



City of Redmond Notice of Application

For more information about this project visit www.redmond.gov/landuseapps

Project Information

Project Name: Hawks Glen

Application Type: Land Division Subdivision

File Number: LAND-2015-01452

Project Description: Subdivide one parcel into 19 lots, 8 duplexes and 11 single family residences. One duplex will meet affordable housing requirements.

Project Location: 17656 NE 116th Street

Site Address, If Applicable: 17656 NE 116TH ST

Size of Subject Area in Acres: 9.76 Sq.Ft. 0

Applicant: Moira Haughian

Process Type: III (see attached flow chart)

A Public Hearing is not required for this application type.

Required Permits, not a part of this application:

Building Permits, Fire Permits, Public Works Permits, Sign Permit/Program

Required Studies:

Critical Aquifer Recharge Area Report, Stormwater Report, Stream Reconnaissance Report, Traffic Study, Tree Health Assessment, Wetland Report

Existing Environmental Documents, relevant to this application:

SEPA Checklist

Important Dates

Application & Completeness Date: June 29, 2016

Notice of Application Date: July 14, 2016

To allow a minimum comment period as specified in RZC, the City will not issue a decision on this project prior to **Aug 4, 2016**. If date ends on a weekend or holiday comments are due on the next business day.

Regulatory Information

Zoning: Residential

Comprehensive Plan Designation: Single-Family Urban

Consistent with Comprehensive Plan: Yes

Applicable Development Regulations:
Redmond Municipal Code & Zoning Code

Public Comment

Although comments are accepted up until the decision is issued, submittal of comments during the comment period required in RZC, will ensure comments are considered prior to issuing a decision and will allow staff and/or the applicant to address comments as early in the process as possible. In addition, persons who want to be informed of future actions or would like to become a party of record on this proposal must provide their name and mailing address to the project planner. Submit written comments or name and address to be added as a party of record to the City of Redmond Planning Department, Development Services Center 15670 NE 85th Street, P.O. Box 97010, Mail Stop 25PL, Redmond, WA 98073-9710, or fax to 425-556-2400. The final decision on this proposal may be appealed according to the City appeal provision specified in RZC Chapter 21.76, Review Procedures.

City Contact Information

Project Planner Name: Sarah Vanags

Phone Number: 425-556-2426

Email: svanags@redmond.gov



Public Comment Form

Project Name: Hawks Glen

File Number: LAND-2015-01452

Contact Information

Name: Ivy Freitag **Phone:** 206.477.7976 **Email:** ivy.freitag@kingcounty.gov

Address: 201 S Jackson Street **State:** Seattle **Zip Code:** 98104

Comments (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed plan at Hawks Glen. I have reviewed the project documents and overall concur with the Determination of Non-Significance. It is important to note that currently there is a ranch house, built in 1964, located on the parcel of the proposed project area. To be considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, a property must be at least fifty years old and meet the National Register Criteria for Evaluation in terms of age, integrity, and significance.

Thank you again and please feel free to contact me with any further questions.

From: [Karen Walter](#)
To: [Sarah Vanags](#)
Cc: [Andy Rheume](#)
Subject: FW: City of Redmond, SEPA-2016-01229 Hawk's Glen
Date: Friday, August 19, 2016 3:21:53 PM

Sarah,

We have reviewed the SEPA documents for the proposed Hawk's Glen subdivision project referenced above. We have some questions and initial comments as noted below:

This project is in the Monticello subbasin which is identified as a high priority for restoration in the City's 2013 Watershed Plan to improve and restore beneficial uses in this stream and the broader Bear Creek basin. See

<http://www.redmond.gov/common/pages/UserFile.aspx?fileId=112355>

Within this plan, there are key actions identified for the reach of Monticello Creek impacted by this project or MC1 from Table 5.6 in the plan. Specifically, projects should be:

- constructing infiltration facilities for new development;
- retrofitting existing facilities;
- protect and increase forested areas;
- add side channels;
- add instream complexity;
- restore buffers; and enhance buffers.

