



CITY OF MILWAUKIE

July 23, 2021

Land Use File(s): R-2021-002

NOTICE OF DECISION

This is official notice of action taken by the Milwaukie Planning Manager on July 23, 2021.

Traducciones de este documento e información sobre este proyecto están disponibles en español. Para solicitar información o preguntar en español, favor de email espanol@milwaukieoregon.gov.

Applicant(s):	Debra and Roger Espinor
Location(s):	2122 SE Sparrow St.
Tax Lot(s):	11E35DD05501 and 5400
Application Type(s):	Replat
Decision:	Approved with Conditions
Review Criteria:	Milwaukie Zoning Ordinance: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• MMC Title 17 Land Division• MMC 19.301 Low Density Residential Zones• MMC 19.500 Supplementary Development Regulations• MMC 19.700 Public Facility Improvements• MMC 19.1005 Type II Review• MMC 19.1200 Solar Access Protection
Neighborhood(s):	Island Station

Appeal period closes: 5:00 p.m., August 7, 2021

This notice is issued in accordance with Milwaukie Municipal Code (MMC) Section 19.1005 Type II Review. The complete case file for this application is available for review by appointment between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on regular business days at the Planning Department, Johnson Creek Facility, 6101 SE Johnson Creek Blvd. Please contact Mary Heberling, Assistant Planner, at 503-786-7658 or heberlingm@milwaukieoregon.gov, if you wish to view this case file or visit the project webpage at <https://www.milwaukieoregon.gov/planning/r-2021-002>.

This decision may be appealed by 5:00 p.m. on August 7, 2021, which is 15 days from the date of this decision.¹ (Note: Please arrive by 4:45 p.m. for appeal payment processing.) Any person who is adversely affected or aggrieved by this decision may appeal the decision by filing a written appeal. An appeal of this decision would be heard by the Milwaukie Planning Commission following the procedures of MMC Section 19.1010 Appeals. This decision will become final on the date above if no appeal is filed during the appeal period. Milwaukie Planning staff can provide information regarding forms, fees, and the appeal process at 503-786-7630 or planning@milwaukieoregon.gov.

Per MMC Subsection 19.1001.7.E, this land use approval expires unless the applicant has: (1) obtained and paid for all necessary development permits and started construction within 2 years of land use approval, and (2) passed final inspection and/or obtained a certificate of occupancy within 4 years of land use approval. Extensions can be granted per MMC Section 19.908.

Exhibits:

1. Findings in Support of Approval
2. Conditions of Approval

Manager's Declaration of Impartiality

I certify that neither I nor any member of my immediate family has a material, personal, or financial relationship with the applicant. I further certify that no other relationship, bias, or ethical conflict exists which would have prevented me from evaluating the land use application solely on its merits and in accordance with the Milwaukie Municipal Code.

Decision

- Approved
 Approved with Conditions
 Denied



Laura Weigel, AICP
Planning Manager

cc: Debra and Roger Espinor (via email)
Planning Commission (via email)
Kelly Brooks, Interim Community Development Director (via email)
Steve Adams, City Engineer (via email)

¹ As per MMC Section 19.1010, if the 15th day falls on a weekend or legal holiday, the end of the appeal period shall be extended to the end of the next business day.

Engineering Development Review (via email)
Samantha Vandagriff, Building Official (via email)
Stephanie Marcinkiewicz, Inspector/Plans Examiner (via email)
Harmony Drake, Permit Technician (via email)
Mike Boumann and Alex McGladrey, CFD#1 (via email)
NDA(s): Island Station (via email)
Land Use File(s): R-2021-002

EXHIBIT 1
Findings in Support of Approval
File #R-2021-002, Replat of 2122 SE Sparrow St

Sections of the Milwaukie Municipal Code not addressed in these findings are found to be inapplicable to the decision on this application.

