

April 5, 2006

WRITTEN ORDER

CASE: **MINOR AMENDMENT TO THE CASCADIA EMPLOYMENT-BASED
PLANNED COMMUNITY PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD):
CASCADIA - PHASE 1, Application Number: 397467**

OWNER/APPLICANT: Cascadia Development Corporation
Attn: Tom Uren, P.E., Vice President & Director of Engineering
500 – 108th Avenue N.E., Suite 1620
Bellevue, WA 98004

ATTORNEY: William T. Lynn
Gordon, Thomas, Honeywell, et al
P.O. Box 1157
Tacoma, WA 98401

CONTACT: Robert Jenkins, Associate Planner

PROPOSAL: The request is for a Minor Amendment to Phase 1 of the Cascadia Employment-Based Planned Community (EBPC) Planned Unit Development (PUD) to:

- 1) Modify the size and location of various development parcels based on detailed topographic information, road and storm drainage designs, changes in the housing market, changes in the design and focus of commercial and multi-family development, desires/ needs of school, fire district, and commercial center and golf resort users, and a relocation of Canyonfalls Boulevard East - the north-south arterial.
- 2) Relocate/convert Canyonfalls Boulevard East from providing off-site access to the northwest to an arterial providing only internal circulation for the northern portion of Phase 1 and future Phase 2.
- 3) Base development of the 1,719 residential units on a range of:
 - a. 1-10 dwelling units per gross acre for single-family residential uses throughout the 805.3 acres of single-family parcels, rather than minimum lot sizes by individual parcels totaling 801.1 acres; and
 - b. 8-14 dwelling units per gross acre over 19.4 acres, rather than 286 dwelling units on 36 gross acres, i.e., 7.9 dwelling units/gross acres.

The acreage devoted to residential uses would be decreased from 837.1 to 824.7 acres.

- 4) Relocate the multi-family area from the northeast corner of the Canyonfalls Boulevard East/Cascadia Boulevard East (the east-west arterial) intersection to the northwest corner of the intersection. Residential uses in the upper stories of the buildings in the abutting Neighborhood Center may also be provided.
- 5) Increase the size of the golf course and related open space parcels from 203.5 to 219.1 acres and provide for an alternate location for the golf resort hotel and conference center closer to the bluff to provide for better views.
- 6) Relocate the neighborhood commercial center from the northwest corner of the Canyonfalls Boulevard East/Cascadia Boulevard East intersection to a location further to the west beyond the park and school.
- 7) Relocate the marketing center from the intersection of 198th Avenue East and Cascadia Boulevard East to one of three proposed locations along Cascadia Boulevard East.
- 8) Relocate the elementary school and abutting park from the south side of the Canyonfalls Boulevard East/Cascadia Boulevard East intersection to the northwest.
- 9) Expand and convert the open space areas on the northwest and southwest corners of the 198th Avenue East/Cascadia Boulevard East intersection into 13.5 acres of formal park space.
- 10) Locate the required fire station on the northeast corner of the Canyonfalls Boulevard East/Cascadia Boulevard East intersection.

The site is located at the southern end of the Bonney Lake Plateau, south of 128th Street East and accessed via 198th Avenue East, in Sec. 16, the E 1/2 of Sec. 17, the NE 1/4 of Sec. 20, Sec. 21 and 22, the NW 1/4 of Sec. 23, and the NE 1/4 of Sec. 27, T19N, R5E, W.M., in Council District No. 1.

SUMMARY: The project has been reviewed for conformance with the Pierce County Development Regulations - Zoning and the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan. The Department finds that the proposal meets the criteria required for the granting of a Minor Amendment to the Cascadia EBPC PUD approval, provided the conditions of approval are met. The permit does not require a public hearing before the Examiner. The request has been approved subject to conditions.

