasing Plan

-----Original Message-----

From: Associated Project Consultants, Inc. [<mailto:apcengineers@nas.com>]
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2007 4:49 PM
To: Steve Banham (E-mail); Sandy Petersen (E-mail); Terry Galvin (E-mail)
Cc: Jack Swanson (E-mail); Doug Connelly (E-mail)
Subject: East Blaine Servicing and Phasing Plan

Steve,

Thank you for meeting with us to discuss the remaining items dealing with the East Maple Ridge project.

We have reviewed the request for added information about the servicing and phasing of the East Maple Ridge PUD and plat and offer the attached summary. There are some presumptions and as to means and methods proposed both by both the developer and the city that make this preliminary plan workable and gives it some flexibility. Your suggestions were very helpful and appreciated.

<<...>>

Douglas N. Campbell, P.E.
Principal
Associated Project Consultants, Inc., P.S.
1401 Astor Street
Bellingham, WA 98225
671-1146 Fax: 360-671-1169
apcengineers@nas.com
website: www.apcengineers.com

This communication, including attachments, is for the exclusive use of addressee and may contain proprietary, confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, copying, disclosure, dissemination or distribution is strictly prohibited.

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

3-12-07

Doug Campbell

From: Terry Galvin [TGalvin@cityofblaine.com]
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2007 4:33 PM
To: apcengineers@nas.com
Subject: submittal requirements

I am working on the staff report.... Question – not sure of the status of your submittal packet. Have you provided the submittal materials for members of the PC? They usually are provided to the PC members as attachments to the staff report. My deadline for the staff report is this Friday.

Terry Galvin
Community Development Director

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

10/16/2007

3-12-07

Doug Campbell

From: Terry Galvin [TGalvin@cityofblaine.com]
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2007 6:16 PM
To: Associated Project Consultants, Inc.
Subject: RE: EMR 93-167

I will call in the morning.

Terry Galvin
Community Development Director

-----Original Message-----

From: Associated Project Consultants, Inc. [mailto:apcengineers@nas.com]
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2007 6:17 PM
To: Terry Galvin
Subject: EMR 93-167

Terry,

Call me regarding the submittal you are requesting.

Thanks

Douglas N. Campbell, P.E.
Principal
Associated Project Consultants, Inc., P.S.
1401 Astor Street
Bellingham, WA 98225
671-1146 Fax: 360-671-1169
apcengineers@nas.com
website: www.apcengineers.com

This communication, including attachments, is for the exclusive use of addressee and may contain proprietary, confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, copying, disclosure, dissemination or distribution is strictly prohibited.

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

10/16/2007

3-13-07

Doug Campbell

From: Terry Galvin [TGalvin@cityofblaine.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2007 8:57 AM
To: Jonathon Sitkin
Cc: Department Heads; apcengineers@nas.com; Jack O. Swanson; Alex Wenger
Subject: phased development and vesting - East Maple Ridge

Jon – there is a significant issue that needs resolution earlier, rather than later. Our code has time limits on long plats and does not appear to anticipate a large development such as East Maple Falls or Grandis Pond with a number of phases.

The applicant, of course, wants to insure that the development as the security of being able to develop in a phased manner over, perhaps a 20 year period, without having to substantially revise with every new rule, OR go through a public hearing every time they initiate another phase of the development.

The City will be concerned with the standard of development, consistency with the approved final PUD and sees the advantage of periodic review to insure that it is on track. The questions I have in my mind have to do with the expectation of compliance with new regulations; the need for a very clear master plan if development is going to take place over a 20 year period.

This is important enough that It warrants a meeting between you me, Doug and Jack. Jack has sent us a letter outlining his understanding of the issue. I can provide that for you. However, I would like to get this sorted out before I send out a staff report this Friday. Can you meet sometime Thursday or Friday?

Terry Galvin
Community Development Director

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

10/16/2007

3-15-07

Doug Campbell

From: Terry Galvin [TGalvin@cityofblaine.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 15, 2007 11:20 AM
To: Jonathon Sitkin
Cc: Gary Tomsic; apcengineers@nas.com; Jack O. Swanson; Doug Campbell
Subject: PUD and vesting

Jon – still have not heard back from you on this issue. Doug Campbell (with Jack Swanson) and I are both trying to get some clarification on this legal issue. My staff report is due tomorrow. Reference attached emails. Please let me know when you will have some time. I have a parks board meeting at 3pm today but I am otherwise available. Thanks.

Terry Galvin
Community Development Director

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

10/16/2007

31507

Doug Campbell

From: Terry Galvin [TGalvin@cityofblaine.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 15, 2007 11:13 AM
To: Associated Project Consultants, Inc.
Subject: RE: Meeting today

Two things.

1. I am still working on a draft I can send you.
2. After making several calls and emails, I have still not heard back from Jon Sitkin regarding a meeting.

I am working on both but cannot confirm a meeting until I get something from Jon.

Terry Galvin
Community Development Director

-----Original Message-----

From: Associated Project Consultants, Inc. [mailto:apcengineers@nas.com]

Sent: Thursday, March 15, 2007 9:56 AM
To: Terry Galvin
Cc: Jack O. Swanson; "Doug Campbell"@nas.com
Subject: Meeting today

Hello Terry,

Can you let me know when and where we will be meeting today.

Thank you,

Doug Campbell, P.E.
Principal
Associated Project Consultants, Inc., P.S.
1401 Astor Street
Bellingham, WA 98225
Ph. (360) 671-1146 - Fax (360) 671-1169
E-mail: apcengineers@nas.com
Website: www.apcengineers.com

This communication, including attachments, is for the exclusive use of addressee and may contain proprietary, confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, copying, disclosure, dissemination or distribution is strictly prohibited.