1. The applicants, Debra and Roger Espinor, have applied for approval to replat their property at 2122 SE Sparrow St (the “subject property”) to create a flag lot that will provide access from the existing home to Sparrow St. The subject property is identified as Tax Lots 11E35DD05501 (“parcel 1”) and 5400 (“parcel 2”) on the Clackamas County Tax Assessor map and is zoned Residential R-5.
2. The subject property is comprised of Tract 6 from the Robertson’s Subdivision (subdivision platted in 1884). The proposal is to replat the two taxlots approximately 37,768-sq ft subject property to create Taxlot 5501 (parcel 1) into a flag lot. Parcel 2 would be a standard rectangular lot approximately 18,182 sq ft in area. Parcel 1 would be a flag lot approximately 18,634 sq ft in area, with a 35-ft-wide accessway or “pole” and a “flag” portion of approximately 13,921 sq ft.
3. The proposed boundary adjustment involves the reconfiguration of a platted lot from a recorded subdivision and therefore constitutes a replat as per the definitions in Milwaukie Municipal Code (MMC) Chapter 17.08. The proposal is subject to the following provisions of the MMC:
 - MMC Title 17 Land Division, including:
 - MMC Chapter 17.12 Application Procedure & Approval Criteria
 - MMC Chapter 17.16 Application Requirements and Procedures
 - MMC Chapter 17.20 Preliminary Plat
 - MMC Chapter 17.28 Design Standards
 - MMC Chapter 17.32 Improvements
 - MMC Section 19.301 Low Density Residential Zones (including R-5)
 - MMC Chapter 19.500 Supplementary Development Regulations (including MMC 19.504.8 Flag Lot Design and Development Standards)
 - MMC Chapter 19.700 Public Facility Improvements
 - MMC Section 19.1005 Type II Review
 - MMC Chapter 19.1200 Solar Access Protection

The applicant is the property owner and has authority to initiate the application per MMC Subsection 19.1001.6.A. The application was initially submitted on May 24, 2021, and deemed complete on June 3, 2021. The application has been processed in accordance with MMC Section 19.1005 Type II Review, with a decision by the Planning Director.

4. MMC Title 17 Land Division

MMC Title 17 establishes the standards and procedures for land division and property boundary changes.

a. MMC Chapter 17.12 Application Procedure and Approval Criteria

(1) MMC Section 17.12.020 Application Procedure

MMC Table 17.12.020 outlines the applicable review procedures for various types of land divisions and property boundary changes, including replats. As per MMC Table 17.12.020, a partition replat (i.e., a replat resulting in 3 or fewer lots) that does not modify a plat originally decided by the City's Planning Commission and is not a parcel consolidation is subject to Type II review. As per MMC Subsection 17.12.020.B.1, Type II review may be changed to Type I review upon finding that the proposal is consistent with applicable standards and criteria, that it is consistent with the basis and findings of the original approval, and that it does not increase the number of lots.

The subject property is comprised of Tract 6 from the Robertson's Subdivision (subdivision platted in 1884). The proposed reconfiguration of the underlying subdivision lot would create a new developable lot, which is a partition replat as per the definitions of MMC Chapter 17.08 and the guidance of MMC Table 17.12.020.

The original plat, Robertson's Subdivision of Tract 6, was platted and recorded in 1884 by Clackamas County, well before the City's first subdivision ordinance was adopted in 1967. The proposed replat is not a parcel consolidation and is consistent with all applicable standards and criteria, but it would keep the number of lots underlying the subject property at 2.

The Planning Manager finds that the proposed replat is not a candidate for reduction to Type I review due to it not being a lot consolidation and so is subject to Type II review.

(2) MMC Section 17.12.030 Approval Criteria for Lot Consolidation, Property Line Adjustment, and Replat

MMC 17.12.030 establishes three approval criteria for boundary changes:

(a) The boundary change is compliant with Title 17 and Title 19.

As discussed in these findings, the proposed replat complies with all applicable standards of Titles 17 and 19.

(b) The boundary change will allow reasonable development of the affected lots and will not create the need for a variance of any land division or zoning standard.

As discussed in Findings 5 and 6, the proposed replat would not result in the creation of any new nonconformities for Parcel 2. The newly created flag lot (Parcel 1) would meet the applicable standards of the R-5 zone without the need for any variances.

- (c) Boundary changes shall not reduce residential density below minimum density requirements of the zoning district in which the property is located.

The subject property is zoned for low density residential development, with a net area of 0.84 acres and a minimum density requirement of 6 units. However, there are natural slopes in excess of 25% that reduces the density to 1 dwelling unit for Parcel 1. The proposed replat would result in a total of 2 lots, with a minimum density of 3 units for Parcel 2 and a minimum density of 1 unit for Parcel 1 for a total of 4 units for the overall site.

The Planning Manager finds that the proposed replat meets the approval criteria established in MMC 17.12.030.

