

## Harbor Grove Subdivision Comments - Engineering Review

### 1. Brandon Rudd-(13)

- a. Can you tell me what is the best format to submit awareness for it, along with slope erosion concerns? I just want to make sure my hillside doesn't erode away when they start digging into the hill

### 2. David Tyler-(16)

- a. Loss of significant existing vegetation. The plans do not appear to make any attempt at retaining vegetation on the site, which will further exacerbate drainage impacts.
- b. Visual eyesore created by installation of two retaining walls up to 16 feet in height along the west perimeter of the development, as well as associated fill.

### 3. Rajmadan Sangumani & Bharathi Sivasakthi-

- a. Also, I want to make sure that the roots of the big trees in my backyard are not cut down when they start digging, Will the builder assure me of the wellbeing of the trees in my backyard?

### 4. Kenneth R Willett-(1)

- a. There is no mitigation plan for the disruption of services or neighborhood traffic which will result from the proposed development and construction efforts.
- b. The application lists the removal of 5100 cubic yards of excavation and 5100 cubic yards of fill. This will require the use of excavation and transportation equipment. The application does not describe any engineering evaluation of the current road system, including 88th Street, 53rd Ave. W or 92nd Street, required to support this traffic without damage or reinforcement and repairs that may be necessary as the result of this traffic. There is no commitment by the developer to do this engineering evaluation or make improvements and repairs

### 5. Terri Hix-(2)

- a. Our second concern is with what we believe will be an unsightly and intimidating retaining wall system uphill from our property. The plan indicates that there will be 2-8 foot retaining walls terraced and when accounting for the slope of the grade this will present something approaching a 20 foot structure directly to the NE of our backyard. This structure cannot help but damage our property value as it will be like living in front of a castle wall. Aesthetics aside, we are concerned that these retaining walls which are built inside the building set back are likely not per code. This design needs a proper engineering review to ensure the safety and security of the walls and of the foundation drain treatment as mentioned previously.

### 6. Charles Van Citters-(5)

- a. In looking through the plans the first thing I notice is the number of X's on the "Existing Conditions" page where the majority of the trees are going to be cut down. The Environmental checklist states that 27 significant trees will remain, and 74 will be removed. It is hard to imagine that with 90% or more of the land denuded, still more than 25% of the significant trees remain. It also states that there will be 60 trees

planted, but how many of those will be significant trees? I think we know the answer to that one (1) what type of funding is available to maintain them? (2) Why does the Landscape Plans sheet only show 20 trees to be planted what about the other 40?

- b. On the TESC (Temporary Erosion and Sediment Plan), I see that with the exception of the north panhandle portion of the property, practically all of the rest of the property will be bulldozed. I see that there is a temporary interceptor swale that runs North South across the property about 60' east of the western property line. At its lowest point it appears to be at an undisturbed ground level of 393ft. This swale then drains according to the plan to a temporary 23' x 42' sediment trap on lot 1 about 280' to the East with a current ground level elevation of 396' to 398' from there it drains thru a temporary 12" flex pipe outfall with continuous positive slope to a riprap pad at an elevation of about 401' and then into the storm ditch that drains North to Smugglers Gulch Creek. It seems that the runoff that the swale collects will have to run uphill at least 8' to its outfall 340' away. I don't see how this can work unless it installed after all the grading is done when it may no longer needed.
- c. The Grading Plan shows that there will be extensive fill, over 20' high near the western property line by the retaining wall and as much 18' high on lots 5 and 6 within the building setbacks and 10' high over lot 1 by where the sediment trap is planned. (16) How will the city ensure that the site has been properly stripped, excavated, and structurally filled,
- d. The Grading Plan shows two retaining walls #1 located about 6 feet from the western property line and #2 about 6 feet further East from #1. #1 at its lowest point rests on ground that has a current elevation of 380 and its Toe is at an elevation of 382(?) and the Top is at 390 it is to be backfilled to the top with structural fill which slopes up to the bottom of retaining wall #2, which, if you are following along, is to be built on about 10 feet of structural fill with a Toe of 394 and a Top of 402 and Backfilled with compacted structural fill to a height at least 18' above the original ground elevation directly below.