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

3 16 07

Doug Campbell

From: Terry Galvin [TGalvin@cityofblaine.com]
Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 9:50 AM
To: Associated Project Consultants, Inc.
Subject: RE: EMR

Sitkin has been out of the office. He is now reviewing the Swanson letter and the phasing draft (March 3). Looks like I am going to have to work through the weekend on this.... And get it to the PC on Monday. However, I would like to get the application packets to them today. That will give them something to review over the weekend.

I Am trying to at least get something to you by noon.

When are the application packets going to be delivered?

Terry Galvin
Community Development Director

-----Original Message-----

From: Associated Project Consultants, Inc. [mailto:apcengineers@nas.com]
Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 8:12 AM
To: Terry Galvin
Subject: EMR

Terry,

Whats the progress on the staff report and Sitkin?

Thanks

Douglas N. Campbell, P.E.
Principal
Associated Project Consultants, Inc., P.S.
1401 Astor Street
Bellingham, WA 98225
671-1146 Fax: 360-671-1169
apcengineers@nas.com
website: www.apcengineers.com

This communication, including attachments, is for the exclusive use of addressee and may contain proprietary, confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, copying, disclosure, dissemination or distribution is strictly prohibited.

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

10/16/2007

31707

Doug Campbell

From: Terry Galvin [TGalvin@cityofblaine.com]
Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 1:50 PM
To: Associated Project Consultants, Inc.
Subject: RE: 93-167 EMR (T. Galvin)

Here in my office... Does that work.

Terry Galvin
Community Development Director

-----Original Message-----

From: Associated Project Consultants, Inc. [mailto:apcengineers@nas.com]
Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 12:41 PM
To: Terry Galvin; Jack O. Swanson
Subject: FW: 93-167 EMR (T. Galvin)

Terry,

Where do you want the packets delivered?

Doug

Email the staff report, if it is done on the weekend, to my home office please, campbell98226@msn.com.

Thanks

Douglas N. Campbell, P.E.
Principal
Associated Project Consultants, Inc., P.S.
1401 Astor Street
Bellingham, WA 98225
671-1146 Fax: 360-671-1169
apcengineers@nas.com
website: www.apcengineers.com

This communication, including attachments, is for the exclusive use of addressee and may contain proprietary, confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, copying, disclosure, dissemination or distribution is strictly prohibited.

-----Original Message-----

From: Sylvia Cooper
Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 10:00 AM
To: Doug Campbell; Nathan Row
Subject: 93-167 EMR (T. Galvin)

-----Original Message-----

From: Terry Galvin [mailto:TGalvin@cityofblaine.com]
Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 9:50 AM
To: Associated Project Consultants, Inc.

10/16/2007

Subject: RE: EMR

Sitkin has been out of the office. He is now reviewing the Swanson letter and the phasing draft (March 3). Looks like I am going to have to work through the weekend on this.... And get it to the PC on Monday. However, I would like to get the application packets to them today. That will give them something to review over the weekend.

I Am trying to at least get something to you by noon.

When are the application packets going to be delivered?

Terry Galvin
Community Development Director

-----Original Message-----

From: Associated Project Consultants, Inc. [mailto:apcengineers@nas.com]

Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 8:12 AM

To: Terry Galvin

Subject: EMR

Terry,

Whats the progress on the staff report and Sitkin?

Thanks

Douglas N. Campbell, P.E.
Principal
Associated Project Consultants, Inc., P.S.
1401 Astor Street
Bellingham, WA 98225
671-1146 Fax: 360-671-1169
apcengineers@nas.com
website: www.apcengineers.com

This communication, including attachments, is for the exclusive use of addressee and may contain proprietary, confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, copying, disclosure, dissemination or distribution is strictly prohibited.

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

3 20 07

Doug Campbell

From: Terry Galvin [TGalvin@cityofblaine.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2007 1:01 PM
To: apcengineers@nas.com
Cc: Sandy Petersen; Steve Banham
Subject: staff report

Staff report has been put on the web site. My department sent a hard copy to you. I found that the information contained in the application packet was did not allow me to make recommendations to the Planning Commission with any confidence. Consequently, I asked the PC to review the submittal, and make a decision; move on with the existing information or request additional information.

I have attached my submittal and information review to assist you in your presentation Thursday evening.

Terry Galvin
Community Development Director

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

10/16/2007



REQUEST FOR PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

Exhibit C

Packet Adequacy And Detail Review

REVIEW DOCUMENTS CHECKLIST FOR EAST MAPLE RIDGE PUD & LOP

The following is a review of the documents submitted as part of the PUD and preliminary plat application to the City of Blaine. Staff consolidated all submittal and information requirements and provided a review in the following pages. Submittal requirements for this project were derived from the following Chapters of the Blaine Municipal Code.

I. 17.42, Planned Residential (PR) zoning district, BMC

II. 17.48, Planned Unit Development, BMC

III. 17.56 (.030) Preliminary Plat, BMC

Note: Since the reviews are related - where the same document is required for both PUD and Preliminary Plat review, staff allowed the applicant to consolidate the submission where applicable. When consolidated into a single document, the submittal must be labeled "for both PUD plan & preliminary plat submittal". This efficiency option was not intended to reduce the submittal requirements for either application, but where convenient, include additional information on both.

I. Information & submittal requirements pursuant to BMC 17.42, Planned Residential (PR) zoning district

Section 17.42.080 Modifications and reinforcement to the planned unit development standards.

A. A planned unit development must be approved by the city prior to the issuance of any development permits on the site (per Chapter 17.48 BMC). If the entire area of planned residential zone is not included in the planned unit development, the relationship to existing uses or areas not included must be indicated and considered in the overall plan.