From a review of the available information, it is not apparent how this project is meeting or exceeding these actions and requirements. For example, stormwater from basin 5 of the site is to discharge to NE 116 and the City's east-flowing stormdrain system without flow control or water quality treatment (see pages 1-2; 1-3; and 4-1 of stormwater report) which ultimately flows into an unnamed tributary to Monticello Creek. This approach is likely inconsistent with the watershed plan. Stormwater cannot be infiltrated per pages 2-1 and 2-2 of the Stormwater report. Also, there is no mention of retrofitting this east-flowing stormdrain system which will include of this new stormwater discharge. When does this system get retrofitted?

How does Monticello Creek get enhanced with new side channels and instream complexity if there is a new outfall?

How do stream buffers get restored if there is a stream buffer reduction (see page 19 of Critical Areas Study) and trail within the 150 foot regulated stream buffer? The stream buffer will be further impacted by a new stormwater structure and outfall and is a permanent impact as trees will not be allowed to grow over these structures.

Additional information is needed to demonstrate how this project is meeting the actions and requirements from the City's 2013 Watershed Plan which was adopted as an alternative stormwater management approach by Ecology and has regulatory implications as a result. Please note that we did not object to the City's watershed plan as we felt it had merits and we expect it to be fully implemented programmatically and with individual development projects such as Hawks' Glen.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this proposal and may have further comments once we have received responses and additional information.

Thank you,
Karen Walter
Watersheds and Land Use Team Leader

Muckleshoot Indian Tribe Fisheries Division

*Habitat Program
39015 172nd Ave SE
Auburn, WA 98092
253-876-3116*

From: Gloria Meerscheidt [mailto:GMeerscheidt@REDMOND.GOV]
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2016 10:31 AM
To: andy.swayne@pse.com; Angie Peace; chelland@bellevuewa.gov; Chris Jenkins; connie.blumen@kingcounty.gov; Dan Sokol; dbeadle@ci.sammamish.wa.us; dlewarch@sugumish.nsn.us; Elaine Somers; Elizabeth.Elliott@kingcounty.gov; Erika Harris; Fisheries Fileroom; fmiller@lwsd.org; gary.kriedt@kingcounty.gov; Gretchen.Kaehler@dahp.wa.gov; Jennifer Meisner; Johnson Meninick; Jon Regala; Karen Walter; Kate Valdez; klyste@stillaguamish.com; Laura Murphy; Mark.Wilgus@kingcounty.gov; mattb@snoqualmtribe.us; mpaine@bellevuewa.gov; Philippe D. LeTourneau; Puget Sound Clean Air Agency; Ramin Pazooki; Richard Yound; robert.nunnenkamp@kingcounty.gov; ryoung@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov; sepacenter@dnr.wa.gov; sepadesk@dfw.wa.gov; sepaunit@ecy.wa.gov; Steve Mullen-Moses; Steve.Bottheim@kingcounty.gov; Steven Mullen-Moses; tina.morehead@kingcounty.gov; tlavender2@frontier.com; tmcgruder@gmail.com; Tom Hinman-citizen
Cc: Sarah Vanags; Gloria Meerscheidt; mhaughian@thebluelinegroup.com
Subject: City of Redmond, SEPA-2016-01229 Hawk's Glen

To review the supporting environmental documents related to this project visit:

<http://www.redmond.gov/development/CodesandRules/LandUseActionNotices>

and scroll to the project name listed alphabetically.

Gloria Meerscheidt

Administrative Assistant, Development Review
City of Redmond – Development Services Center
15670 NE 85th St, MS: 2SPL
Redmond, WA 98052
P: 425.556.2407 F: 425.556.2400
www.redmond.gov

This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. www.websense.com

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

From: [Cindy Wellborn](#)
To: KWalter@muckleshoot.nsn.us
Cc: [Sarah Vanags](#); [Paulette M. Norman](#); [Andy Rheaume](#); [Moiria Haughian](#)
Subject: Hawks Glen, SEPA-2016-01229
Date: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 12:46:51 PM