The Planning Director finds that the proposed replat meets all applicable standards of MMC 17.12.

- b. MMC Chapter 17.16 Application Requirements and Procedures

MMC Section 17.16.050 establishes the application requirements for replat, including completed application forms and checklists, applicable fees, a narrative describing how the proposal meets approval criteria, and the applicable information specified for preliminary plat on the City's Preliminary Plat Checklist and in MMC Chapter 17.20 Preliminary Plat.

The applicant's submittal materials include the necessary forms, checklists, and fees, as well as a narrative, preliminary plat document, and other information sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the applicable standards and criteria.

As proposed, the Planning Manager finds that the application meets the applicable requirements for replat submittal.

- c. MMC Chapter 17.20 Preliminary Plat

MMC 17.20 establishes the information required for a preliminary plat, including general information to be shown on the plat and existing and proposed conditions.

The applicant's preliminary plat submittal is to scale and includes a vicinity map, existing conditions, contour lines, existing improvements on Parcels 1 and 2, and the new configuration for both proposed parcels.

As proposed, the Planning Manager finds that the preliminary plat includes the relevant and necessary information as outlined in MMC 17.20.

- d. MMC Chapter 17.28 Design Standards

- (1) MMC Section 17.28.040 General Lot Design

MMC 17.28.040 establishes general design standards for lots, including standards for size, shape, compound lot line segments, and frontage.

- (a) MMC Subsection 17.28.040.A Size and Shape

MMC 17.28.040.A requires that the lot size, width, shape, and orientation shall be appropriate for the location and the type of use contemplated. Minimum lot standards shall conform to Title 19.

As addressed in Findings 5 and 6, the proposed replat would result in parcels that both have adequate size and dimensions for development and uses allowed in the underlying R-5 zone and conform to the standards of Title 19.

(b) MMC 17.28.040.B Rectilinear Lots Required

MMC 17.28.040.B requires that lot shape shall be rectilinear, except where not practicable due to location along a street radius, or existing lot shape. The sidelines of lots, as far as practicable, shall run at right angles to the street upon which the lots face. As far as practicable, the rear lot line shall run parallel to the street.

As proposed, Parcel 2 would be rectilinear in shape, with sidelines running at right angles to the street which each lot faces and rear lot lines running parallel to the street. Parcel 1 has existing compound lot lines along the southern property line and the northern property line shifts northeast to west, but meets the standards that limits compound lot lines in MMC 17.28.040.C.

(c) MMC 17.28.040.C Limits on Compound Lot Line Segments

MMC 17.28.040.C discourages cumulative lateral changes in direction of a side or rear lot line exceeding 10% of the distance between opposing lot corners along a given lot line. Changes in direction shall be measured from a straight line drawn between opposing lot corners.

As proposed, Parcel 2 would be a standard rectangular shape. Parcel 1 would be a flag lot shape, which technically includes a compound segment. However, Parcel 1 would conform to the applicable flag lot design standards as addressed in Findings 4-d-2 and 4-d-3. The northern property line of Parcel 1 also shifts northeast to west, but meets the standards that limit compound lot lines. The southern property line has compound lot lines that existed before the proposed replat.

(d) MMC 17.28.040.D Adjustments to Lot Shape Standard

MMC 17.28.040.D provides that lot shape standards may be adjusted subject to Section 19.911 Variances.

No adjustment to lot shape standards has been requested or proposed.

(e) MMC 17.28.040.E Limits on Double and Reversed Frontage Lots

MMC 17.28.040.E limits double and reversed frontage lots except where essential to provide separations of residential development from railroads, traffic arteries, or adjacent nonresidential uses, or to overcome specific disadvantages of topography and orientation.

The proposed replat would not result in any double or reversed frontage lots.

(f) MMC 17.28.040.F Measurement of Required Frontage

MMC 17.28.040.F requires that required frontage be measured along the street upon which the lot takes access.

As proposed, both parcels have frontage on and would take access from Sparrow St. Parcel 2 would have 150 ft of frontage, well in excess of the 35-ft minimum requirement. Parcel 1 would provide 35-ft frontage, which is 10 ft above the requirement for single flag lots.

The Planning Manager finds that the proposed replat complies with all applicable design standards of MMC 17.28.040.

