



BARGHAUSEN

RECEIVED

AUG 26 2022

August 26, 2022

CITY OF DUPONT

Barb Kincaid, AICP
City of DuPont
Department of Community Development
1700 Civic Drive
DuPont, WA 98327

RE: Founder's Ridge
Response to Application for PLNG2021-027 Preliminary Plat
Located along Center Drive, DuPont, Pierce County, Washington
Our Job No. 21127

Dear Barb:

We have revised the plans and technical documents for the above-referenced project in accordance with your comment letter dated March 25, 2022. Enclosed are the following documents for your review and approval:

1. Two (2) copies of the Preliminary Civil Engineering Plans - 8/17/2022
2. Two (2) copies of the Preliminary Plat - 8/17/2022
3. Two (2) copies of the Stormwater Site Plan - 8/11/2022
4. Two (2) copies of the Revised SEPA Checklist - 8/17/2022
5. Two (2) copies of the Truck Turn Exhibit - 8/15/2022
6. Two (2) copies of the Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment Report and Voluntary Bat Habitat Restoration Plan - 7/2022
7. Two (2) copies of the Certified Arborist Report - 8/17/2022
8. Two (2) copies of the Preliminary Architectural Site Plan - 8/16/2022
9. Two (2) copies of the Preliminary Building Elevations - 8/17/2022
10. Two (2) copies of the Preliminary Landscape Plans - 8/16/2022
11. Two (2) copies of the Soundview Response to Third-Party Comments - 7/14/2022
12. Two (2) copies of the Updated Title Report
13. Two (2) copies of the Phase 2 Archaeological Survey for the Founder's Ridge Project, Dupont, Pierce County, Washington - 3/1/2022
14. Two (2) copies of the Revised Photometric Plans
15. One (1) USB containing all files

BARGHAUSEN CONSULTING ENGINEERS, INC.

18215 72ND AVENUE SOUTH KENT, WA 98032 P) 425.251.6222 F) 425.251.8782
BRANCH OFFICES: CHEHALIS, WA KLAMATH FALLS, OR LONG BEACH, CA RICHLAND, WA ROSEVILLE, CA
barghausen.com

The following outline provides each of your comments in *italics* exactly as written, along with a narrative response describing how each comment was addressed:

A. General Comments

- 1. The preliminary plat plans, civil plans, landscape plans and architectural site plan use different nomenclature for lot numbers, building numbers and road numbers. Prior to resubmittal check that all plans are consistent.*

Response: Acknowledged.

- 2. All revisions shall be shown in clouds.*

Response: Acknowledged.

B. Consistency with DMC 25.41 Mixed Use Village

- 1. DMC 25.41.010(5) provides that the MUV-5 subdistrict is intended to be a primary employment area that allows office, light manufacturing, and research and development. DMC 25.41.015 Definitions provide a definition for light manufacturing as follows:*

"Light manufacturing" means an indoor facility used for the assembly, fabrication, and conversion of semi-processed material into finished products, where the intensity, scale, and characteristics of the operation are unlikely to negatively impact surrounding land uses. Light manufacturing also includes intermediate services such as machining, welding, grinding, and machine/industrial repair. Examples of light manufacturing uses include, but are not limited to, clothing and fabric manufacturing; food and beverage products, including ice production; electronic, optical, and instrumentation assembly; jewelry production; and manufacturing musical instruments. Outdoor storage or processing of equipment or materials is prohibited.

The application materials propose all light manufacturing-type uses for the proposal; therefore, the comments in this letter are based on a light manufacturing use. It is our understanding that a tenant has not yet been identified for the proposal. There are other uses listed in DMC 25.41.020(a) that could be viable uses within the buildings, including office, service business and research and development. In separate correspondence you have indicated that you intend for the buildings to be permitted for all uses that are allowed in the zoning district. This may affect the traffic study and trip generation as well as other environmental effects of the proposal that will be addressed in the environmental review comments/environmental impact statement. Please take careful consideration of your intention for uses within the buildings as the addition of uses outside of light manufacturing will not be allowed when applications for tenant improvement permits for uses other than light manufacturing are requested. A mix of uses within the building will require compliance with the Commercial and Mixed-Use Design Standards in DMC Chapter 25.70. Any future changes to the buildings and/or site plan to comply with DMC 25.70 that are made following issuance of a final decision on the project will require a site plan amendment per DMC 25.150.050.

Response: Our intention is to develop the buildings for light manufacturing-type uses. There are other uses listed in DMC 24.41.020(a) that could be viable, these uses may or

may not affect the traffic study and trip generation and environmental effects. If the uses are allowed in DMC 24.41.020(a) and do not affect the traffic study, trip generation, or environmental effects, then they should be allowed permits for tenant improvements.

2. *DMC 25.41.040(1) Maximum nonresidential floor area ratio (FAR) provides that nonresidential uses shall have a maximum 0.30 FAR. Subsection (2) provides that the area used for calculating the allowable FAR shall be based on the lot/parcel used for the nonresidential development. The Architectural Site Plan dated July 7, 2021, provides the floor area ratio broken out per proposed lot, however the lot sizes do not match the new preliminary plat drawings. Table 1 below provides the FAR using the lot sizes in on the preliminary plat drawings:*

Table 1 – Floor Area Ratio*				
	Lot 2	Lot 3	Lot 4	Lot 5
Lot Area	1,056,491 SF / 24.25 acres	646,535 SF / 14.84 acres	1,061,594 SF / 24.37 acres	1,406,032 SF / 32.27 acres
Building Area	200,000 SF	200,000 SF	200,000 SF	200,000 SF
FAR	.19	.309	.19	.14

*Ratio calculated based on the Preliminary Plat drawings.

Lots 1 and 7 do not propose buildings at this time and there is no Lot 6. The FAR for Lot 3 is slightly over the allowed maximum of .30 FAR. Revise the building or the lot size to provide no more than .30 FAR on all lots.

Response: The lot lines between lots 3 & 4 have been adjusted to conform with the FAR requirements. Lot 3 FAR is now 0.29.

3. *The Table in DMC 25.41.050(a), provides the following nonresidential setbacks:*

Front: 25 feet

Side: 25 feet

Rear: 25 feet

Abutting a golf course: 30 feet

Additional: In addition, any building wall over 40 feet high shall be set back at least an additional one foot for each foot in height over 40 feet.

