



# **KITITAS COUNTY**

## **DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

---

### **MEMORANDUM**

---

TO: Community Development Services

FROM: Public Works Planning Review Team

DATE: March 24, 2021

SUBJECT: Forest Ridge Final Plat Resubmittal LPF-20-00005

---

**The following shall be addressed prior to final approval:**

#### **PLAT NOTES:**

1. The plat should note that Kittitas County is not responsible for the maintenance of private roads within the plat.

2005 KCC Chapter 12 – Private Roads 12.12.010 7. “Clearly described on the face of the plat, short plat, or other development authorization and clearly signed at street location as a private street or road, for the maintenance of which Kittitas County is not responsible and a disclosure statement of the same is filed with the County Auditor.”

2. 2005 KCC Chapter 12 – Private Roads 12.12.010 8. The following note shall be placed on the face of the plat:

“Kittitas County will not accept private roads for maintenance as public streets or roads until such streets or roads are brought into conformance with current County Road Standards. This requirement will include the hard surface paving of any street or road surfaced originally with gravel.”

3. Easement AC-1 appears to be outside of the plat boundary. This easement is noted to be herein dedicated by this plat. A plat cannot dedicate an easement that is outside the plat boundary.

**The following is not a required change:**

**Easement DW-4**

Easement DW-4 has a proposed width of 20 feet. This easement width only allows for a single parcel to be served from this access point. Easement DW-4 connects to easement DW-5 which has a width of 40 feet. Easement DW-4 would require a 40-foot width if these two easements were to serve 2 future lots. See 2005 KCC 12.12.020 Table 12-1 for easement width requirements.

**ENGINEERING:**

1. Please provide a detailed cost estimate for the remaining work for Forest Ridge. This should include a cross section of areas identified as out of compliance, and documentation that the solution will not leave the roadway without a proper base (in the case of a cut), and that the ditch will not be taken out of compliance (in the case of a fill). If it would be helpful, a meeting could be set up with the Public Works staff to discuss the solution further. Public Works will not be comfortable moving forward with final plat until remaining work has been bonded for or completed.
2. The response letter dated March 15<sup>th</sup> states a 'drainage report will be submitted the week of March 15<sup>th</sup>'. This report has not been submitted, so in the opinion of Public Works this application is incomplete. Additionally, a drainage report for Phase 1 (from the collector road to the top of the project) dated August 4<sup>th</sup>, 2020 was submitted and comments were sent out on August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2020. To my knowledge these comments haven't been addressed either.
3. The response letter dated March 15<sup>th</sup> states that 'no further stormwater issues are known at this time'. The county has identified several issues with the current stormwater system which are listed below:
  - a. New culverts have been installed in locations which have outfalls not contained by a ditch. In many cases, culverts direct storm runoff directly onto private property.
  - b. The county was made aware that WDFW is requiring two larger (4ft) culverts which will need to be installed on Creekside Rd at approximately 12+00 and 44+00. These haven't been installed and they aren't shown on any plans, but a change like this will likely require significant changes to the road and surrounding ditches.
  - c. A retention/detention pond can be seen on site near the collector road and during a site meeting it was explained that it wouldn't act as an infiltration pond. Instead stormwater would be collected in the pond and then routed downhill

into a private landowner's pond. Because the natural (and existing) drainage pattern has been disrupted, analysis should be done to verify that the second pond can handle the required flows. Another retention/detention pond can be seen near the bottom of the project at approximately 8+00, and a similar analysis should be done here.

- d. A county inspector visited the site on March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2021 and noted several locations where the hill side has broken up and fallen into the ditch blocking runoff.

**WATER MITIGATION/METERING:**

Final Plat Notes:

The following notes shall be placed on the face of the plat:

**C-1** "Metering is required for all new uses of domestic water for residential well connections and usage must be recorded in a manner consistent with Kittitas County Code Chapter 13.35.027 and Ecology regulations."

**SURVEY:**

**Required Changes:**

1. Survey Note 3, Sheet 1 shows a blank for the equipment used, and includes a few typos.
2. The N1/4 corner and the E1/4 corner do not have ties to determine the location.
3. Section corners are shown in the legend "as noted". Map contains no such notation.
4. The parcels identified as FD-2, FD-3 and FD-4 do not have any defined limits shown.
5. The historic parcels A-1 through D-2 can be confusing as they are not clearly identified as historic parcels. Including the recording number (AFN or Book and Page) would clarify this.
6. Set corners shall be shown on the face of the plat.
7. References to other pages (See Sheet X of X) are incorrect in the total page count, (all occurrences) as well as the reference page (n'most label, sheet 5)
8. There are multiple occurrences of labels being obscured by crossing linework.

9. Easement AC-1 cannot be "herein dedicated" as it falls outside of the plat limits. Please include the recording number of the easement, or show it as "to be filed by separate document"
10. If Tract AC-1 is an existing roadway, please include road name, surfacing, and ownership (EX: Forest Ridge Road, Private R/W- Gravel)
11. The South Boundary of AC-1, near Lot 26 has a missing label.
12. The East Boundary of AC-1, adjacent to Future Lot 37 does not match the closure report.
13. The North Line of the Easement DW-5 appears to have missing linework. It is also discrepant between page 6 and page 4.
14. The North line of Tract OS-1 adjacent to Future Lot 66 is missing.
15. Buffer areas and Future Lots are either in greyscale or a very fine pen style. Applicant is reminded that greyscaling is specifically prohibited from filed plats due to DNR scanning problems except for logos and vicinity maps.
16. Page numbering on sheet 6 is incorrect.