Staff Response:

- *The remainder of the Planned Residential (PR) Zoning District was not considered in the submittals. Staff note: the PR zoning district is approximately 1100 acres. The proposed PUD is 88 acres. Therefore this requirement applies.*

(A Cont) The plan shall contain reports, maps, sketches and supporting documents to adequately describe the applicant's proposal. Written documents required for the master plan should include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Description of existing site conditions including but not limited to topography,

watercourses, soils/geologic conditions, unique natural and built features, forest cover, wetlands, wildlife corridors and aquifer recharge areas and other items required to fully understand the site. Supplementary reports may be included for reference;

Staff Response:

- *No clear watercourses identified in the plan. The stormwater report provides watershed information.*
- *No evidence of a study or report of vegetation type, tree type etc. other than within wetland areas.*
- *Appendix 10 - Geotechnical Report provides soil and geologic and aquifer information.*
- *Appendix 11 - Wetland Delineation Report provides wetland information.*
- *No survey of significant trees, wildlife corridors or characterization of the site in its present condition.*

- b. Phasing of the development including at least the location, use, density, extent, or amount by each phase; general timing (ranges); and reasonable security devices to assure projects approved in each phase are completed;

Staff Response:

- *The applicant has provided a phasing plan for utilities and it is contained in Appendix 8. However, a detailed phasing plan that includes characterization details, timing and proposed security was not included in the packet*

3. Economic feasibility studies or market analyses necessary to evaluate phasing proposals and fiscal impact on the city;

Staff Response: Not included in packet

4. Other documentation required by the city.

Staff Response: To date, no other documents requested above those required in the BMC

B. An environmental checklist for each phase of the development, as defined in the State Environmental Policy Act, will be done for the overall planned unit development evaluating the impact of the above items.

Staff Response: Checklist submitted for entire PUD.

II. Information & submittal requirements pursuant to BMC 17.48, Planned Unit Development.

17.48.060 Submission – Contents.

An applicant may submit applications for preliminary and final PUD approval simultaneously; provided all information required under this section through BMC 17.48.200 is submitted:

Staff Response: The applicant has not indicated that the submittal is for a preliminary or both. Staff is proceeding on the presumption that the application is for a preliminary PUD application.

A. Completed permit application form(s) signed by the owner(s) of the subject property or by a representative authorized to do so by written instrument executed by the owner(s) and filed with the application.

B. The site plan shall be prepared, drawn and certified by a land surveyor registered by the state and include the following:

1. The existing site conditions, including contours at five-foot intervals, watercourses, unique natural features and forest cover;

Staff Response:

- a. No clear watercourses on site plan.*
- b. No evidence of detailed vegetation type, tree type etc. on site plan*
- c. No survey of significant trees or forest cover on site plan.*

2. Proposed lot lines and plot designs;

Staff Response:

- a. Lots lines are clear.*
- b. Plot design is not clear. Only provided examples but there does not appear to be clear application to the site.*

3. The location and floor area size of all existing and proposed buildings, structures and other improvements, including maximum heights, types of dwelling units, density per type and nonresidential structures including commercial facilities;

Staff Response:

- a. Did not provide location and floor size.*
- b. Building heights are not detailed.*
- c. Cannot easily determine where dwelling type is located on the site.*
- d. Not clear what the density per type is distribution of dwelling unit type.*
- e. No clear indication of size or type of commercial facilities.*
- f. Other Specific details that are missing:***

Residential Character:

1. Multi Family development housing numbers
 - a. Number and location of residential units proposed as zero lot line attached single family structures (zero lot line duplexes).*
 - b. Number and location of residential units proposed as Row housing.*
 - c. Number and location of residential units proposed as Live/Work Row Housing.*
 - d. Number and location of residential units proposed as Stacked Flats.*
2. Building footprints for individual lots not depicted on site plan.
 - a. Building footprints for the Cottage Single Family lots.*
 - b. Building footprints for the Zero Lot Line attached Single Family lots.*
 - c. Building footprints for the Row housing lots.*
 - d. Building footprints for the Live/Work Row housing lots.*
 - e. Building footprints for the Stacked Flats housing lots.*
3. Estimated livable area calculations:
 - a. Square footage range of the Cottage Single Family units*
 - b. Square footage range of the Zero Lot Line attached Single Family units*
 - c. Square footage range of the Row housing units*
 - d. Square footage range of the Live/Work Row housing units*
 - e. Square footage range of the Stacked Flats housing units*

4. The location and size in acres or square feet of all areas to be conveyed, dedicated or reserved as common open spaces, public parks, recreational areas, school sites and similar public and semipublic uses;

Staff Response:

- a. Individual areas not dedicated to any specific use.*
- b. City Park to be dedicated to city? No detail as to intent or how that is going to be accomplished and when.*

5. The existing and proposed circulation system of arterial, collector and local streets including off-street parking areas, service areas, loading areas and major points of access to public rights-of-way, including major points of ingress and egress to the development.

Staff Response:

- a. Public works comments not received.*
- b. Adequate submittal for vehicular circulation.*
- c. More detail needed for pedestrian circulation.*

5. (Continuation of 5) Notations of proposed ownership, public or private, should be included where appropriate;

Staff Response: Notations of proposed ownership, public or private not indicated.

6. The existing and proposed pedestrian circulation system, including its interrelationships with the vehicular circulation system, indicating proposed solutions to points of conflict;

Staff Response: Multi-use trail indicated in Pedestrian Circulation Plan (map #7) contains no design detail. width? lighting? for multi use trail vs. pedestrian path.