(2) MMC Section 17.28.050 Flag Lot Development and Future Access

MMC 17.28.050 requires that applicants for flag lot partitioning show that access by means of a dedicated public street is not possible. Consideration shall be given to other inaccessible adjacent or nearby properties for which a jointly dedicated public right-of-way could provide suitable access and avoid other flag lots. The creation of flag lots shall not preclude the development of street access to surrounding properties.

The parcels have a lot directly south of them that could redevelop, but already has access to two public ROWs, therefore public ROW from Sparrow St is not necessary. Properties to the west of the parcels have access to public ROW already as well. The proposed replat is not precluding surrounding properties of development/redevelopment opportunities.

The Planning Manager finds that the proposed flag lot configuration is allowable because access by way of a dedicated public street is not possible. This standard is met.

(3) MMC Subsection 17.28.060 Flag Lot Design Standards

MMC 17.28.060 requires that flag lot proposals be consistent with the applicable design standards of MMC Subsection 19.504.8 and prohibits the creation of more than 2 flag lots.

The proposed replat involves the creation of 1 standard rectangular lot and 1 flag lot. The proposed flag lot's consistency with the design standards of MMC 19.504.8 is addressed in Finding 6-c.

The Planning Manager finds that this standard is met.

As proposed, the Planning Manager finds that the new parcels presented in the applicant's preliminary plat meet the applicable design standards established in MMC 17.28.

e. MMC Chapter 17.32 Improvements

MMC 17.32 establishes procedures for public improvements, including a requirement that all work shall conform to the standards and specifications of the Public Works Standards and MMC Chapter 19.700.

As discussed in Finding 7, Fee in Lieu of Construction (FILOC) will be required for the 35' frontage of Parcel 1. Parcel 2, when it redevelops, will require a new driveway approach and frontage improvements constructed proportional to the anticipated impacts and in compliance with MMC 19.700.

As conditioned, the Planning Manager finds that the applicable standards of MMC 17.32 are met.

As conditioned, the Planning Manager finds that the proposed replat meets all applicable standards of MMC Title 17.

5. MMC Section 19.301 Low Density Residential Zones (including R-5)

MMC Table 19.301.4 establishes development standards for the low density residential zones, including the R-5 zone. Table 5 provides the applicable standards for development in the R-5 zone with respect to both lots resulting from the proposed replat.

Table 5 Lot and Development Standards			
Standard	R-5 Requirement	Parcel 1 (undeveloped)	Parcel 2 (undeveloped)
Minimum lot size	5,000 sq ft	18,634 sq ft (Approx. 13,921 sq ft not including flag pole)	18,182 sq ft
Minimum lot width	50 ft	Approx. 170 ft (with 35-ft-wide flag pole)	150 ft
Minimum lot depth	80 ft	126 ft	93 ft
Minimum street frontage	35 ft (25 ft for single flag poles)	35 ft	150 ft
Front yard	20 ft (See Finding 6-a for a discussion of the additional yard requirement of MMC 19.501.2)	TBD	TBD
Side yard(s)	5 ft	TBD	TBD
Rear yard	20 ft	TBD	TBD
Minimum density	7.0 units/acre	1 unit (due to 25%+ slope)	3 units
Maximum density	8.7 units/acre	1 unit (due to 25%+ slope)	3 units

The Planning Manager finds that the proposed replat meets all applicable development standards of MMC 19.301 for both parcels.

6. MMC Subsection 19.504.8 Flag Lot Design and Development Standards

MMC 19.504.8 provides standards for flag lots in all zones. These include a provision that the areas contained within the accessway or pole portion of the lot do not count toward meeting the minimum lot area requirement. The minimum front and rear yard requirement for flag lots is 30 ft, with minimum side yards of 10 ft for both primary and accessory structures. As per the definition of “front lot line” established in MMC Section

19.201, the front lot line of a flag lot is the lot line closest to the street from which the flag lot takes access, excluding lot lines that are part of the pole.

As per MMC Subsection 19.504.8.D, flag lots are required to have a minimum accessway or pole width of 25 ft, with a minimum 12-ft-wide driveway that is consolidated with the driveway of the parent lot to the greatest extent practicable. MMC Subsection 19.504.8.E establishes standards to minimize potential adverse impacts to abutting properties. These include a requirement to provide fencing and screening along the flag lot driveway and around the flag portion of the lot. All trees 6 in or greater in diameter must be preserved, or mitigated for if development requires their removal.