Karen,

Thank you for your recent email and discussion of the SEPA documents for the Hawks Glen subdivision project, SEPA-2016-01229. The current stormwater requirements in the Stormwater Technical Notebook and RMC 15.24 represent what the State of Washington and Redmond consider to be necessary and appropriate for new development to limit impacts to small streams. The watershed plan doesn't add additional requirements on development or preclude development from occurring. Instead, the watershed plan prioritizes the creeks the City wants to improve with investments in stormwater retrofits in existing development, in-stream habitat projects, and other programs. The City has imposed requirements on the project consistent with the Stormwater Technical Notebook and RMC 15.24, therefore, the City has acted to the extent of its authority.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Best Regards,
Cindy

Cindy Wellborn, P.E., LEED-AP
Senior Stormwater and Utilities Engineer
City of Redmond
Development Services
cwellborn@Redmond.gov
425.556.2495



From: [Brett Pudists](#)
To: [Karen Walter \(karen.walter@muckleshoot.nsn.us\)](#); [Sarah Vanags](#)
Cc: [Moirra Haughian](#); [Matt Perkins \(matt.perkins@quadranthomes.com\)](#); [Corey Watson \(Corey.Watson@quadranthomes.com\)](#); [Meryl@wetlandresources.com](#); [Cindy Wellborn](#)
Subject: RE: City of Redmond, SEPA-2016-01229 Hawk's Glen - Response
Date: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 1:01:36 PM

Karen,

Thank you for your comments (below) on the Hawks Glen project. The critical area study and stormwater management plan were prepared in accordance with current City of Redmond Code to protect sensitive areas and mitigate impacts of development associated with the project. The 2013 Citywide Watershed Management Plan (WMP) includes guidance to be considered as part of proposed development projects, as well as provides goals for basin wide Capital Projects to be funded and implemented by The City. Capital Projects, such as retrofitting offsite existing facilities and adding side channels in the creek corridor are beyond the scope of the proposed development project.

Following are key elements extracted from your comments (in bold) with responses.

1. **Within this plan, there are key actions identified for the reach of Monticello Creek impacted by this project or MC1 from Table 5.6 in the plan. Specifically, projects should be:**
 - a. **constructing infiltration facilities for new development;**
 Response: The site is underlain by glacial till and is not suitable for infiltration as outlined in the Geotechnical Report prepared by Terra Associates (revision date June 14, 2016).
 - b. **retrofitting existing facilities;**
 Response: The site does not contain existing facilities instead new storm water facilities will be constructed to meet current flow control and water quality standards.
 - c. **protect and increase forested areas;**
 Response: The forested portion of the site is adjacent to the critical areas and associated buffers which are located in the northern portion of the site. Implementation of the buffer restoration plan will add forested area to wetland buffers which will increase forested areas elsewhere on the site. All of the critical areas and their buffers will be placed in Critical Area Tracts which will be protected from deforestation in perpetuity.
 - d. **add side channels;**
 Response: See response to item 3 below.
 - e. **add instream complexity;**
 Response: The stream channel and riparian area on site currently contain multiple features that contribute to instream complexity. The onsite portion of Monticello Creek has natural meanders, pools, and varies in width. Wetland area immediately adjacent to the stream bank allows for moderation of water velocity. There are several areas where large woody debris is present in the stream channel. The area immediately adjacent to the stream is forested, which will continue to provide a source of large woody debris and refugia. Considering the features present in and adjacent to the stream channel, the onsite portion of the stream does not require enhancement to create instream complexity.

f. restore buffers; and enhance buffers.

Response: See response to item 4 below.

- 2. From a review of the available information, it is not apparent how this project is meeting or exceeding these actions and requirements. For example, stormwater from basin 5 of the site is to discharge to NE 116 and the City's east-flowing storm drain system without flow control or water quality treatment (see pages 1-2; 1-3; and 4-1 of stormwater report) which ultimately flows into an unnamed tributary to Monticello Creek. This approach is likely inconsistent with the watershed plan.**

Response: The area associated with Basin5 is relatively small and falls below detention and water quality thresholds contained in the City of Redmond Stormwater Technical Notebook. Of the 1,285 SF of PGIS for Basin 5 referenced in the drainage report, nearly half is existing PGIS that is being replaced (637 SF new / 648 SF replaced). Similarly, of the 3,695 SF of sidewalk in the report, nearly 50% is existing sidewalk that is being replaced (1,915 new / 1,780 sf replaced).

