



**Vineyard Vista Subdivision
Preliminary Plat, Critical Areas Permit, Tree Cutting
Permit, and SEPA
Type III
Technical Completeness Review**
Community Development
210 East 4th Street
La Center, WA 98629

Date: February 5, 2024

File No. 2024-002SUB/SEP/CAR/TRE

Site Address: No Site Address. Northeast North Fork Avenue, La Center, WA 98629

Parcel: 258903000 & 63472946

Legal Description: #36 SEC 34 T5N R1E WM 29.46A and Southview Heights PH 8 TT A SUB 2006

Project Description:

The applicant is proposing an 84-lot single-family detached residential subdivision on the approximate 29.53-acre site. Lot sizes would range from 6,900 square feet to 19,656 square feet. The properties are located east of Northeast North Fork Avenue, north of Southview Heights Subdivision, and at the northern La Center City limits. The site is zoned low density residential (LDR-7.5) with an Urban Holding (UH-10) overlay and the comprehensive plan designation for the site is Urban Low Density Residential (UL). Access to the property would be from two public street entrances from Northeast North Fork Avenue and Northeast 24th Circle.

Applicant's Representative: Contact: Mason Wolfe
Wolfe Project Management, LLC
2410 West Main Street, Suite 210
Battle Ground, WA 98604
mason@wolfepm.com

The City's planning consultant (WSP, USA Inc.) and engineering staff reviewed application materials for the proposed Type III Preliminary Plat, Critical Areas Permit, Tree Cutting Permit, and SEPA Review. We are writing to notify you that the application is deemed **incomplete** as documented below.

Planning Comments

The pre-application conference notes (2022-039-PAC) contain a list of required submittal items based on LCMC 18.30.050, 18.30.150, and 18.210.030.

- *The information listed in LCMC 18.210.010(2), provided an environmental checklist is required for a technically complete application unless categorically exempt.*
 - Status: **Complete**. The applicant provided a signed and completed SEPA Environmental checklist.
- *An application form with original signatures by the applicant and property owners. If there is more than one property owner, separate application forms and signatures are required.*
 - Status: **Complete**. The applicant provided a signed application form, along with an owner authorization.
- *Proof of ownership document, such as copies of deeds and/or a policy of satisfactory commitment for title insurance.*
 - Status: **Complete**. The applicant provided a copy of a quit claim deed for the property confirming ownership by Chinookan, LLC (parcel 63472946) and a boundary line adjustment (BLA) agreement confirming ownership by Chinookan, LLC (parcel 258903000).
- *A legal description of the site.*
 - Status: **Complete**. The legal description is contained on the application form and an extended legal description is contained on the deed and BLA agreement.
- *Site Plan. At a scale of no more than one inch equals 200 feet with north arrow, date, graphic scale, existing and proposed lots, tracts, easements, rights-of-way and structures on the site, and existing lots, tracts, easements, rights-of-way and structures abutting the site; provided, information about off-site structures and other features may be approximate if such information is not in the public record. The applicant shall provide one copy of the plan reduced to fit on an eight-and-one-half-inch by 11-inch page. Principal features of the plan shall be dimensioned.*
 - Status: **Incomplete**. The applicant provided preliminary plat plans including a site plan (with north arrow, date, graphic scale, lots, tracts, and rights-of-way), an existing conditions plan with a preliminary boundary survey, preliminary grading plan, and a preliminary stormwater plan. The plans are 1" = 60' (1" = 50' for preliminary grading and stormwater plan) and can be reduced to fit on an 8.5" x 11" sheet.
 - A tree removal and retention plan was provided in accordance with LCMC 18.350. The applicant indicates in the narrative and preliminary plans that all trees are to be removed on site and to be mitigated with the proposed street trees and replanting in the riparian buffer area and would meet the native species requirements of LCMC 18.340. Please see the "Additional Issues Noted During Review" section below. These plans should also be produced by a landscape architect or an arborist in accordance with LCMC 18.350.060.
 - Tree survey and inventory: A tree survey and inventory was provided by the applicant and in accordance with the pre-application notes for the site as there are numerous trees.
 - Tree protection plan: The applicant provided plans showing existing trees with proposed site improvements as required by LCMC 18.350.060. Several trees are proposed for removal with mitigation for all trees at ten-inch diameter at breast height (dbh) or greater and some trees are to be preserved, including several Oregon white oaks. However, Staff are unable to locate all of replanted trees for required mitigation on the provided plans. Please update plans to indicate where,

what kind, and size of trees are to be planted, including the riparian areas as discussed in the critical areas report. It is unclear that 245 Oregon white oak trees and 535 other trees could be planted in the areas indicated and reach maturity without having to reduce the number of planted trees. Please provide information demonstrating that there is enough area to plant this many mitigation trees. Please also see comment on additional Oregon white oak mitigation that may be needed based on BAS in the additional issues section of this letter.