The architectural site plan indicates that buildings are 50 feet in height requiring an extra setback of 10 feet. Setbacks are labeled on the civil site plans. In all cases the setbacks appear to be exceeding the code minimums. It appears as though a 50-foot setback is provided from the golf course and Old Fort Lake, exceeding the code minimums of 40 feet and 35 feet, respectively. Sheet C4, C7, C9 labels the setback from the new road as 50 feet, but that does not appear accurate. Sheet C12, C13 and C15 labels the building setback as 28 feet from the new road. Confirm the setback measurements on the civil plans. Add the code requirement for setbacks and provide measured setbacks to the buildings to the preliminary plat drawings (see also Consistency with Title 24-Subdivisions, below).

Response: The setbacks have been updated to reflect the city requirements as indicated above. Sheets C4, C7, C9, C12, C13, & C15 have been revised to correctly label the building setbacks.

4. *The proposal provides that building height will be 50 feet, which is less than the 65-foot maximum required per DMC 25.41.050(1).*

Response: Acknowledged.

5. *DMC 25.41.050(a), footnote (1) provides that for a light manufacturing use the design standards in DMC 25.41.060(3) shall apply in addition to the dimensional standards. DMC 25.41.050(5) provides that the parking and loading areas shall be provided as required by Chapter 25.95 DMC and (6) requires compliance with the landscaping standards in DMC 25.90. See below for comments regarding compliance with the design standards in DMC 25.41.060(3), Chapter 25.95 Parking and Chapter 25.90 Landscaping. Note that DMC 25.41.050 (2) requires that a mixed-use building comply with DMC Chapter 25.70, Commercial and Mixed-Use Design Regulations and Guidelines. Our comments are based on the assumption that the buildings will be 100% light manufacturing uses.*

Response: Acknowledged.

6. *DMC 25.41.050(6) provides that landscaping shall be provided as required by Chapter 25.90 DMC; see Consistency with DMC 25.90, Landscaping, below. Buffer requirements shall be applied pursuant to the standards listed in the Chapter 25.10 DMC "buffer" definition. DMC 25.41.050(6)(b) provides the following applicable buffer requirements for light manufacturing sites and similar uses:*

- i. *Sites abutting a golf course or open space district shall be screened by a full landscape buffer.*

Response: Full buffer is indicated on the landscape plans along the golf course and where truck court may abut public roads

- ii. *Sites abutting a residential district shall be screened by a full landscape buffer.*
 - iii. *Sites abutting an arterial or collector roadway shall be screened by a moderate landscape buffer.*

Response: Moderate buffer is indicated along the roadways.

The applicant proposes light manufacturing type uses, therefore the buffer requirements of DMC 25.41.050(6)(b) listed above shall apply. There are no property boundaries abutting a residential district. The property abuts both a golf course and open space district on the north, west and southwest boundaries, therefore a full landscape buffer shall be provided in these areas. Due to future volumes anticipated in the Old Fort Lake Subarea, all new public roads in the OFLSA are anticipated to be collectors or arterials. Where parcels abut an arterial or collector roadway a moderate landscape buffer shall be provided. Moderate and full landscape buffers are defined in DMC 25.10.020.060 as follows:

“Buffer – landscape” means a strip of trees, shrubs, and ground cover of sufficient height, width, and density to screen, within three years of planting, an unsightly or nuisance- generating land use from a more sensitive land use, even in the winter months. The minimum visual screening is 100 percent for full buffers, 50 percent for moderate buffers, and 25 percent for light buffers. Berms, grade separations, walls, and fences may be incorporated to achieve up to 50 percent of the minimum screening. For critical areas, see DMC 25.105.030.”

We reviewed the buffers provided on the landscape plans and have the following comments. Note that lot, building, and road numbers described below are in accordance with the details provided on the landscape plans.

- a. *Full buffer Planting Plans –The landscape plans indicate that every 100 feet the full buffer Type A will have 3 evergreen trees, 2 deciduous trees, 2 ornamental trees and 13 shrubs. Full buffer Type B is similar and proposes 4 evergreen trees, 1 deciduous tree, 4 ornamental trees and 20 shrubs. The trees are to be 2-inch caliper or 6 feet tall at time of planting and the shrubs are 1-gallon plants. No groundcover is provided. The spacing appears to suggest an approximate spacing of the trees of 20 feet on-center (“OC”). For the shrubs, they are about 7.5 feet OC. This density of planting will not provide 100 percent screening within three years. Revise the planting plan to provide all evergreen trees and increase the tree density to provide a tree spacing of no more than 15 feet OC. The tree height at planting shall be 7 to 8 feet minimum. Revise the shrub quantities to provide between 3 to 5 feet OC. Also, add groundcover as required by code for a full buffer. All sheets of the landscape plan shall provide the abutting property designations for either Golf Course, Open Space or MUV-7.*

Response: The planting plan has been revised to indicate 7' tall evergreen trees planted 15' OC, shrubs planted 5' OC, ground cover added, and property designations added.

- b. *Moderate buffer Planting Plans - The landscape plans indicate that every 100 feet the moderate buffer Type A will provide one deciduous tree, 2 ornamental trees and 27 shrubs. Moderate buffer Type B proposes 1 evergreen tree, 6 ornamental trees and 27 shrubs. Type C provides 2 deciduous trees, 2 ornamental trees and 24 shrubs and Type D provides 1 deciduous tree, 4 ornamental trees and 26 shrubs. The trees are to be 2-inch caliper or 6 feet tall at time of planting and the shrubs are 1-gallon plants. No groundcover is provided. The spacing appears to suggest an approximate spacing of the trees of 20 feet OC. This density of planting will not provide a 50 percent screening within three years. The city is in support of a mix of evergreen, deciduous and ornamental tree types in the moderate buffer and the planting sizes proposed but requires a reduced tree spacing of 15 feet to meet the moderate buffer requirements. Revise the planting plan to increase the density of trees and add groundcover as required for a moderate buffer.*

Response: The planting plan has been revised to indicate tree spacing at 15' and the ground cover has been added.