As proposed, Parcel 1 is a flag lot with a 35-ft wide pole. The applicant has proposed separate driveways for Parcels 1 and 2, and the Engineering Department has confirmed that it is not necessary to require the parcels to share a driveway while both Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 remain undeveloped. Both Parcel 1 and Parcel 2's compliance with the other applicable standards of MMC 19.504.8, including setbacks and protection of adjoining properties, will be evaluated at the time of development permit submittal.

As proposed, the Planning Manager finds that the applicable standards of this subsection are met.

7. MMC 19.700 Public Facility Improvements

MMC 19.700 is intended to ensure that development, including redevelopment, provides public facilities that are safe, convenient, and adequate in rough proportion to their public facility impacts.

a. MMC Section 19.702 Applicability

MMC 19.702 establishes the applicability of the provisions of MMC 19.700, including partitions, subdivisions, replats, new construction, modification of existing structures, and changes or intensifications in use.

The applicant proposes to replat the subject property to create a new developable lot. The proposed replat triggers the requirements of MMC 19.700.

b. MMC Section 19.703 Review Process

MMC 19.703 establishes the review process for development that is subject to MMC 19.700, including requiring a preapplication conference, establishing the type of application required, and providing approval criteria.

The applicant had a preapplication conference waived by the Planning Manager on June 1, 2021. As noted in Finding 7-c, the proposed replat does not trigger a Transportation Impact Study (TIS), so the proposal's compliance with MMC 19.700 has been evaluated as part of the replat review, as per MMC Subsection 19.703.2.B.

Per MMC Subsection 19.703.4.D, the City is requiring Fee in Lieu of Construction (FILOC) for Parcel 1 in compliance with MMC 13.32.

c. MMC Section 19.704 Transportation Impact Evaluation

MMC 19.704 establishes the process and requirements for evaluating development impacts on the surrounding transportation system, including determining when a formal TIS is necessary and what mitigation measures will be required.

The City Engineer has determined that the proposed replat (which involves the creation of a new developable lot) would not trigger a significant increase in trip generation and therefore does not require a TIS.

d. MMC Section 19.705 Rough Proportionality

MMC 19.705 requires that transportation impacts of the proposed development be mitigated in proportion to its potential impacts.

The proposed replat would create 1 new developable lot (Parcel 2) of sufficient size to support a single-family detached dwelling or duplex. The lot could also further partition for up to 3 total dwellings. Development on Parcel 2 would have new impacts on the public street system, and the new developable parcel's frontage on Sparrow St is not improved to current City standards. As discussed in Finding 7-f, a condition has been established to require Fee in Lieu of Construction (FILOC) for the 35' frontage of Parcel 1. Parcel 2 will require frontage improvements, including a new driveway approach, proportional to the anticipated impacts once it is ready to develop or re-partition.

e. MMC Section 19.707 Agency Notification and Coordinated Review

MMC 19.707 establishes provisions for coordinating land use application review with other agencies that may have some interest in a project that is in proximity to facilities they manage.

The proposed replat did not require referral to any other agencies as provided in MMC 19.707.

f. MMC Section 19.708 Transportation Facility Requirements

MMC 19.708 establishes the City's requirements and standards for improvements to public streets, including pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities.

(1) MMC Subsection 19.708.1 General Street Requirements and Standards

MMC 19.708.1 provides general standards for streets, including for access management, clear vision, street layout and connectivity, and intersection design and spacing.

As conditioned, the proposed replat will require FILOC for Parcel 1 and no frontage improvements will be constructed until Parcel 2 develops or re-partitions. At such a time, the FILOC for Parcel 1 will be used to construct the required frontage improvements in tandem with all required improvements for Parcel 2.

No changes are proposed to the existing driveway on Parcel 1, but a new driveway approach and frontage improvements proportional to the anticipated impacts will be required for Parcel 2, when it redevelops.

As conditioned, the proposed replat is consistent with the applicable standards of MMC 19.708.1.

As conditioned, the Planning Manager finds that the proposed replat will meet all applicable standards of MMC 19.708.

The Planning Manager finds that, as conditioned, the proposed replat meets the applicable public facility improvement standards of MMC 19.700.

8. MMC Chapter 19.1200 Solar Access Protection

A primary purpose of MMC 19.1200 is to orient new lots and parcels to allow utilization of solar energy. In particular, MMC Section 19.1203 establishes solar access provisions for new development.