7. The existing and proposed utility systems including sanitary sewers, storm sewers and water, electric, gas and telephone lines;

Staff Response:

- a. Public Works Comments pending*

8. A general landscape plan indicating the treatment of materials used for private and common open space (this landscape plan should be in general schematic form at this stage);

Staff Response:

- a. Inadequate detail provided*
- b. No indication of existing vegetation type, age, etc.*
- c. No indication of landscaping and characterization of stormwater ponds.*

9. Enough information on land areas adjacent to the proposed PUD to indicate the relationships between the proposed development and existing and proposed adjacent areas, including land uses, zoning classifications, densities, circulation systems, public facilities and unique natural features of the landscape;

Staff Response:

- a. Inadequate detail and information addressing the surrounding area.*
- b. No existing or projected residential type and density estimates provided*
- c. No information on Harvey Road community to the east*
- d. No information on Cables Addition community to the north.*

10. The proposed treatment of the perimeter of the PUD, including materials and techniques used such as screens, fences and walls;

Staff Response:

- a. Proposal calls for a 30' natural buffer only. No further detail provided.*

11. Any additional information, as required by the planning commission, necessary to evaluate the character and impact of the proposed PUD;

Staff Response:

- a. To be determined.*

12. Provisions for maintenance of common space or common property;

Staff Response:

a. *No information on maintenacne of common space or common property.*

C. The required filing fees shall be paid to the city upon submission of a PUD for approval.

Staff Response:

a. *Requirement met.*

D. SEPA checklist, if required, typewritten or in ink and signed.

Staff Response:

a. *Requirement met.*

E. A statement of objectives to be achieved by the PUD through the particular approach proposed by the applicant. This statement should include a description of the character of the proposed development and the rationale behind the assumptions and choices made by the applicant.

Staff Response:

- a. *While the applicant has included 6 "Principle design parameters" in the submittal packet, there is no general discription of the development that applies the design parameters to the project.*
- b. *Within several attachements, the applincant provides objectives and guidance for specific components of the development. They include the following:*
 1. *Page 1 of the applicants packet lists 6 "principle design parameters for East Maple Ridge."*
 2. *Attachment 12-Building Lot Configurations, includes design objectives and lot standards.*
 3. *Attachment 13-Architectural Guidelines, includes a goal statement and design guidelnes for single family attached and detached housing.*
 4. *Attachement 14-Landscaping and Planting Standards, includes a design objective and related standards.*
 5. *Attachment 15- Sign standards contains no goals or objectives.*

F. A statement of the applicant's intentions with regard to the future selling or leasing of all or portions of the PUD, such as land areas, dwelling units, etc.

Staff Response: Statement not included.

G. Quantitative data for the following:

1. Total number and type of dwelling units;

Staff Response: general information provided.

2. Parcel size;

Staff Response: Not provided in PUD maps or information. Lot sizes are are included in the preliminary plat maps contained in the binder sleeve.

3. Proposed lot coverage of buildings and structures;

Staff Response: Not provided.

4. Approximate gross and net residential densities;

Staff Response: Appicant provides gross density but does not provide net density.

5. Total amount of open space, including a separate figure for usable open space;

Staff Response: Adequate information, but not clear if it includes stormwater detention areas..

6. Total amount of nonresidential construction, including a separate figure for commercial or institutional facilities;

Staff Response: No information provided on PUD map.

General comment: The applicant provides a summary of most of the requested information in

the introduction of the application packet. There is also a six-line project summary that addresses the request in general terms.

7. Economic feasibility studies or market analyses or other studies as required by the review authority.

Staff response: No information provided.

III. Information & submittal requirements pursuant to BMC 17.56(.030) Preliminary Plat

Persons making application for preliminary plat approval shall submit the following:

- A. Completed preliminary plat application form(s) signed by the owner(s) of the subject property or by a representative authorized to do so by written instrument executed by the owner(s) and filed with the application.

Subdivision Title Report - Provide a Title Report current to within 30 days of the date of application.

Staff Response: Title report provided – January 11, 2007

- B. Assessor's Map & List of Property Owners
Provide an Assessor's Map(s) showing the location of the subject property and all properties, partially or completely within 300 feet of the external boundaries of the subject property. The Applicant must also provide a mailing list of all property owners who are included within the 300-foot radius.

Staff Response: Provided by the City of Blaine.

- C. Legal Description
All subdivision applications shall have a legal description of the entire parcel to be subdivided and shall be stamped by a registered land surveyor.

Staff Response: Provided

- D. Vicinity Map
A location and vicinity map, drawn to a sufficient scale, that clearly locates the proposed project in relation to streets, intersections, other rights-of-way, natural features and other prominent landmarks.

Staff Response: Adequate detail provided, however no prominent landmarks included

- E. Existing Conditions Plan
An existing conditions plan, that extends at least 50 feet beyond the boundaries of the subject site and is accurately drawn to 1" = 20', 30' 40' or 50' scale, shall include the following information:

Staff Response: Site plan provided at a scale of 1"=200'

- a. A professionally prepared topographic map based upon a site survey delineating existing contours at no less than five-foot intervals, and which locates all surface water features streams, wetlands and marine waters, along with their associated ordinary high-water lines and/or required setback/buffers, location of drainage patterns and drainage courses, and other critical environmental areas, such as unstable slopes, slopes in excess of 15%, 100-year floodplain and significant wildlife habitat;

Staff Response: Location of drainage patterns and drainage courses not provided

on this map but indicated in stormwater plan.

b. The site size, dimensions and orientation relative to north;

Staff Response: Provided

c. The location of existing structures and other improvements on the site, including but not limited to buildings, fences, landscaped areas, culverts, in ground and above ground storage tanks, pedestrian walkways and areas, bikeways, bridges, roads, streets and other internal circulation, parking, loading, open space and utility structures and lines, including fire hydrants;

Staff Response: Provided

d. The location and dimensions of existing easements.