- c. *Other landscape buffer comments are:*

- i. *The north boundary of Lot 1 is adjacent to golf course and MUV-7-designated property. The landscape plans depict tree retention plus full buffer type A and B in areas. It is unclear the extents of the full buffer. For example, the far northwest corner does not provide a full buffer, it depicts a total of four ornamental trees located north of Pond 2 in an area adjacent to golf course-designated property. A full buffer is needed along the entire boundary shared with the golf course; additional notations and plantings shall make that clear.*

Response: A full buffer has been added along the building and parking except where existing trees are being preserved for screening.

- ii. *The buffers adjacent to proposed Roads 1, 2 and 3 are required by code to be at a minimum a moderate buffer. (See below for the requirements for full buffer where required to screen loading docks per DMC 25.41.050(3)(d)). There are segments of the frontages that do not have callouts indicating the proposed buffer type. For example, there is no notation of buffer type for the landscaping between Pond 2 on Lot 1 and Proposed Road #3 and there is no notation along proposed Road #1 adjacent to the southeast corner of the building. Portions of the lot abutting New Road #3 on Lot 4 do not indicate a moderate buffer will be provided. Increase the notations provided on the landscape plan for all lots indicating the proposed buffer types.*

Response: Moderate buffers are between all parking lots and building to the roads. Buffers have not been provided to the ponds.

- iii. *There is not enough detail provided to assess how the buffers meet the definition of a full buffer. Revise landscape plan to provide planting details, including the number, size, and species of plants within the buffers.*

Response: Details indicate the plants, and a listing of all plant types are indicated in the notes.

Response: See Wetland Consultants Response to Third-Party Comments dated July 14, 2022, included with this submittal.

7. *Per DMC 25.41.050(8) Outdoor storage, if located between a building and street or side of the building and visible from a street at other than a driveway entrance, shall be screened by a six-foot-high solid fence or wall. No outdoor storage areas are depicted on the plans.*

Response: Outdoor storage is not anticipated. If a tenant requires outdoor storage, it will be screened pr DMC 25.41.050(8)

8. *Per DMC 25.41.050 (14), outdoor lighting shall be designed to minimize light throw beyond the site. Outdoor light poles shall not exceed 30 feet. We have reviewed the submitted Site Lighting Plans, Photometric Analysis and specification of lighting fixtures provided. Lighting fixtures are full cut-off type, and some are also shielded. Light pole heights are provided at the maximum allowed of 30 feet. The site photometrics are acceptable at the property line.*

With the exception of lighting required for roadways, all other lighting is below 1.0 footcandles at the property line, which is within acceptable standards. Pedestrian scale lighting is not provided at the multi-use trail. Revise the lighting plans to provide for pedestrian scale lighting on the multi-use trail.

Response: Photometric plan has been revised to provide the pedestrian scale lighting.

9. *Per DMC 25.41.060(3) Light manufacturing, research, and development, and like buildings shall be subject to the following design guidelines:*

a. *Blank walls greater than 50 feet in length along the front and side of a building shall be softened either by planting large, 12-foot minimum trees adjacent to the building, by wood trellises on the building, or by similar means. The building elevations demonstrate various treatments including façade modulation, metal panels, windows and paint color variations that serve to break up blank walls below the maximum of 50 feet in most places. For the purposes of the blank wall evaluation, the Table 2 below provides the applicable front and sides of the buildings referenced on the Architectural Site Plan. See also the enclosure labeled Property Line Assignments. Property line assignments are guided by the following definition of property line provided in DMC 25.10.160.110:*

“Property line” means those lines enclosing a lot and those lines defining a recorded vehicular access easement. The following are categories of property lines:

(1) *“Front property line” is any property line that is adjacent to a street or vehicular access easement or tract more than 21 feet in width, except when said vehicular access easement or tract:*

(A) *Is located entirely on an adjacent lot or lots and does not serve the subject property; or*

(B) *Encompasses a hammerhead turnaround required by the fire department, whether or not it is located on or serves the subject property.*

(2) *“Rear property line” is any property line that is farther from and essentially parallel to a front property line except on a lot which contains two or more front property lines; or any property line that is adjacent to a street, alley or vehicular access easement or tract 21 feet or less in width, except when said vehicular access easement or tract serves only one lot, or is located entirely on an adjacent lot or lots and does not serve the subject property; or any property line that is adjacent to a vehicular access easement or tract which encompasses a hammerhead turnaround required by the fire department.*

(3) *“Side property line” is any property line other than a front property line or a rear property line.*

Table 2 - Founder's Ridge Lot Line Assignments*

	Front Lot Line/ Facade	Side Lot Line/ Facade	Rear Lot Line/Facade
Lot 1/Bldg. 1	Abutting Road 1, 2 and 3	North line	n/a
Lot 2/Bldg. 2	Abutting Road 1 and 3	Northwest and southeast lot	n/a

		lines	
Lot 3/Bldg. 3	Abutting Road 3	Northwest and southeast lot lines	Line opposite/parallel to Road 3
Lot 4/Bldg. 4	Abutting Road 3	Northwest and southeast lot lines	Line opposite/parallel to Road 3

**Lots and building numbers are based on the architectural site plan*

According to the lot line assignments, all facades of Buildings 1 and 2 are required to meet the blank wall requirements, and all except the line opposite Road 3 shall meet the blank wall requirements for Buildings 3 and 4. Review of the submitted building elevations shows the following blank wall locations:

- b. Buildings 1 and 2 – The partial north elevation (views 2 and 3) depict larger than 50-foot-wide wall spans above the dock doors. Provide treatments to the north elevation to address the blank walls. It is assumed that the treatments will need to be in the form of a change in materials, addition of windows, or other such treatment as landscaping will not be possible in this area. Also, the elevation shows a concrete screen wall that is a blank wall greater than 50 feet. Trees are depicted for screening the wall on the landscape plans, but tree heights are noted to be 6 feet. Revise the landscape plans to increase the height of the trees planted at the concrete screen wall for all lots to be a minimum of 12 feet at the time of planting.*

Response: The elevations have been revised to add additional windows at the docks. The landscape plans indicate 12' tall trees at concrete screen walls.