- a. MMC Subsection 19.1203.2 establishes the applicability of MMC Subsection 19.1203.3 as extending to applications to create lots in single-family zones. Exceptions are allowable to the extent the Planning Director finds that the applicant has shown one or more of the conditions listed in MMC Subsections 19.1203.4 and 19.1203.5 exist and that exemptions or adjustments are warranted.

The proposed replat will create new parcels in the R-7 zone, which allows single-family residences. As discussed in Findings 9-b and 9-d, the Planning Director has granted an adjustment for both parcels.

- b. MMC Subsection 19.1203.3 establishes solar design standards, including basic requirements for north-south dimension (minimum 90 ft) and front-lot-line orientation with respect to a true east-west axis (within 30°). There are two other options for compliance, for either establishing a protected solar building line or demonstrating a particular level of performance with respect to protection from shading.

As proposed, Parcel 1 has a north-south dimension of only 74 ft and a front lot line oriented nearly 90° from a true east-west axis. Parcel 2 has a north-south dimension of 99 ft but a front lot line oriented nearly 90° from a true east-west axis. As discussed in Finding 9-d, the Planning Director has found that adjustments are warranted that would exempt both parcels from this standard.

As proposed and with the adjustment noted in Finding 9-d, the solar design standards are not applicable to Parcels 1 and 2.

- c. MMC Subsection 19.1203.4 establishes exemptions from the standards of MMC 19.1203.3, including where an off-site structure and/or vegetation produces a shadow pattern that would affect allowable development on the site.

No exemptions from the solar design standards have been requested. This standard is not applicable.

- d. MMC Subsection 19.1203.5 establishes provisions for adjustments to the percentage of lots that must comply with the solar design standards of MMC 19.1203.3, including

cases in which the application of the solar design standards would reduce the density or increase the on-site development costs.

The subject property is 99 ft wide and 213 ft deep, with its front lot line at 55th Ave oriented nearly 90° from a true east-west axis but with a north-south dimension of more than 90 ft. It is large enough to be divided but not configured to be split into 2 lots that each have a 90-ft north-south dimension. The existing configuration of the subject property makes it impossible to create new parcels from this lot with a front-lot-line orientation that can meet the solar design standards of MMC 19.1203.3, which would otherwise prevent the subject property from achieving the minimum required density through land division. The Planning Director has reduced the percentage of lots that must comply with the solar design standards to 0%, effectively excepting both parcels from the solar design standards.

The Planning Director finds that an adjustment to except both Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 from the design standards is warranted. As proposed, the applicable provisions of the solar access standards established in MMC 19.1200 are met.

9. The application was referred to the following departments and agencies on June 4, 2021:
 - Milwaukie Building Department
 - Milwaukie Engineering Department
 - Milwaukie Public Works Department
 - Milwaukie Police Department
 - City Attorney
 - Island Station Neighborhood District Association (NDA), Chairperson and Land Use Committee (LUC)
 - Clackamas Fire District #1 (CFD#1)

In addition, notice of the public hearing was mailed to owners and residents of properties within 300 ft of the subject property on June 4, 2021.

The comments received are summarized as follows:

- **Jennifer Backhaus, Engineering Tech III, City of Milwaukie Engineering Department:** Comments related to the project's compliance with MMC Chapter 19.700, which have been incorporated into these findings.

Exhibit 2
Conditions of Approval
File #: R-2021-002, Sparrow St Flag Lot Replat

Conditions

1. Prior to City approval of the associated final plat, the following shall be resolved:
Payment of the Fee in Lieu of Construction (FILOC) for the 35' frontage of Parcel 1.
2. Parcel 2 will require frontage improvements, including a new driveway approach, proportional to the anticipated impacts once it is ready to develop or re-partition.
3. No frontage improvements will be constructed until Parcel 2 develops or re-partitions. At such a time, the FILOC for Parcel 1 will be used to construct the required frontage improvements in tandem with all required improvements for Parcel 2.

Additional Requirements

Additional requirements are items that the applicant will be required to complete as their project progresses. They are included with the conditions so that applicants and staff have a clear understanding of what is required at various points in the development and permitting process. Typical examples are items like stormwater management plans, limits on the hours of construction, and other inspections and permits required by Building, Engineering, or Public Works.

1. Final Plat

As per MMC Section 17.04.120, replats must be recorded by plat. As per MMC Section 17.24.040, an application for final plat must be submitted to the City within 6 months of this approval.