



CITY OF
MUKILTEO

*Planning and Community
Development Department*

June 9, 2016

Fatah Boualamallah
5333 – 150th Pl. SW.
Edmonds, WA 98026

**Re: Islamic Center Of Mukilteo; 3920 Harbour Pointe Blvd.
Application Nos. PPR –RUP-HE-2016-001/ENG-2016-005**

Dear Mr. Boualamallah:

City staff has finished its initial review of the documents submitted for the above-referenced applications. Based on our review and the comments received, additional information and revisions to some plans must be submitted to allow us to complete our review of your project. Pursuant to Mukilteo Municipal Code (MMC) 17.13.040(C), the City may request additional information to complete its review of a project. Following is a description of the revisions and additional information that must be submitted.

Planning Department:

Revise Sheet SP1 Site Plan and Landscaping Plan as follows:

1. Correct the spelling of “sprinklered”.
2. Include the lot area of 35,000 square feet and building footprint of 1,878 square feet and correct the lot coverage to be 5.36%.

Engineering Department:

General

3. A temporary construction easement will be required from the neighboring properties to the west and the east for the construction of the retaining walls. A copy shall be submitted to the City prior to permit issuance.
4. The driveway access point is shown to be 20 feet wide. However, the driveway minimum street opening width onto a collector street (Harbour Pointe Boulevard) is 24 feet. The driveway can taper down as it goes south to a minimum of 20 feet to meet fire access requirements, however the opening at the street must be 24 feet. Please revise plans to show the 24-foot opening at the street.
5. The Engineering Permit Application states the land surface modification square footage is 16,291, however the total impervious square footage area is 18,709 (page 1), 16,291 (page 2), and 19,556 (page 3). Please provide the total clearing area in square feet and the correct impervious surface square footage. Impervious surfaces shall include all permeable pavement and grasscrete areas.

Stormwater

The review for stormwater is general in nature at this time. A detailed review of the plan sets cannot be completed until the following items are addressed:

6. The Stormwater Report must show how List #2 (found in Volume I, page 2-26, of the 2012 *Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington - SWMMWW*) was followed in

the proper order to determine which BMPs are applicable for this project. If a BMP is determined to be not feasible, evidence of infeasibility must be provided.

7. A Pilot Infiltration Test (PIT) must be performed for this project and its results provided to the City for review. For any proposed infiltration (including but not limited to grasscrete pavers, bioinfiltration swales, and permeable pavement), the project applicant shall conduct saturated hydraulic conductivity testing, using a Pilot Infiltration Test (PIT), in accordance with Section 3.1.1 of Volume I, and Section 3.4 of Volume III of the *SWMMWW*. The results of the PITs shall be provided to the City and used as the infiltration design rate (with any necessary correction factors) for all infiltration features, in accordance with Section 3.4 of Volume III of the *SWMMWW*.
8. The project's stormwater plans must include all driveway areas and frontage areas that are part of the current project, as well as parking areas and roof tops, for treatment and flow control. Please ensure the drainage report and plans reflect this. However, any future Harbour Pointe Boulevard street improvements completed by the City do not need to be accounted for in this project.
9. The wetland report dated April 13, 2016 indicates that the wetland on-site is fed by both groundwater and surface water. Please ensure the stormwater design shows how Minimum Requirement #8 is met, and how the hydrology of the wetland is protected. To do this, follow Guidesheet 3-B of Appendix I-D, found in Volume I of the *SWMMWW*.
10. The Preliminary Stormwater Report dated March 2016 does not provide an analysis of the runoff from the entire site for Predeveloped Land Use. This analysis must be done and the results provided to the City. This analysis shall use forested conditions with Type C soils for modeling and comparison of post-development runoff, for the entire site, including grass-crete paver areas.
11. The Preliminary Stormwater Report does not model the Point of Compliance (POC), stated on page 9, for the pre-developed or post-developed conditions. The model must the stated POC in both pre-developed and post-developed conditions. Please revise the Stormwater Report to include this information.
12. Please provide the soil classification of the site, as identified in the Unified Classification System.

Boundary and Topography Survey

13. Resubmit the Boundary and Topography Survey with professional land surveyor's signature on it and the expiration date entered for the professional land surveyor license.

Civil Plan Set

Revise Sheet 1 of 10 as follows:

14. Show the turning radius for a car in Parking space #10 to be able to get out of the parking stall.
15. Change *City of Mukilteo Planer* to *City of Mukilteo Planner*.