- 10. Per DMC 25.41.050(3) (b) Entrances shall be emphasized with architecturally distinctive elements such as a covered walk, gabled roof, landscaping, or similar means. Earth-berming at the base of the facade is encouraged for large-scale structures. Building designs for multi-phase campuses are encouraged to be of similar character. The building elevations and renderings depict that the entrances have a metal canopy (covered walk) and landscaping. The landscaping depicted on the Typical Foundation Planting Plans indicate a variety of shrubs of different types and heights to be provided around the entrances. The landscape plans provide a "typical foundation planting plan"; therefore, each will be of similar character. According to the grading plans, earth-berming at the base of the façade is not provided. The sizes of the buildings are considered large in scale; therefore, provide a berm around the base of the façade of each building.*

Response: DMC 25.41.060(3) (b) indicates earth berthing at the base of the façade is encouraged for large-scale structures. It is not desirable to berm at base of the façade due to the potential for water seeping into the building. We have provided berms between the road and parking lot and have added additional landscaping adjacent to the building.

- 11. Per DMC 25.41.050(3)(c), parking areas shall be located at the rear of buildings or separated from public rights-of-way by a moderate buffer (see Chapter 25.90 DMC). Parking lots are located at fronts, sides and/or the rear of the buildings; therefore, they shall be screened by a minimum of a moderate buffer. This code requirement is duplicative with*

DMC 25.41.050(a). See comment #6, above, for comments regarding the buffers provided.

Response: The buffers have been provided as indicated above.

12. *Per DMC 25.41.050(3) (d) Loading docks, service areas, and semi-truck parking areas shall be located at the rear of buildings or separated from public rights-of-way by a full buffer (see Chapter 25.90 DMC). According to the lot line assignments in Table 2, loading dock locations are provided as follows:*

a. *Building 1 docks are not located in the rear, however they are separated from the right of way and a full buffer is provided along segments of Road 2. A landscaped screening wall screens the dock doors from Road 2. The landscape buffer screening from Road #2 and the docks is depicted on the plans as a moderate buffer. Modify the landscape plans to provide a full buffer between Building 1 dock doors and the Road 2 right of way.*

Response: Full buffer has been provided along all truck docks that abut a road except where existing vegetation is being retained.

b. *Building 2 dock doors are not located in the rear, however they are separated from the right of way with a full buffer along Road 3 and a screening wall.*

c. *Building 3 dock doors are not located in the rear and are separated from the right of way with a moderate buffer along Road 3 and a screening wall. Modify the landscape plans to provide a full buffer between Building 3 dock doors and the Road 3 right of way.*

Response: A full buffer has been provided.

d. *Building 4 provides dock doors to the rear and sides of the building and the landscape plans depict a moderate buffer along proposed Road 3 and a full buffer to screen the dock doors from the golf course on the rear and side of the lot. This screening is appropriate.*

Response: Acknowledged.

13. *Per DMC 25.41.060(4)(a) All roadways shall include sidewalks and/or a multi-use trail to facilitate pedestrian circulation. Roadway sections are provided on Sheet C56 of the civil plans and depict five different types labeled A through E. All but Type E depict a 5-foot sidewalk on one side and a 12-foot paved trail on the other side of each street section. Type E does not provide either a sidewalk or trail. This type is depicted as new Road #3 on Sheet C14, which is intended to be a Major Collector, but is not an area intended for a future multiuse trail on the OFL SAP. Provide sidewalks on Road #3/Type E as required per the Major Collector section and the OFL SAP.*

Response: Sidewalks have been added to Road 3, as requested. The sidewalk has been added and a separate sidewalk plan has been provided.

14. *Per DMC 25.41.060(4) (b) all buildings shall have a direct, paved pedestrian connection*

from the front entrance to the nearest street sidewalk. The plan sets do not depict a direct paved pedestrian connection from each building's front entrance to the nearest street sidewalk; nor do they depict each building's entry location. Revise the plans to provide the pedestrian connection to the street from the building access.

Response: Direct paved pedestrian connections have been included and indicated on the plans. The sidewalk has been added and a separate sidewalk plan has been provided.

15. *DMC 25.41.060(4) (c) Surface parking lots shall be designed with a designated pedestrian pathway that connects to a prominent building access door. The plan sets do not depict a designated pedestrian pathway that connects the parking lot to a prominent building access door, nor do they depict the entry location. Revise the plans to provide the designated pedestrian pathway to the building access.*

Response: Pedestrian pathways have been added to each lot and are indicated on the plans. The typical foundation plan indicates building entrances. Pedestrian access is provided via a sidewalk between the building and parking lot.

16. *Per DMC 25.41.070 Design Review. Design review is required for all multifamily, nonresidential, and mixed-use projects as set forth in DMC 25.175.010. Design review may be processed concurrently with the site plan approval process. You have submitted an application for Design Review to be processed concurrent with the application and have included the required submittal requirements. Comments on design review are included herein.*

Response: Understood

17. *Per DMC 25.41.080, site plan approval is required for all multifamily, nonresidential, and mixed-use projects as set forth in Chapter 25.150 DMC. The applicant has submitted for site plan approval. This staff report provides comments on the required consistency analysis provided in DMC 25.150.*

Response: Understood

18. *Per DMC 25.41.090, any proposed site plan, plat and/or binding site plan shall accommodate roadways, trails, and other rights-of-way as depicted in the Old Fort Lake subarea plan (OFLSAP). The community development director may allow roadway alignments to be adjusted to respond to documented cultural resources and/or critical areas subject. According to the OFLSAP, and submitted Cultural Resources Assessment, the site has been assessed for documented cultural resources areas within the proposed roadway alignments or trail areas and the report recommends that archaeological monitoring occur in conjunction with site excavation activities. With the monitoring, the proposed road alignments are acceptable. There are also no known onsite critical areas, however the site is located adjacent to Old Fort Lake and its regulated 100-foot buffer. The OFLSAP Figure 15 Future Transportation Plan Map depicts the future road alignments and classifications. The site plan depicts the roadways in compliance with the general roadway alignments depicted in the OFLSAP. According to Figure 15 all roadways within the Founder's Ridge proposal are to be minor arterials, with the exception of new Road #3, which is a Major Collector. The roadway classifications are not provided on the plans or in the Traffic Study. Provide the road classifications on the civil plans.*

The OFLSAP future trail alignments are also shown on Figure 12 in the OFLSAP. The alignment generally follows the roadway alignments provided and appears to be in compliance. One exception is a segment of trail that is missing from new Road 2 to the future Old Fort Lake Trailhead. The landscape plans depict this area as future bat habitat area. Add this trail connection to the plans and add the trailhead to the plans. Adjust the bat habitat plan to allow for trail and trailhead improvements.