- Tree removal criteria: The applicant's arborist report has demonstrated how they are meeting the tree removal criteria in LCMC 18.350.080. Please see the "Additional Issues Noted During Review" section below.
- *A copy of the pre-application conference summary*
 - Status: **Complete**.
- *A written description of how the proposed preliminary plat does or can comply with each applicable approval criterion for the preliminary plat, and basic facts and other substantial evidence that support the description.*
 - Status: **Complete**. The applicant provided a Project Narrative discussing compliance with selected standards. The narrative indicates that there are no flag lots on the site, but upon Staff review, there are indeed flag lots on the site. Please see the section "Additional Issues Noted During Review" below for further discussion.
- *Names and addresses of owners of land within a radius of 300 feet:*
 - Status: **Complete**. The applicant provided mailing labels for properties within 300 feet of the subject site.
- *Applications associated with the preliminary plat, such as exceptions, adjustments or variances to dimensional requirements of the base or overlay zones or for modifications to the road standards in Chapter 12.10 LCMC that are required to approve the preliminary plat application as proposed.*
 - Status: **Complete**.
 - The applicant's geotechnical report by True North Geotechnical indicates that the site is classified as Site Class C soils for ground shaking amplification and concluded that there are no seismic hazards on the site. However, this conflicts with information and databases that Staff have access. Please see the "Additional Issues Noted During Review" section below. Additionally, the geotechnical report has confirmed the presence of the erosion hazard areas as mapped within the riparian buffer and steep slopes, which are a landslide hazard. However, the report indicates there are no landslide hazards on the site, but that there are steep slopes in excess of 40%, which is an indicator of a landslide hazard. Please see the "Additional Issues Noted During Review" section below.
- *A wetlands delineation report OR letter from a certified wetland biologist stating that there are no wetlands/stream resources onsite. The applicant must also provide a critical areas report for the mapped streams and Oregon white oaks on the site.*
 - Status: **Complete**. The applicant submitted a letter from Cascadia Ecological Services, Inc. The report has determined that wetlands do not occur on the site and not subject to the wetland critical areas requirements of LCMC 18.300.090(3) and a critical areas permit. The report also confirmed the presence of a Type Ns stream on the site. Type Ns streams are afforded a 75-foot buffer on either side of the OHWM. Lastly, the report confirmed the presence of several Oregon white oak trees, with

most being preserved and three being removed. The removed Oregon white oaks are mitigated at a ratio that is not in accordance with BAS. See further comments in the additional issues section below.

- *A geotechnical study is required if the site will contain substantial fill and contains seismic hazards.*
 - Status: **Complete**. The applicant provided a geotechnical report addressing site soil stability for proposed improvements.
- *Preliminary grading, erosion control and drainage plans, which may be a single plan, consistent with applicable provisions of Chapter 18.320 LCMC.*
 - Status: **Incomplete**. The applicant provided a preliminary grading and erosion control plan and drainage plan, but the verification of the ability to connect to 24th Avenue must be verified. This is discussed in this report. The applicant also provided a separate preliminary Technical Information Report (TIR), which discusses storm water and drainage. The conclusions section of the provided geotechnical report also discusses drainage, grading, and erosion control.
- *Evidence that potable water will be provided to each lot from a public water system, and that each lot will be connected to public sewer.*
 - Status: **Incomplete**. The applicant's preliminary plat shows public water throughout the site. The applicant has also provided a request for utility review for water availability from Clark Public Utilities (CPU), which indicates sufficient water capacity will be made for this project from off-site improvements such as a booster pump station or possible reservoir site. There is sufficient water connection for the project from Northeast North Fork Avenue and East 24th Circle.
 - The applicant's plans show public sewer throughout the site with connection from the subdivision to the existing public facility is not the intended location that was planned for this subdivision. In the preapplication conference notes, the city discussed connecting to this public sewer in the 20-foot wide easement, just west of Gaither Avenue. The applicant's utility plan shows the subdivision sewer connecting to an existing public sewer, just east end of 24th Circle, that extends through a public easement on private residential property. This existing system, in phase 8 of Southview Heights, is not accessible, and will not be easily maintained by the city. The length of this sewer system is heavily vegetated with bushes and trees. Furthermore, this existing public sewer is over 19 years old and the condition and capacity is unknown. **This connection will likely not be approved for connection, unless there is no other feasible option.** The application will need to show why the sewer connection in the 20-foot easement, west of Gaither Street cannot be used. If the city allows the use of the public sewer in Southview Heights, the applicant will need to verify the condition of the public sewer, and that it has enough capacity for connection of the public sewer from Vineyard Vista Subdivision. In addition, if this Southview Heights sewer is allowed, **the applicant may need to provide an accessible route through this existing easement area on private property.** This may be providing a gate and drivable gravel road surface.
- *A phasing plan, if proposed.*
 - Status: **Not applicable**. The applicant narrative indicates that no phasing is proposed with the development.
- *An archeological predetermination*

- Status: **Complete**. The applicant provided an archaeological predetermination survey from Clark County.
- *A traffic study.*
 - Status: **Complete**. The applicant provided a Transportation Impact Study.
- *A signed Agreement to Pay Outside Professional Review Expenses Related to Land Use Application. (Provided during the meeting.)*
 - Status: **Complete**.
- *Topographic Map*
 - Status: **Complete**. The applicant's existing conditions plan provides existing topographic information.