**7. Erich Volkstorf-(6)**

- a. Additionally, document proposed mitigation of traffic safety improvements which will be needed due to added traffic on 53rd Ave. W and surrounding surface streets.

**8. B. Jon Boyce-**

- a. Street Frontage Improvements - None. There are none! Unbelievable! There are NO sidewalks and provisions for public safety? 53rd Ave West between 88th and 92nd has a decades long safety issue. Only recently, through the installation of speed bumps, has it become moderately more safe for pedestrians, children, and bicyclists. This proposal adds scores of daily car trips without any mitigation for pedestrian safety.
- b. Sheet UT-01 Rain Garden Proposal - I was a member of the city's LID citizens committee. The proposed raingarden is in the 10 foot ROW. Where is there room for pedestrians? Add 50 car trips per day (both projects) yet NO mitigation for increased traffic? The proposed RG location means that at such time when MUK does put in sidewalks, the RG

will be removed. Also, given the existent grading (not the “improved grading”) they look good on paper, but are not an improvement

**9. Gregory Chapdelaine-(10)**

- a. Height of proposed retaining walls and structures. The height of the proposed retaining walls and required fill (up to 20’) in some places...

**10. Sylvia Kawabata-(12)**

- a. Project description page 2, the report states the total approximate area is 1.33 acres, the supplemental application and preliminary plat plans says the gross site area = 2.43 acres and the new site area = 2.38 acres. Please clarify what is the correct size of the project.
- b. The application is incomplete since it did not include a Hydrology Report as required in MMC 15.16.060 for sites with a mass clearing and grading and development of a proposed sub-division site. See MMC 15.16.060 D.
- c. Page 7 Plants The applicant proposes to remove 74 significant conifers and 12 significant deciduous trees (totaling 86 significant trees), and preserve 27 significant trees.

**11. David Tyler-(16)**

- a. R.O.W. dedication and future frontage improvements on 53rd Ave. W. The City’s requirement for a dedication of 10 feet of right-of-way on 53rd would seem to imply frontage improvements (street widening and/or sidewalk) will be needed. The drainage study should account for any additional impervious area tied to this project’s need for frontage improvements, whether they are built now or at some point in the future. This obligation should not be passed on to the City of Mukilteo and taxpayers
- b. TESC Plan (Sheet 4 of 12). The TESC plan shows a “temporary interceptor swale” that apparently is intended to collect surface flows and route them east to a sediment trap, which appears to discharge to a swale in 53rd at an approximate elevation of 402 feet. However, no elevation data is provided for the swale itself. Since positive flow is required from all portions of the interceptor swale to the sediment trap discharge point, a likely scenario is that the lowest point of the swale will need to be at least 405’ elevation. This will be at too high of an elevation to effectively prevent stormwater runoff and erosion impacts on adjacent properties, which are at a much lower elevation of around 380’ or less.
- c. 15.16.050.C.2.b.i.(b), which requires a slope and hydrology report when clearing/grading on slopes greater than 35%. The south and southwest portions of the site contain slopes greater than 35% (see Figure 2 below from Grading Plan, Sheet 5). I calculated slopes up to 40%.
- d. Grading and Retaining Walls. Subsection 15.16.140.C requires the incorporation of “special precautions” to protect adjoining properties from impacts. How has this requirement been met by the proposed project design? Based on previously described

impacts, the project design should be revised by the applicant to demonstrate consistency with this standard.

**12. John Cole-(17)**

- a. I have a recorded easement that has been omitted or ignored in the preliminary plat. It was recorded with Snohomish County in May of 2008. This easement grants me ingress, egress, and utilities to the north of my property. Within this easement, the proposed plat intends to violate this easement in several ways:
- b. The proposed plat shows removing a catch basin in my driveway, as well as a dispersion trench that is outside of the easement and on MY property.
- c. The proposed planting schedule has a large maple tree very near or in front of the steps leading to my front door.
- d. I have very significant concerns regarding the access I will have to my house during construction. The proposed footprint of the vault would cut off the access to my house for me, my family, friends, deliveries, emergency vehicles, etc. The proposed temporary construction access, which is my current and only access, would also become the temporary access for me. Will this surface be appropriate for all types of vehicles? Will my access be guaranteed 24 hours a day 7 days a week?