Road #2 ends inside future Lot 5 in a cul-de-sac (per the preliminary plat drawings) that concludes short of the property boundaries. The Road #2 cul-de-sac shall be extended to the end of Lot #5 to allow for future extension of the road by others.

Provide an exhibit which depicts the turning radius for fire trucks and semitrucks accessing the site.

Response: Road classifications have been included on Sheet C56 of the Civil Plans. Road #2 has been extended to the end of the lot. An exhibit has been provided to show all critical fire truck and WB-67 movements through the site.

C. Consistency with DMC Chapter 25.80 Cultural, Historical and Archaeological Resources

1. *Consistency with DMC Chapter 25.80 Cultural, Historical and Archaeological Resources*

DMC 25.80.020 provides four designated cultural resource sites within the city:

- i. 1833 site of Fort Nisqually*
- ii. 1843 site of Fort Nisqually*
- iii. Site of Methodist/Episcopal Mission; and*
- iv. Wilkes Observatory site.*

Figure 12 in the Old Fort Lake Subarea Plan depicts the general location of designated cultural resource sites. The 1833 site of Fort Nisqually is located near the center of the adjacent Home Course Golf Course property. The 1843 site of Fort Nisqually is located offsite to the east of the Subarea and the Methodist/Episcopal Mission is located offsite to the north of the Subarea. The Wilkes Observatory Site is located on the adjacent City-owned property designated as Open Space. Another site is depicted on Figure 12 that is not listed as a designated cultural resource site in DMC. 25.80.020, the “Crystallizer site” which appears to be located at the far north portion of Lot 5. The Subarea Plan describes the Crystallizer site as follows:

- Crystallizer Site: The crystallizer site is reminiscent of the key location of the previous manufacturing use on the Old Fort Lake property. The crystallizer site has a relic with left behind building foundation and part of the wall structure.*

In the absence of regulations protecting the Crystallizer Site, per DMC 25.175.040(b) staff relies upon the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The OFL Subarea Plan, an element of the City Comprehensive Plan provides Cultural Resources Goals and Policies

to guide future development and decision-making. There are no specific policies related to the Crystallizer site. Other related policies include:

CR 1.3, "Develop an active preservation program that emphasizes community outreach and involvement including other local governments and agencies."

CR1.4, "Seek ways to capitalize on DuPont's unique cultural and historic resources to enhance tourism and local education opportunities."

CR1.5, "Partner with the Nisqually Tribe to identify cultural sites that have tribal heritage and possess native artifacts."

CR 1.6, "Apply the city's cultural resources policies and regulations to all future development within the subarea."

The relics described in the OFL SAP are not depicted on the survey or preliminary plat drawings. Provide the location and details of the Crystallizer Site relics on the survey and preliminary plat drawings. The Crystallizer Site is not located in the area of impact that was evaluated in the cultural resources studies you provided. Provide documentation on the historical significance of the crystallizer site.

Response: HRA has determined that the Crystallizer Site has not been previously formally recorded as an archaeological site and is otherwise more than 0.5 miles to the northwest of the project AI and will not be impacted by the proposed development. Artifacts have been included and are labelled in the preliminary plat and civil engineering drawings.

D. Consistency with DMC Chapter 25.90 Landscaping

1. *DMC 25.90.020(2) requires the minimum portion of the site which must be a landscape area. The portion is dependent on the type or use of the property. For manufacturing/research type use the minimum is 20 percent. Staff interprets this requirement as needing to be met for each proposed lot. Sensitive areas, sensitive area buffers, parks and land designated as open space do not count toward this requirement. The minimum landscape area calculation is provided on the Architectural Site Plan as shown in Table 3.*

Table 3 - Landscape Area Provided Per Lot

Lot Number	Landscape Area (Acres)	Lot Size (acres)	Percent of Landscape Area
Lot 1	13.57	24.22	56%
Lot 2	5.66	15.06	37.5%
Lot 3	13.62	24.07	56.5%
Lot 4	17.51	27.7	63%

The landscaped area provided per lot exceeds the minimum of 20 percent and is compliant. The lot areas provided on the architectural site plan, however, do not match the preliminary plat lot areas. Revise the architectural site plan to be consistent with the lot numbers and area calculations provided on the preliminary plat maps.

Response: The architectural site plan has been revised to indicate the correct lot numbers.

2. *DMC 25.90.030 requires street trees be provided within with right-of-way in accordance with the city's public works standards. They shall be provided at least one per 40 to 50 feet of frontage, depending on the species and other circumstances; located within the right of way; of the same species as other street trees in the same streetscape; spaced to accommodate sight distance requirements for driveways and intersections; and be at least two inches in caliper and minimum branch height of six feet. The landscape plans depict street trees of varying species to be provided at 1 per 50 feet of frontage. Heights are provided for the trees; however, it is not clear that the heights provided are at the time of planting or at maturity. Revise the landscape plans to provide tree height at the time of planting. Revise the proposed tree types to be consistent with the City's recommended street trees (see enclosed Tree Care Manual).*

Response: The species list has been updated.

3. *DMC 25.90.030 (2) requires the interior of surface parking lots with 10 or more stalls shall be landscaped with at least one tree per six stalls. The landscape plans provide a quantity of trees demonstrating that at least one tree per six stalls will be provided, however the quantity of trailer parking spaces was not included in the calculation and no landscape islands are depicted in the trailer parking areas. Revise the landscape plans to include the required landscape islands and tree quantities inclusive of the trailer parking areas.*

Response: Islands have been provided for interior parking lots which are the car parking areas. They have not been included in the trailer storage area as these areas are not parking lots. We have added additional trees along the trailer storage area.