Public Works and Engineering Comments

- Public Works and Engineering Comments per 18.320 LCMC.
 - Status: **Incomplete**. The applicant has shown a new road connection from the site to 24th Circle. The Southview Heights Phase 8 Plat shows Tract "A" 5-feet to be dedicated with this Plat to and maintained by the HOA. An agreement, plat revision, or some other legal document must be obtained from the HOA and recorded to allow this road connection.
- The applicant submitted a grading and erosion control plan.
- Section 18.320.120 (1) LCMC states that ground-disturbing activities of more than 500 square feet are subject to the requirements of *City of La Center Erosion Control Guidelines*. Section 18.320.120 (2)(a) LCMC states that the creation of more than 2,000 square feet of impervious surface is subject to stormwater regulation.
- The applicant proposes to create new impervious interior streets in the subdivision. Per LCMC 18.320.210, treatment BMPs shall be sized to treat the water quality design storm, defined as the six-month, 24-hour storm runoff volume.

The revised site layout must meet the minimum requirements:

The LCMC section 18.320.220 states that if surface water leaves the site, stormwater must be detained per LCMC. Runoff calculations need to consider undisturbed forest as the pre-developed condition in determining runoff curve numbers or a downstream analysis of the existing conveyance system is required. The design must meet the LCMC 18.320 and the 1992 Puget Sound Manual for the design of the system.

Stormwater requirements:

- Status: **Complete**. The applicant submitted a storm report to address these requirements.

Additional Issues Noted During Review

Please note that this section of the completeness review are not items that are required in order to determine that the application is complete. However, the applicant may wish to address these issues prior to completeness to avoid delays in the review process later.

- The Oregon white oaks that are proposed to be removed are not sufficiently mitigated for in accordance with the most recent BAS. WDFW has released new guidance and mitigation ratios for removed Oregon white oaks. The three individual Oregon white oaks to be removed should be first assessed for the temporal loss of ecological function by determining the baseline ecological function of each tree, the ecological function after development, and the resulting enhancement mitigation ratio per guidance. Additionally, each tree removed will have to be replanted to replace the physical loss of habitat. Per the new WDFW guidance, the physical loss of habitat replacement (replanting) ratios are as follows for each tree to be removed:
 - 8-inch dbh: 50:1
 - 14-inch dbh: 100:1
 - 20- inch dbh: 150:1

Please update the critical areas report and mitigation ratios in accordance with use the new WDFW guidance: *Best Management Practices for Mitigating Impacts to Oregon White Oak Priority Habitat (January 2, 2024)* for both temporal and physical loss of ecological function.

- Many trees are proposed for removal on the site. Staff have determined that the applicant is exceeding net minimum density by approximately 10 lots and that there may be opportunities to preserve additional trees, while increasing the residential density of the site. LCMC 18.350.080(4) allows the City to require alternative site plans that would lessen the impact on trees. Please provide additional plat plans or evidence that alternatives were considered to removing the trees.
- The provided geotechnical report has information that conflicts with critical areas databases accessed by Staff. The geotechnical report indicates that Clark County MapsOnline maps the site as within Site Class C soils for ground shaking amplification. Both Clark County MapsOnline and the Washington Geologic Information Portal indicate the site is classified as Site Class D or C-D, which may be a seismic hazard.

The geotechnical report concludes that, from site samples and analysis, it's agreed the site has Site Class C soils. Staff requests the geotechnical report to be updated consistent with the databases and confirm whether or not a seismic hazard exists.. Lastly, the geotechnical report indicates that there are no potentials of unstable soils, therefore, there are not landslide hazard areas on the site. However, the report indicates the presence of slopes greater than 40% on the site and that there are "slope hazards" on the site. In accordance with LCMC 18.300.030, an indicator of a landslide hazard area includes any areas with slopes greater than 40%, therefore, please confirm whether landslide hazards exist on the site in accordance with LCMC 18.300.030(54).

- The narrative indicates that there are no occurrence of flag lots on the site that would be subject to the requirements of LCMC 18.210.040(3), however, Staff notes there are about six lots (Lots 1, 17, 18, 23, 56, and 64) that are flag lots on the site as defined by LCMC 18.40. Staff requests that the applicant updates it's submitted narrative to address how the flag lots will comply with the requirements of LCMC 18.210.040(3).

Signed: Anthony Paul Cooper Date: 2/5/24
 Tony Cooper, P.E, City Engineer