Revise Sheet 6 of 10 as follows:

16. The retaining wall design shall be designed, with information from the Geotechnical Engineering Evaluation, by a licensed structural engineer, not by *the contractor/supplier* as stated on the Note. The note must be revised and the plans must be submitted and approved by the City prior to permit issuance.
17. The northern retaining wall is shown to be outside of the clearing limits/silt fence, and within the 80-foot buffer. Please clarify how this is to be constructed when it is outside of the erosion control protection area, as well as outside of the clearing limits.

18. The retaining wall to the east of the driveway will impact the two trees shown on the plans, the 14" diameter alder and the 24" diameter cedar. If these two trees are not being removed as part of the project, show how the trees will be protected during construction.
19. At the driveway opening, if the adjacent sidewalk has a cross slope that is greater than 2.0%, add a transition piece between the driveway and the adjacent sidewalk so that the driveway meets ADA compliance.
20. Add a note stating the driveway shall be built per WSDOT Standard Plan F-80.10-03.

Revise Sheet 9 of 10 as follows:

21. Replace Snohomish County Public Works Drop Curb Driveway with WSDOT Standard Plan F-80.10-03.
22. Add note regarding transition panels if the adjacent sidewalk's cross slope is over 2.0%.
23. Revise the Temporary Construction Entrance so it has a minimum depth of at least 100 feet (also applies on Sheet 3 of 9).

Revise Sheet 10 of 10 as follow:

24. General Note #2, the phone number to call is 425.263.8000

Traffic Impact Analysis

The Traffic Impact Analysis & Revised Parking Analysis submitted on March 11, 2016 only accounted for the 477 square feet of gross floor area for the assembly area and asked that consideration be given to not examine the entire 3,796 square feet of gross floor area. It is imperative that the other areas be given consideration as they include classrooms, offices and a kitchen. While at this time the intent may be to not use the classroom and office spaces during the week, it's not unreasonable to believe that in the future this could change and there could be classroom and/or office space use during the week. This possibility needs to be taken into account when looking at possible traffic impacts.

The Analysis also looked at the difference between a church and a mosque:

Christian prayers are held on Sunday mornings but Islamic prayers are held on Fridays at about noon. Friday prayers usually last for about 90 minutes and the start time depends on summer daylight saving time. But, they are always over by 2:30 PM

Consideration must be taken for individuals socializing with others before leaving the mosque, and the traffic impact of those leaving on Friday afternoons.

As you noted in the analysis, Land Use Code (LUC) 562 – Mosque lists Church LUC 560 as a related and similar land use.

The City's calculation for the P.M. Peak Hour Trips this project would generate is 2.51 additional trips. This number is arrived at by including the entire gross floor area of the building in the calculation and then using the LUC Church (560) peak hour of adjacent street traffic. We arrived at 2.51 additional trips for one hour between 4 and 6 p.m. as follows:

$$3,796 \text{ square feet} / 1000 \text{ square feet} = 3.796$$

$$3.796 \times .66 = 2.51 \text{ additional trips}$$

Based on the above calculation, the project meets concurrency with 2.51 additional trips, and the traffic impact fee would be \$4,697.55. If you disagree with the City's calculation, you may submit a revised Traffic Impact Analysis. That revised analysis must include the following:

25. The analysis must specifically account for all of the gross floor area. It may be appropriate to determine certain portions of the floor area will not generate any trips, now and in the

future, but the analysis must specifically state this and include reasoning supporting this assertion.

26. The analysis must address the potential for people to linger on site after the Friday prayer service has concluded at 2:30 p.m. and impact the traffic congestion on Harbour Pointe Boulevard in front of the project site and at the Harbour Pointe Boulevard/SR525 intersection. If the belief is people will not linger on site in such a manner as to create any P.M. Peak Hour Trips or impact traffic congestion, supporting statements must be provided. To partially support this position you may want to visit the site at 2:30 p.m. on a Friday to observe and document with photographs the traffic congestion on Harbour Pointe Boulevard in front of the project site and at the Harbour Pointe Boulevard/SR525 intersection.

The above Engineering Review Comments may be an incomplete list of items. The developer should review all submittals for compliance with the City's current requirements prior to submittal.

Please note that in accordance with MMC 17.13.060(E), if the City requests additional information, as with this letter, the applicant has 180 calendar days to submit additional information. If the required information is not submitted within the 180 calendar days, the application will be considered lapsed for failure to submit the necessary information in a timely manner and the file will be closed. The applicant may request, in writing, an extension of up to an additional 90 calendar days. Additionally, pursuant to MMC 17.13.080(B), any time for which the City has requested and is waiting additional information and/or revisions does not count as part of the City's overall review period for a project.

Sincerely,



Glen Pickus, AICP
Planning Manager

pc: Challis Stringer, Sr. Engineer Technician
Jennifer Adam, Surface Water Technician

Project and correspondence files