As a result of this project, 4,175 sf of PGIS associated with the existing driveway (previously not treated for water quality) and 5,300 SF of impervious associated with rooftops are being removed and replaced with plantings which is a net benefit with respect to storm water. Also, the configuration of improvements along 116th are such that runoff from the new sidewalk will be directed to a 10' wide planter strip which provides opportunities for limited infiltration and flow attenuation that were not provided prior to development.

- 3. How does Monticello Creek get enhanced with new side channels and instream complexity if there is a new outfall?**

Response: The City of Redmond required the storm drain outfall be placed in the proposed location. This outfall is adjacent to an existing road and bridge crossing, minimizing potential disturbance to the stream corridor vegetation. The impacts of the outfall structure are minimal, about 100 square feet. Additionally, the area where the conveyance pipe and outfall are located (against a road and in an existing utility easement) is not conducive to creating quality side channel habitat. The proposed outfall will not prevent quality side channel creation elsewhere in the Monticello Creek corridor.

- 4. How do stream buffers get restored if there is a stream buffer reduction (see page 19 of Critical Areas Study) and trail within the 150 foot regulated stream buffer?**

The stream buffer will be further impacted by a new stormwater structure and outfall and is a permanent impact as trees will not be allowed to grow over these structures.

Response: Overall, the stream buffer averaging plan will provide a net gain of 1,090 square feet of stream buffer on the subject site. The western and southern portions of the Monticello Creek buffer are currently pasture with very sporadic shrubs and/or tree cover. The buffer restoration plan proposed will remove invasive plants and install native shrubs and trees across all areas of buffer that are currently pasture areas (See Sheet 9 of Critical Areas Study). This will increase the vegetation diversity on site, provide additional cover for wildlife, and increase available native food sources on the site.

The vault outfall pipe will result in temporary buffer disturbance for pipe installation. The outfall will result in 100 square feet (or less) of permanent buffer impact. These impacts

will be restored/mitigated by planting native shrubs in the disturbed area, and supplementing vegetation in the area between the outfall structure and the stream channel. While trees will not be installed as part of the mitigation plantings, this area is currently forested and the existing canopy will continue to provide cover post-construction.

Let us know if you have additional questions about the proposed development.

Regards,

Brett Pudists, PE | Project Manager

BLUELINE | www.thebluelinegroup.com

d 425.250.7247 | o 425.216.4051 | f 425.216.4052

LAND MATTERS : : Civil Engineering : : Land Use Planning

From: Sarah Vanags <svanags@redmond.gov>

Date: August 22, 2016 at 7:15:44 AM PDT

To: Cindy Wellborn <cwellborn@redmond.gov>, Moira Haughian
<mhaughian@thebluelinegroup.com>

Subject: FW: City of Redmond, SEPA-2016-01229 Hawk's Glen

Please see below

Sarah K Pyle

Senior Planner

City of Redmond – Planning & Community Development

15670 NE 85th St, Redmond, WA 98052 MS:2SPL

P: 425.556.2426 F: 425.556.2400

From: Karen Walter [<mailto:KWalter@muckleshoot.nsn.us>]

Sent: Friday, August 19, 2016 3:22 PM

To: Sarah Vanags

Cc: Andy Rheume

Subject: FW: City of Redmond, SEPA-2016-01229 Hawk's Glen

Sarah,

We have reviewed the SEPA documents for the proposed Hawk's Glen subdivision project referenced above. We have some questions and initial comments as noted below:

This project is in the Monticello subbasin which is identified as a high priority for restoration in the City's 2013 Watershed Plan to improve and restore beneficial uses in this stream and the broader Bear Creek basin. See

<http://www.redmond.gov/common/pages/UserFile.aspx?fileId=112355>

Within this plan, there are key actions identified for the reach of Monticello Creek impacted by this project or MC1 from Table 5.6 in the plan. Specifically, projects should be:

- constructing infiltration facilities for new development;
- retrofitting existing facilities;
- protect and increase forested areas;
- add side channels;
- add instream complexity;
- restore buffers; and enhance buffers.