Staff Response: Provided

e. Preliminary Plat Map

The preliminary plat map, prepared and certified by a land surveyor registered by the State of Washington, shall be drawn to the same scale as the existing conditions plan and shall include the following:

a. The location and dimensions of proposed lots, streets and other rights-of-way and public or private access and/or utility easements on and adjoining the site;

Staff Response: Provided

b. All areas, if any, to be preserved as buffers or to be dedicated or temporarily reserved for a public, private or community use or for open space;

Staff Response: Provided

c. An accurate and complete legal description of the subject property;

Staff Response: Provided

d. Critical Areas pursuant to Division Five, of the City's Land Use & Development Code;

Staff Response: Provided. See Appendix 11-Wetlands delineation report.

e. Existing structures to be retained on the site and their distance from property lines of the subject site;

Staff Response: Provided

f. Proposed structures on the site, including fences, etc., and their distance from property lines;

Staff Response: Not provided on plat map, no details on single family residences, multi family structures only have general details

g. Summary table which includes, total site area, gross floor area by use, (i.e., manufacturing, office, retail, storage), total lot coverage proposed, including residential density calculations.

Staff Response:

- *Gross floor area by use not not provided on plat map.*
- *Total lot coverage not provided.*

- *Only gross residential density number provided. Needs net density number.*
 -
- f. **Landscape Plan**
The proposed landscape plan shall be drawn to the same scale as the site plan and in accordance with the provisions, design standards and guidelines of the City's landscaping regulations, Chapter 17.126, BMC. The plan shall show location, height and material of fences, buffers, berms, walls and other proposed screening, if applicable, and the location and dimensions or area of terraces, decks, shelters, play areas and other recreation areas.
Staff Response:
- *Only general buffer areas identified*
 - *No fence location or details provided*
 - *No indication of existing specimen trees, what will be left intact.*
- g. **Lighting Plan**
If applicable, the proposed lighting plan shall show all existing and proposed lighting on site and within right-of-ways. Include light sources, patterns and illumination and other design standards, pursuant to the standards as articulated in the City's "Development Guidelines and Public Works Standards"
Staff Response: Submitted as Appendix 16- Lighting Plan.
- h. **Reduced Copies of all Oversized Plans**
If plans submitted are on paper larger than 11" x 17", than a reduced set, 11" x 17" or smaller, shall be provided.
Staff Response: Submitted with application packet.
- i. **Conceptual Street Design Plan,**
If proposed project requires street improvements, then drawings showing location/dimensions of existing and proposed rights-of-way, curbs and sidewalks, storm drains and catch basins, pavement section(s), sewer and water mains, power, street trees and all other elements between the pavement edge and property line.
Staff Response: More detail required. See public works comments.
- j. **SEPA Environmental Checklist**
A completed and signed SEPA Environmental Checklist, if applicable.
Staff Response: Provide
- k. **Other Applications, Plans, Studies, Etc.**
Other information, such as wetland, traffic, geotechnical or other studies, shall be provided as requested by the Director, including related applications or studies, to show that the development complies with other applicable City Standards.
Staff Response: Additional Request studies by Director:
1. *Traffic Report submitted with application packet.*
 2. *Geotechnical Report submitted with application packet.*
 3. *Wetlands Report submitted with application packet.*

This concludes staff's review.

4207

Doug Campbell

From: Terry Galvin [TGalvin@cityofblaine.com]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2007 5:04 PM
To: apcengineers@nas.com
Subject: Follow up letter

Doug – have been working on the PC letter. 75% complete... I will be working on it another hour tonight and early tomorrow morning. Will send out a draft to PC for their review with a cc to you.

Terry Galvin
Community Development Director

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

10/16/2007

4-4-07

Doug Campbell

From: Terry Galvin [TGalvin@cityofblaine.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2007 5:45 PM
To: Planning Commission
Cc: Doug Campbell; Jonathon Sitkin; City Council; Department Heads; Sandy Petersen; CED All
Subject: PC directed letter to applicant

East Maple Ridge PUD proposal: Attached is my final draft of the letter you asked me to write. I have included it in draft form for your final review. I am also sending it to Doug Campbell so that he can begin to pull together a response now rather than later. I have provided it in word format so that you can make edits if you like and send them to Jeff.

Another subject: The applicants for Silver Maple Court (Doug Scarlett) were unable to provide the submittal material for the application packet. After talking with them this afternoon I have begun to take the necessary steps to postpone the public hearing, scheduled for April 4, and reschedule it for April 26.

Final comment: In light of the discussions we have had with the City Council in the last few joint CC/PC work sessions, I have CCd them so that they can see the tangible changes that are taking place as a result of our discussions. They can discuss any clarification they need or related issues with Gary Tomsic or myself, if they arise.

Regards to all

Terry Galvin
Community Development Director

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

10/16/2007

April 2, 2007

Doug Connelly
9070 Custer School Road
Custer, WA 98240

Mr. Connelly,

At the end of their worksession last Thursday, the Planning Commission decided to request the applicant to submit additional information in accordance with the City requirements. They instructed staff to prepare a letter that detailed the information that they have requested. This letter includes that list of addition submittals.

Please note that the additional information must be submitted to this office before the City can resume its review of the project. Prior to the resumption of PC review staff will be required to review the additional information and revise their staff report accordingly. Once completed, staff will submit the additional information and revised staff report to the Planning Commission and notify all parties of record and the general public of the PCs intent to continue the Public hearing and provide for public comment on the complete information packet. Once the open public record is closed, the Planning Commission can then resume its review of the proposed project. Staff will keep you posted of these dates as they become clear.