4. *DMC 25.90.030 (3) requires buffers to mitigate incompatible uses or screen uses as follows:*
 - i. *A moderate buffer shall be provided between parking lots and any adjacent public right-of-way.*
 - ii. *In the process of reviewing development proposals, the city will require full, moderate, or light buffers as necessary to mitigate incompatibility, for example between residential and nonresidential development, or between an outdoor storage or trash receptacle area and surrounding high-use areas.*

These standards are duplicative to the standards required in DMC 25.41.050(6)(b). See the comments provides in Section B, above.

Response: The buffers have been indicated above.

5. *DMC 25.90.040 requires landscape design with minimal irrigation. All landscape plans shall include a water conservation element, including a statement of techniques proposed to conserve water; and a projection of the amount of irrigation required. No landscape plan is to be approved if the irrigation projection exceeds 11.6 inches of water per year, 7.2 gallons per square foot, or 313,632 gallons per acre. The landscape plans provide a typical*

irrigation & water conservation plan. It depicts areas to receive drip and popup irrigation and include water conservation notes. The notes state that irrigated areas shall receive no more than 11.6 inches of water per year from the irrigation system. The irrigation plans will be reviewed by the City Engineer and comments provided under separate cover.

Response: We will address any comments received.

E. Consistency with DMC Chapter 25.95 Off-Street Parking

1. *DMC 25.90.030 provides the minimum and maximum number of parking spaces for certain uses. Light manufacturing use, as proposed for the Founder's Ridge project, is not listed in the code's parking table. The closest type of use listed is "Industries, research facilities, print shops, bakeries, wholesales, and warehouses," which requires a minimum of 0.3 and a maximum of 1 parking spaces per worker at maximum shift. Table 4 below provides the proposed number of spaces per 200,000 SF building and lot:*

Table 4 – Founder's Ridge Proposed Parking*		
Lot Number	Vehicle Parking Provided	Min and Max Number of Workers at maximum shift
Lot 1	284	284 - 945
Lot 2	209	209 - 698
Lot 3	288	288 - 959
Lot 4	220	220 - 734
Total	1,001 1	1,001 – 3,336

**Lots numbers and parking quantities as depicted on the Architectural Site Plan*

The off-street parking quantities provided in Table 4 are presumed for passenger vehicles only, however the parking quantities provided do not add up to the total provided. The site plan provides additional trailer spaces; however, the city does not regulate the amount of trailer parking. According to the information provided in the SEPA checklist, which is based on the Troyer Economic Impact Analyses, approximately 474 jobs would be created. This number of employees would require a maximum number of parking spaces of 474; therefore, the parking quantity exceeds the code maximums. Clarify on the architectural site plan the number of parking spaces for passenger vehicles and the total quantity of all types of parking. Either revise/reassess the anticipated number of workers at maximum shift or revise the site plan to provide no more than the maximum number of spaces allowed per worker at maximum shift.

Response: Parking has been provided to accommodate multiple back-to-back shifts and anticipate workers arriving for a second shift while the first shift workers are still on site. Additional stalls are also provided for visitors and sales visits. The Troyer Strategic analysis is based on modeling and not specific tenants, and it is only offered to provide a conservative baseline of what the city might be able to expect in economic benefits from the project. This is different from Applicant's design, which intends to provide parking based on the amount of space proposed to ensure that future uses have ample parking for employees, as well as visitors or customers.

2. *The off-street parking quantities provided in Table 4 are presumed for passenger vehicles only, however the parking quantities provided do not add up to the total provided. The site plan provides additional trailer spaces; however, the city does not regulate the amount of trailer parking. According to the information provided in the SEPA checklist, which is based on the Troyer Economic Impact Analyses, approximately 474 jobs would be created. This number of employees would require a maximum number of parking spaces of 474; therefore, the parking quantity exceeds the code maximums. Clarify on the architectural site plan the number of parking spaces for passenger vehicles and the total quantity of all types of parking. Either revise/reassess the anticipated number of workers at maximum shift or revise the site plan to provide no more than the maximum number of spaces allowed per worker at maximum shift.*

Response: Parking has been provided to accommodate multiple back-to-back shifts and anticipate workers arriving for a second shift while the first shift workers are still on site. Additional stalls are also provided for visitors and sales visits.

3. *DMC 25.95.050 requires that parking not be located within any required vision clearance triangle. All parking is setback from driveway entrances and is not located in the vicinity of a vision clearance triangle.*

Response: Understood.

4. *DMC 25.95.050(4) requires a setback from property lines for parking dependent upon the type of use. In commercial areas, parking spaces shall not be located in required front yards or in required side yards abutting residential areas.*

(5) In manufacturing/research park areas, parking shall not be located in required front yards or within five feet of any property line.

(6) In industrial areas, parking spaces shall not be located within 20 feet of the front property line.

The City interprets (5) as being most similar to the proposal. Parking areas on each lot exceed all of the above setback requirements.

Response: Understood.

5. *DMC 25.95.050 provides the dimensional requirements of parking spaces, drive aisles and other design requirements. The parking spaces are 9' x 18' in dimension, which meets the requirements for a 90-degree, two-way drive aisle. The required aisle width is 26 feet, 27-foot width is provided in passenger vehicle areas and up to 70 feet in width is provided in truck maneuvering areas. The other design requirements will be reviewed in depth at the time of site development permit.*

Response: Understood.

6. *DMC 25.95.060 requires disabled parking be provided in accordance with state law and at least one of every 20 employee parking spaces reserved for high-occupancy vehicles. These preferential spaces and bicycles are to be given locational priority in parking space*

layout. No high occupancy spaces are provided on the architectural site plan or the civil plans. Accessible parking is depicted as being provided and will be reviewed for full compliance at the time of site development permit. Provide the required number of high occupancy spaces on the architectural site plan and civil plans.

Response: High occupancy spaces have been provided.

7. *DMC 25.95.070 requires adequate off-street loading facilities and maneuvering spaces. The locations and design of the loading facilities are regulated. The loading berths, or docks, that are at 90-degree angles are required to have a minimum length of 55 feet, width of 12 feet, and have an apron of 75 feet. Review of the architectural site plan depicts a length of 60 feet, width of 13 feet and an apron of 130 feet. The loading dock design is in compliance.*

Response: Understood.