From a review of the available information, it is not apparent how this project is meeting or exceeding these actions and requirements. For example, stormwater from basin 5 of the site is to discharge to NE 116 and the City's east-flowing stormdrain system without flow control or water quality treatment (see pages 1-2; 1-3; and 4-1 of stormwater report) which ultimately flows into an unnamed tributary to Monticello Creek. This approach is likely inconsistent with the watershed plan. Stormwater cannot be infiltrated per pages 2-1 and 2-2 of the Stormwater report. Also, there is no mention of retrofitting this east-flowing stormdrain system which will include of this new stormwater discharge. When does this system get retrofitted?

How does Monticello Creek get enhanced with new side channels and instream complexity if there is a new outfall?

How do stream buffers get restored if there is a stream buffer reduction (see page 19 of Critical Areas Study) and trail within the 150 foot regulated stream buffer? The stream buffer will be further impacted by a new stormwater structure and outfall and is a permanent impact as trees will not be allowed to grow over these structures.

Additional information is needed to demonstrate how this project is meeting the actions and requirements from the City's 2013 Watershed Plan which was adopted as an alternative stormwater management approach by Ecology and has regulatory implications as a result.

Please note that we did not object to the City's watershed plan as we felt it had merits and we expect it to be fully implemented programmatically and with individual development projects such as Hawks' Glen.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this proposal and may have further comments once we have received responses and additional information.

Thank you,
Karen Walter
Watersheds and Land Use Team Leader

*Muckleshoot Indian Tribe Fisheries Division
Habitat Program
39015 172nd Ave SE
Auburn, WA 98092
253-876-3116*

From: Gloria Meerscheidt [<mailto:GMeerscheidt@REDMOND.GOV>]
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2016 10:31 AM
To: andy.swayne@pse.com; Angie Peace; chelland@bellevuewa.gov; Chris Jenkins; connie.blumen@kingcounty.gov; Dan Sokol; dbeadle@ci.sammamish.wa.us; dlewarch@sugumish.nsn.us; Elaine Somers; Elizabeth.Elliott@kingcounty.gov; Erika Harris; Fisheries Fileroom; fmiller@lwsd.org; gary.kriedt@kingcounty.gov; Gretchen.Kaehler@dahp.wa.gov; Jennifer Meisner; Johnson Meninick; Jon Regala; Karen Walter; Kate Valdez; klyste@stillaguamish.com; Laura Murphy; Mark.Wilgus@kingcounty.gov; mattb@snoqualmi-tribe.us; mpaine@bellevuewa.gov; Philippe D. LeTourneau; Puget Sound Clean Air Agency; Ramin Pazooki; Richard Yound; robert.nunnenkamp@kingcounty.gov; ryoung@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov; sepacenter@dnr.wa.gov; sepadesk@dfw.wa.gov; sepaunit@ecy.wa.gov; Steve Mullen-Moses; Steve.Bottheim@kingcounty.gov; Steven Mullen-Moses; tina.morehead@kingcounty.gov; tlavender2@frontier.com; tmcgruder@gmail.com; Tom Hinman-citizen
Cc: Sarah Vanags; Gloria Meerscheidt; mhaughian@thebluelinegroup.com
Subject: City of Redmond, SEPA-2016-01229 Hawk's Glen

To review the supporting environmental documents related to this project visit:

<http://www.redmond.gov/development/CodesandRules/LandUseActionNotices>

and scroll to the project name listed alphabetically.

Gloria Meerscheidt

Administrative Assistant, Development Review

City of Redmond – Development Services Center

15670 NE 85th St, MS: 2SPL

Redmond, WA 98052

P: 425.556.2407 F: 425.556.2400

www.redmond.gov

This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. www.websense.com

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.