Additional requested information to be provided by applicant:

1. Additional information requested pursuant to East Blaine Revised Annexation Agreement.

The applicant shall provide evidence that he has satisfied or provided for satisfaction of all "Developer's Obligations" contained in section 2 of the "Amended Development Agreement" approved by the City Council in April of 2005, signed by Doug and Louise Connelly, the Mayor, and the City Manager on April 29, 2005 and notarized by Jack Swanson on the same date. (Attachment included)

2. Additional information requested pursuant to Chapters 17.42, Planned Residential (PR) zoning district, 17.48, Planned Unit Development, and 17.56 (.030), BMC

The applicant shall revise and reorganize the submittal document so that it is organized in such a manner that, along with maps and illustrations, it can be used as a guidebook for the proposed East Maple Ridge residential development

over the length of its phased development process. The development guidebook should provide detailed and integrated information that responds to the following question and information requests:

1. In one section of the guidebook, explain, how this development will achieve the long term goals and objectives for the city in this area? In responding to this question, provide a clear statement of Intent and goals for the project. This statement should include a description of the character of the proposed development and the rationale behind the assumptions and choices made by the applicant. This should also include clear evidence that demonstrates how the development will achieve the purpose statements contained in the in Chapters 17.42, Planned Residential (PR) zoning district, 17.48, Planned Unit Development, and 17.56 , Preliminary Plat, BMC.
2. In one section of the guidebook, explain how the proposed project will achieve compatibility with existing and future development in the east Blaine area. In providing an answer, use site-specific examples and provide enough detail to show a rational and logical basis for the response. For instance, what is the relationship of the proposed development to existing properties and uses in the vicinity of the subject property? Provide enough information on land areas adjacent to the proposed PUD to indicate cause and affect relationships. This should include a discussion of existing and projected densities, circulation systems, public facilities and unique natural features of the surrounding landscape. How will this impact Harvey Road community to the east? Cables Addition community to the north. Etc.
3. In one section of the guidebook, describe the elements of creative and imaginative design that have resulted from using this PUD process. What other benefits are derived that would not otherwise be achieved without using the PUD process?
4. How will the proposed development promote more economical and efficient use of the land while providing a harmonious variety of housing choices, a higher level of city attractiveness and quality, and preservation of scenic open space;
5. What are the applicant's intentions with regard to the future selling or leasing of all or portions of the PUD, such as land areas, dwelling units, etc.
6. The design & development standards contained in your initial submittal are very general. It is difficult to determine where and how they apply. The standards will provide the best chance of consistently achieving the goals of the project. Please provide clear and detailed standards, illustrations and supporting text for the development proposal. If these vary from phase to phase please indicate the variation. This will allow for a more efficient review process during the phased development process.
7. In once section of the guidebook, demonstrate that the proposed development will not result in higher net public cost or that earlier incursion of public cost will be required. Include detailed information that will help the city determine fiscal impact to the city, additional infrastructure, commercial services, human services, etc that will be required for this development over the next 20 years. Precisely outline what and how each phase will pay for.
8. In one section of the guidebook, pprovide demographic and population information for the proposed development at full development buildout. Include an analysis of how this will alter City population projections in their 2002 projections study.

9. In one section of the guidebook, provide a history of the subject parcel and its existing site condition? Include a map or series of maps in the text document that illustrate topography, watercourses, soils/geologic conditions, unique natural and built features, forest cover, unique features or vegetation, wetlands, wildlife corridors and aquifer recharge areas and other items required to fully understand the site. The information needs to additionally identify all significant trees (over 12" DBH evergreen or hardwood with alder exception) Supplementary reports may be referenced;
10. What is the location and floor area size of all proposed buildings, structures and related structural improvements, including maximum heights, types of dwelling units, density per type of residential unit. Include characterization of all nonresidential structures including commercial facilities. This should include information that addresses the following:
 - Multi Family development housing numbers:**
 - Number and location of residential units proposed as zero lot line attached single family structures (zero lot line duplexes).
 - Number and location of residential units proposed as Row housing.
 - Number and location of residential units proposed as Live/Work Row Housing.
 - Number and location of residential units proposed as Stacked Flats.
 - Building footprints for individual lots not depicted on site plan:**
 - Building footprints for the Cottage Single Family lots.
 - Building footprints for the Zero Lot Line attached Single Family lots.
 - Building footprints for the Row housing lots.
 - Building footprints for the Live/Work Row housing lots.
 - Building footprints for the Stacked Flats housing lots.
 - Estimated livable area calculations:**
 - Square footage range of the Cottage Single Family units
 - Square footage range of the Zero Lot Line attached Single Family units
 - Square footage range of the Row housing units
 - Square footage range of the Live/Work Row housing units
 - Square footage range of the Stacked Flats housing units
 - Total amount of nonresidential construction, including a separate figure for commercial or institutional facilities;
11. What is the location and size in acres or square feet of all areas to be conveyed, dedicated or reserved as common open spaces, public parks, recreational areas, school sites and similar public and semipublic uses.
12. Provide notations of proposed ownership, public or private, should be included where appropriate;
13. What provisions will be made for maintenance of common space or common property? How will this be implemented during the phase development period? Will there be an association. What will be the CC&Rs for the development?
14. What will be the design characteristics of the multi-use trail indicated in Pedestrian Circulation Plan (map #7,) width? lighting? for multi use trail vs. Pedestrian path. Who is going to maintain it?
15. Provide additional detail in the landscape plan . While still general in scope please include identification and characterization of:
 - a. Passive open spaces.

- b. Landscaping and characterization of stormwater pond.
 - c. The proposed treatment of the perimeter of the PUD, including materials and techniques used such as screens, fences and walls;
 - d. Neighborhood parks
 - e. Community parks.
 - f. What existing significant trees and vegetation will be left intact.
16. Phasing. Provide additional detail relating to phasing of the development into 13 proposed phases. The phasing plan should also information addressing density, development type, all public improvements, commercial development, off-site road improvements, indicate who is responsible for funding and building the improvements, and establish a schedule that establishes a timeline for each improvement. Please address what reasonable security devices should be used to assure that projects approved in each phase are completed;
17. Concurrency. Concurrency means a determination that the facilities necessary to serve a proposed land development are in place or planned for and properly funded with a reasonable expectation that the facilities will be in place at the time needed to preserve adopted levels of service. The information in the project proposal does not adequately address the City's concurrency concerns. Please provide a clear and adequately detailed plan that addresses both the existing and future facilities necessary to serve the proposed development as phased development occurs and at full development buildout.