8. *DMC 25.100 regulates the design and location of refuse and recycling receptacles. The enclosures cannot be located in required yards or buffers and shall comply with the screening requirements of DMC 25.70. Per DM 25.100.050, the enclosure shall be designed and finished to match the primary building in terms of design and materials; shall be sized for both general refuse and recycling bins and located on a flat and level area of a minimum of 100 square feet, surfaced with concrete with an opening of 10 feet in width. The enclosures shall not be visible from public streets, on-site access routes or parking areas; otherwise, the enclosure shall be fully gated with a three-foot wide pedestrian opening (unless automated closing assembly). Dumpster locations are depicted on the site plans as being located in the dock loading areas. The architectural site plan states that final locations are subject to tenant requirements and determined at the time of tenant finish. Refuse container locations and maneuverability has been reviewed and approved by the service provider, Waste Connections. It shall be noted that all of the requirements of DMC 25.100 and 25.70.070(1) apply, which may include landscape screening of the service areas depending on location. Revise the plans to comply with the dumpster location and design requirements.*

Response: Compactors are not visible from public streets, on-site access roads, or parking areas. They are screened by the building, screening walls, and landscaping. They are not visible, therefore, they do not require separate screening. If it is determined that they are visible, they shall be screened per DMC 25.70 and 25.100.50 prior to final occupancy permit. A note has been added to the plans.

9. *DMC 25.115 requires Transportation Concurrency Review. Per DMC 25.115.020, the proposal is subject to a concurrency test and a land use application will not be approved until a certificate of concurrency has been issued. Provide a letter requesting concurrency evaluation for the proposal and a fee of \$350.*

Response: This will be submitted shortly under a separate cover.

F. Consistency with DMC 25.105, Critical Areas

1. *We have reviewed the Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment Report and*

Voluntary Bat Habitat Restoration Plan prepared by Soundview Consultants dated November 2021 and understand the findings describe that Old Fort Lake is offsite, a Category III wetland with a 75-foot buffer for which no impacts are planned/proposed. The report also provides that there is no evidence of bat habitat (Priority species) onsite or Priority Oregon white oak woodlands. The report describes a bat habitat restoration plan that will be peer-reviewed by others. Comments on the peer review will be forwarded when available.

Response: No revisions to the *Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment Report* and *Voluntary Bat Habitat Restoration Plan* have been made. Response to the peer review have been provided under a separate cover in a *Response to Third-Party Comments Technical Memorandum* by Soundview.

G. Consistency with DMC 25.120 Tree Retention

We have reviewed the Tree Modification Request dated Sept. 22, 2021, the Arborist Report dated Nov. 3, 2021, and the Tree Preservation Plan dated Sept. 14, 2021, to assess the tree retention and tree modification request for compliance with DMC Chapter 25.120.

1. *DMC 25.120.030(2) requires that all landmark Oregon white oak trees shall be retained, along with any native understory within a protection zone one and one-half times the radius of the oak's canopy, unless the landmark oaks are within a proposed street right-of-way which is integral to the neighborhood and cannot reasonably be moved, or unless overall neighborhood densities cannot be met. In such cases, up to 30 percent of the landmark oak trees may be removed, when consistent with the standards in the table of DMC 25.120.040(1). At least half of all other (non-oak) landmark trees shall be retained.*

The arborist report provides that there are a total of 139 landmark trees, all of which are Douglas fir. Based on this count, a total of 70 trees are required to be retained. Staff interprets the provisions about tree retention in the roadway to apply to Oregon white oaks, of which you state there are none. Your proposal is to retain seven (7) of the landmark trees. You have requested a Tree Modification to allow for a reduction in the tree retention requirements. Note that the arborist report will be peer-reviewed by the City's on-call certified arborist. Due to the extent of our comments, we will wait for the peer review to occur following resubmittal and response to the comments.

Response: The site plan and Certified Arborist Report have been revised to meet the tree retention requirements of DMC 25.120.030. All 70 landmark trees have been retained. There were no landmark oaks on the subject property; of the 56 Oregon white oaks, 18 qualified as Specimen trees with a DBH of 12 inches or greater. The other oaks had DBH measurements under 12 inches.

2. *DMC 25.10.120.005 Table 1 provides that the measurement of multi-stemmed or multi-trunked trees is the sum of the diameters. Table 1 in the arborist report provides a different measurement for landmark trees. Revise the arborist report methodology, and amend the tree statistics as needed, in calculating the diameters of all multi-stem/multi-trunk trees to comply with DMC 25.10.120.005 Table 1.*

Response: The methodology indicated for landmark and all multi-stemmed trees is consistent with DMC 25.10.120.005 in the revised Certified Arborist Report as are all the

DBH measurements in the attached tables. All stem calculations for measuring multi-stemmed or multi-trunked trees is the sum of the diameters of the stems at breast height.

3. *DMC 25.120.030(2) provides that the tree protection radius shall be one and one-half times the radius of the Oregon white oak's canopy. DMC 25.120.030(5) provides that the tree protection zone for non-oak landmark trees is the drip line of any tree to be retained. The arborist report provides a different method of measuring the protection radius that is not code compliant. Revise the arborists report to demonstrate compliance with city code with the correct tree protection radius for all Oregon white oaks and all non-oak landmark trees to be retained. Per DMC 25.120.030(5), provide the tree protection radius on the landscape and grading plans.*

Response: The Certified Arborist Report has been revised to demonstrate compliance with city code with the correct tree protection radius for all Oregon white oaks (1.5 X radius) and all non-oak landmark trees (1 x dripline) as shown on the revised tree retention plan and associated maps.

4. *Page 5 of the arborists report states that the Old Fort Lake Subarea Plan (OFLSAP) did not intend for tree retention in the areas not designated open space. We are not aware of this. It is staff interpretation that Council intended each development application to meet the City's tree retention requirements. If you have documentation of Council's intent to the contrary, please provide it.*

Response: The Certified Arborist Report and site plan have been revised to meet the Dupont tree retention code.

5. *DMC 25.120.030(4) requires that when the application before the city contains oak management mapping units, trees retained therein shall count toward meeting the tree retention requirements and code provides specific measures for each oak management mapping unit. The arborist report is silent on the presence of oak management mapping units (OMMUs) and the tree modification narrative describes that the tree removal is either adjacent to or abutting OMMUs. Provide an exhibit that overlays the oak management mapping units on the subject property so that we can verify their location with the proposed tree removal. A copy of the map of the oak management mapping units is attached.*

Response: All of the oaks on the subject property are outside of the oak management mapping units (OMMUs). Two map units (MO-8 and MO-9) are located on the subject property, near Old Fort Lake, but no oaks were assessed or located in these areas. A map overlay with the subject property and the OMMUs will be included as Attachment C in the Certified Arborist Report.

6. *DMC 25.120.050 provides a Tree Modification may be requested based on special circumstances pertaining to the land or the trees on it. You provided that there were three special circumstances that justify removal of all but 7 of the landmark trees:*

- i. *Special circumstance number one states that the OFL Subarea is equivalent to a neighborhood plan and tree retention should be reviewed on an overall basis over the 600-acre subarea. The proposal is for a 101-acre portion of the subarea, however, and each subsequent development application will need to be viewed for its own consistency with the tree retention requirements. Additionally, the proposal*

does not include a request for a Master Plan of the entire subarea. Also, unless you can provide additional documentation, there is no basis to assume that Council intended for the open space areas to be the only tree retention areas. The provisions of the DMC to allow for 30% removal of landmark trees within the road rights of way is specific to Oregon white oak landmark trees, which the arborists report has concluded that the property does not have. The argument that the applicant should get credit for having to remove landmark tree within the right of way, therefore is not applicable. Staff cannot support special circumstance number one as justification for the tree removal.

Response: he revised Certified Arborist Report and site plan include the retention of all 70 trees.

ii. *Special circumstance number two states that the irregular shape of the property is caused by adjacent property boundaries and proposed road rights of way as depicted in the subarea plan and not by the applicant and that the shape prohibits a market viable project. Staff notes that the overall development area is 101 acres, for which a substantial amount is available for development. A reduction in size of the building on Lot 1 (as depicted on the Tree Preservation Plan), which is the location of the bulk of the landmark trees, could meet the tree retention requirements. Applicant has indicated that the buildings will likely house multiple tenants, so a smaller building would likely have fewer tenants. Staff cannot support special circumstance number two as justification for the tree removal.*

Response: The building size on Lot 1 has been reduced to accommodate the 70 landmark trees to be retained.

iii. *Special circumstance number 3 is related to the permitting history of the property. Your request states that the prior expired project (First Park) was approved to remove 12 of the 76 landmark trees within proposed rights of way, and that additional landmark trees have established since that project was assessed. Your narrative states that the First Park proposal requested to retain at least 50 percent of all non-oak landmark trees. Our review of the SEPA Determination and Preliminary Plat Decision finds that the First Plat proposal retained all Oregon white oak landmark trees and 83 percent of the Douglas fir landmark trees, all of which was consistent with code requirements. All landmark Douglas fir within road rights of way were approved for removal. Staff cannot support special circumstance number three as justification for the tree removal because that application met the code requirements.*

Response: The arborist report and site plan have been revised to retain 70 landmark trees or 50 percent of all non-oak landmark trees.

Either withdraw the Tree Modification request and demonstrate compliance with the City's tree retention requirements or propose an alternative with justification that staff can support.

Response: The Tree Modification request will be withdrawn. The site plan has been revised to meet the tree retention requirements of DMC Chapter 25.120.

H. Consistency with Title 24 – Subdivision Regulations

1. You submitted an application for a 7-lot preliminary plat on Dec. 23, 2021. On February 7, 2022, you submitted a complete set of preliminary plat drawings (plot dated January 27, 2022). Upon review of the preliminary plat drawings, the proposal is to subdivide the 260.74 acres property into the lots described in Table 5.

Table 5 – Preliminary Plat Proposal*

Lot Number	Size in SF	Size in Acres	Proposed Improvements
Lot 1	1,909,451 SF	43.83 acres	No improvements
Lot 2	1,056,491 SF	24.25 acres	200,000 SF building with parking, circulation, and landscaping.
Lot 3	646,535 SF	14.84 acres	200,000 SF building with parking, circulation, and landscaping.
Lot 4	1,061,594 SF	24.37 acres	200,000 SF building with parking, circulation, and landscaping.
Lot 5	1,406,032 SF	32.27 acres	200,000 SF building with parking, circulation, and landscaping.
Lot 6	n/a – there is no Lot 6		
Lot 7	4,814,454 SF	110.52 acres	No improvements

*Lot numbers and sizes as reflected on the Preliminary Plat drawings submitted Feb. 7, 2022.

DMC 24.01.020 provides the definitions for various subdivisions. The proposal is a subdivision that meets the definition of a “large lot division” because all lots are over five acres in size. If it is your intent to process a large lot division rather than a preliminary plat, provide the city with your intent to withdraw the preliminary plat application and replace it with a large lot subdivision application that complies with DMC Chapter 24.06.

Response: The applicant intends to continue to process a preliminary plat application.

2. The following comments are based upon review of the proposal for compliance with DMC 24.06, Short Subdivision – Large Lot Subdivision. Per DMC 24.06.110, Large Lot Subdivisions are to follow the same review criteria and drafting standards as for short plats. The review criteria for short plats are provided in DMC 24.06.070. The City Engineer will provide comments under separate cover. All lots have ingress and egress. Lot 5 depicts New Road 2 ending in a cul-de-sac prior to reaching the full end of the lot. The plans shall be revised to extend the roadway to the end of the lot so that future extension of the roadway can be completed by others and in a manner that complies with the alignment depicted in the Old Fort Lake Subarea plan.

Response: Acknowledged that engineering comments may be provided under separate cover. The plans have been revised to extend the roadway to the end of the lot line.

We believe that the above responses, together with the enclosed revised plans and technical documents, address the comments in your letter dated March 25, 2022. Please review and approve the enclosed at

Barb Kincaid, AICP
City of DuPont
Department of Community Development

-21-

August 26, 2022

your earliest convenience. If you have questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at this office. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Ben Eldridge, P.E.
Senior Project Engineer

BE/jk
21127c.011
enc: As noted
cc: Steven Reed, Barghausen Consulting Engineers, Inc.