Additional requested information to be provided by staff.

Comprehensive Infrastructure Plan

Staff to provide the CHS infrastructure plan to Doug Campbell by the end of the week with copies made available to PC with the revised staff report. Additionally, staff will provide background and a status of the plan during public hearing period.

That concludes the contents of this letter.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Galvin

Community Development Director

Cc: Jack O. Swanson, Belcher Swanson Law Firm, P.L.L.C.
Douglas N. Campbell, P.E., Associated Project Consultants, Inc.
Gary Tomsic, City Manager, City of Blaine
Steve Banham, Public Works Director
Elizabeth Anderson, Community Planner
Sandy Petersen, Public Works
File

4-9-07

Doug Campbell

From: Terry Galvin [TGalvin@cityofblaine.com]
Sent: Monday, April 09, 2007 11:52 AM
To: Doug Campbell
Cc: Sandy Petersen; Steve Banham; Gary Tomsic
Subject: CHS infrastructure plan

Doug – you should have received a PDF copy of the infrastructure plan last Friday as promised. Please confirm.

Terry Galvin
Community Development Director

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

10/16/2007

5 0 2 0 7

Doug Campbell

To: _dncnr**Subject:** 93-167 Connelly - East Maple Ridge meetings

-----Original Message-----

From: Terry Galvin [mailto:TGalvin@cityofblaine.com]**Sent:** Wednesday, May 02, 2007 11:16 AM**To:** Doug Campbell**Cc:** Gary Tomsic; Jonathon Sitkin; Department Heads; Sandy Petersen; CED All**Subject:** RE: East Maple Ridge meetings

Doug,

The Planning Commission currently has left the public hearing open to allow you to provide the additional information that they requested. At this point, the city has not had any formal response from the you or anyone else representing the applicant, Doug Connelly.

I talked with Gary Tomsic last week about your meeting with him and understand that you have plans to submit a different plan for the East Maple Ridge development. However, before we can discuss this with you the City needs to receive a response to the Planning Commission. They are holding open a public hearing, sent you a letter requesting additional information and are and waiting for your response. If you do not wish to proceed with the public hearing and review process as indicated in an April 4 letter sent to you, please advise the Planning Commission. The April 4 letter began with the following clarification:

At the end of their Thursday, March 29, 2007 worksession on subject project, the Planning Commission decided to request the applicant submit additional information in accordance with the City requirements. They instructed staff to prepare a letter that detailed the information that they have requested. This letter includes that list of additional submittals.

Please note that the additional information must be submitted to this office before the City can resume its review of the project. Prior to the resumption of PC review staff will be required to review the additional information and revise their staff report accordingly. Once completed, staff will submit both the additional information and revised staff report to the Planning Commission and notify all parties of record and the general public of the PCs intent to continue the Public Hearing and provide for a period of time for public comment on the complete information packet. Once the open public record is closed, the Planning Commission can then resume its review of the proposed project. Staff will keep you posted of these dates as they become clear.

Honestly, I have not encountered a situation like this in the past; As I understand it, you want to meet with staff to discuss an alternative development proposal on the same site that the Planning Commission is currently conducting a public hearing on the currently submitted development proposal. Jon Sitkin is out for the next few days but when he gets back I will check with him regarding our legal and procedural requirements. However, It is clear to me that until the planning Commission closes their review of the submitted development proposal, city staff should not engage in discussions with the applicant that address alternative development plans for the subject parcel. Unless otherwise directed by the City Manager, that is the course we are taking.

The best thing you can do to keep the project on track is to respond to the Planning Commission and declare your intent to either proceed with the hearing and the additional requested information or to request an alternative. Once that is done we can help you move forward with your application.

10/16/2007

Regards

Terry Galvin
Community Development Director

-----Original Message-----

From: Associated Project Consultants, Inc. [mailto:apcengineers@nas.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2007 8:02 AM
To: Steve Banham; Terry Galvin
Cc: Jack O. Swanson; Gary Tomsic
Subject: RE: East Maple Ridge

Steve and Terry,

I am following what Gary suggested we do to get this project back on line. I think preparing a proposal is obvious, however, we have been doing that for months and months and months. Let's get a consensus on what will be accepted before we spend more time preparing endless documents that don't lead to any meaningful progress. This project has been languishing and we all should have the same goal to simplify the proposal. I want to meet as scheduled. Please confirm.

Thanks

Doug Campbell

-----Original Message-----

From: Steve Banham [mailto:SBANHAM@cityofblaine.com]
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2007 5:36 PM
To: Doug Campbell
Cc: Terry Galvin
Subject: East Maple Ridge

Doug,

When I contacted Terry about this meeting he indicated that he was expecting to see some sort of written proposal responding both to the Planning Commission and letter from Gary Tomsic before having another meeting, so it looks like the meeting you were proposing for Wednesday may be bit premature.

Stephen Banham
City of Blaine Public Works Director
1200 Yew Avenue, Blaine, WA 98230
(360) 332-8820 Fax (360) 332-7124
pwdir@cityofblaine.com

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

10/16/2007

To: _dncnr

Subject: 93-167 Connelly - East Maple Ridge meetings (T. Galvin)

-----Original Message-----

From: Terry Galvin [mailto:TGalvin@cityofblaine.com]

Sent: Wednesday, May 02, 2007 11:16 AM

To: Doug Campbell

Cc: Gary Tomsic; Jonathon Sitkin; Department Heads; Sandy Petersen; CED All

Subject: RE: East Maple Ridge meetings

Doug,

The Planning Commission currently has left the public hearing open to allow you to provide the additional information that they requested. At this point, the city has not had any formal response from the you or anyone else representing the applicant, Doug Connelly.

I talked with Gary Tomsic last week about your meeting with him and understand that you have plans to submit a different plan for the East Maple Ridge development. However, before we can discuss this with you the City needs to receive a response to the Planning Commission. They are holding open a public hearing, sent you a letter requesting additional information and are and waiting for your response. If you do not wish to proceed with the public hearing and review process as indicated in an April 4 letter sent to you, please advise the Planning Commission. The April 4 letter began with the following clarification:

At the end of their Thursday, March 29, 2007 worksession on subject project, the Planning Commission decided to request the applicant submit additional information in accordance with the City requirements. They instructed staff to prepare a letter that detailed the information that they have requested. This letter includes that list of additional submittals.

Please note that the additional information must be submitted to this office before the City can resume its review of the project. Prior to the resumption of PC review staff will be required to review the additional information and revise their staff report accordingly. Once completed, staff will submit both the additional information and revised staff report to the Planning Commission and notify all parties of record and the general public of the PCs intent to continue the Public Hearing and provide for a period of time for public comment on the complete information packet. Once the open public record is closed, the Planning Commission can then resume its review of the proposed project. Staff will keep you posted of these dates as they become clear.

Honestly, I have not encountered a situation like this in the past; As I understand it, you want to meet with staff to discuss an alternative development proposal on the same site that the Planning Commission is currently conducting a public hearing on the currently submitted development proposal. Jon Sitkin is out for the next few days but when he gets back I will check with him regarding our legal and procedural requirements. However, It is clear to me that until the planning Commission closes their review of the submitted development proposal, city staff should not engage in discussions with the applicant that address alternative development plans for the subject parcel. Unless otherwise directed by the City Manager, that is the course we are taking.

The best thing you can do to keep the project on track is to respond to the Planning Commission and declare your intent to either proceed with the hearing and the additional requested information or to request an alternative. Once that is done we can help you move forward with your application.

Regards

Terry Galvin
Community Development Director

-----Original Message-----

From: Associated Project Consultants, Inc. [mailto:apcengineers@nas.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2007 8:02 AM
To: Steve Banham; Terry Galvin
Cc: Jack O. Swanson; Gary Tomsic
Subject: RE: East Maple Ridge

Steve and Terry,

I am following what Gary suggested we do to get this project back on line. I think preparing a proposal is obvious, however, we have been doing that for months and months and months. Let's get a consensus on what will be accepted before we spend more time preparing endless documents that don't lead to any meaningful progress. This project has been languishing and we all should have the same goal to simplify the proposal. I want to meet as scheduled. Please confirm.

Thanks

Doug Campbell

-----Original Message-----

From: Steve Banham [mailto:SBANHAM@cityofblaine.com]
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2007 5:36 PM
To: Doug Campbell
Cc: Terry Galvin
Subject: East Maple Ridge

Doug,

When I contacted Terry about this meeting he indicated that he was expecting to see some sort of written proposal responding both to the Planning Commission and letter from Gary Tomsic before having another meeting, so it looks like the meeting you were proposing for Wednesday may be bit premature.

Stephen Banham
City of Blaine Public Works Director
1200 Yew Avenue, Blaine, WA 98230
(360) 332-8820 Fax (360) 332-7124
pwdir@cityofblaine.com

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

5-8-07

Doug Campbell

To: _dncnr**Subject:** 93-167 Connelly Co - East Maple Ridge Mtg Follow up (G. Tomsic)

-----Original Message-----

From: Gary Tomsic [mailto:GTomsic@cityofblaine.com]**Sent:** Tuesday, May 08, 2007 2:03 PM**To:** Doug Campbell**Subject:** FW: East Maple Ridge

-----Original Message-----

From: Gary Tomsic**Sent:** Tuesday, May 08, 2007 1:53 PM**To:** apcincps@nas.com**Cc:** Jonathon Sitkin; Steve Banham; Terry Galvin; Gary Tomsic**Subject:** East Maple Ridge

Doug:

This is a follow-up on our telephone discussion yesterday afternoon. I have since spoken with Jon Sitkin, Terry Galvin and Steve Banham. Here is where I think you are in the process.

We do not believe that you have to start over with a "new application" and the changes you propose will not affect your vesting for the project you now propose to develop. However, we do believe that you must give formal notification to the Planning Commission that you intend to change the scope of your pending application. I suggest that you send a letter to the Planning Commission via Terry Galvin's office immediately notifying the Planning Commission that you are going to modify your application by reducing the number of lots and area to be developed. The Planning Commission will decide if the record hearing should be closed and set for another date in the future; or, left open until you are prepared to submit an amended application for staff review. This action deals with the pending application.

Once the letter is received and the Planning Commission takes action, you should then schedule a meeting with the staff to present your modified project scope and discuss application requirements. You will then be required to amend your current application to reflect the project that you actually want approved. Once that is submitted to the City, the staff will review the application and determine if it is complete enough for public and planning commission review. The revised application will then go back to the Planning Commission and the public. This could take several months.

This seems like a reasonable approach. I don't know what else we can do. I would strongly suggest that you send the letter immediately in order for it to be reviewed Thursday. Otherwise you will loose a month.

One final comment, it is not productive for you to continue to involve me as a primary contact for issues related to the project's review. With Tom Black on board, we now have a complete development review team that is fully capable of dealing with this project. For the most part, it will only confuse the issues and slow the progress by involving me or City Council members. I have complete trust in the City's staff.

Gary Tomsic
City Manager

*** This email may be considered a record subject to public review. ***

10/16/2007