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA): The Cascadia Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (Draft EIS, dated March 1998, and Final EIS dated August 1998), analyzed development impacts of Phase 1 at the specific or project level. Phases 2 and 3 were analyzed only for programmatic or conceptual impacts. Development of Phases 2 and 3 will require additional environmental review. This minor amendment application is subject to the requirements of the Final EIS.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. The overall 1,689.8 acre Phase 1 of the Cascadia EBPC is served by public roads, public water, and sanitary sewers and is located within the Employment-Based Planned Community (EBPC) zone classification. The Minor Amendment request is being considered under the EBPC zoning in effect at the time of the original June 18, 1999, rezone/planned unit development (PUD) approval.
2. The original Cascadia Employment-Based Planned Community (EBPC) was approved by the Pierce County Hearing Examiner on June 18, 1999. The three phase, 4,719 acre Cascadia EBPC project includes residential, employment, business park, golf course, school, park, and open space uses. The overall project will include 6,437 dwelling units, and approximately 3.9 million square feet of employment-related uses and will be developed over a 20+ year period. The overall development plan approved by the Pierce County Hearing Examiner is conceptual in nature, particularly in Phases 2 & 3.
3. Phase 1 of Cascadia is located in the northeast portion of the overall project site and includes 1,049,762 square feet/119.2 acres of employment uses, 1,719 residential dwelling units, and 697 acres of golf course, open space, school, and parks. Phase 2 of Cascadia is located in the northwestern portion of the overall project site and includes 319 acres of light to medium intensity employment uses, 696 acres of residential uses, and associated school, park, and open space uses. Phase 3 of Cascadia is located in the southern portion of the overall project site and would contain a development pattern similar to Phases 1 and 2.
4. In summary, the applicant is proposing to retain the original development concept approved in 1999 with revisions to allow for: 1) flexibility in residential housing types, lot sizes, etc., within an overall cap of 1,719 dwelling units; 2) elimination of the northwestern off-site access, i.e., Canyonfalls Boulevard East, into Phase 1; 3) relocation of school, park, neighborhood commercial center, and multi-family areas to allow for the potential expansion of the neighborhood center into a larger town center in the future, which would require additional review and approval; 4) allow for alternative locations for the golf resort to allow for enhanced views of Mount Rainier; and 5) adjustment of the development parcels to reflect detailed road alignments, topography, etc. Development of subdivisions will require the applicant to apply for individual preliminary and final plat approvals.
5. The original application for this Minor Amendment was submitted and deemed complete on November 30, 2004.
6. The Planning and Land Services Department circulated the original application materials to appropriate County agencies for review and comment on December 14, 2004.
7. Notification of the original proposal was mailed to neighboring property owners and parties of record to the original 1999 decision on December 14, 2004.
8. The applicant posted notification of the proposal on the site on December 20, 2004. A sworn affidavit of the posting is located in the file.

9. A modified minor amendment layout was submitted on August 10, 2005. The revised layout included the following changes:
 - a. decreased the acreage for multi-family and high density housing of other types and increased it for single-family detached housing;
 - b. decreased the acreage devoted to residential uses and increased area for open space and recreation;
 - c. shifted the multi-family area from the northeast to the northwest corner of the Canyonfalls Boulevard East/Cascadia Boulevard East intersection, with residential uses possible in the upper stories of the buildings in the abutting Neighborhood Center;
 - d. shifted the neighborhood commercial center from the northwest corner of the Canyonfalls Boulevard East/Cascadia Boulevard East intersection to a location further to the west beyond the park and school;
 - e. relocated the location of the marketing center from the intersection of 198th Avenue East and Cascadia Boulevard East to one of three proposed locations along Cascadia Boulevard East; and
 - f. relocated the fire station from west of the of the Canyonfalls Boulevard East/Cascadia Boulevard East intersection to the northeast corner of the same intersection.
10. The Planning and Land Services Department circulated the revised application materials to appropriate County agencies for review and comment on September 9, 2005.
11. Notification of the revised proposal was mailed to neighboring property owners and parties of record to the original 1999 decision on September 9, 2005.
12. A revised Cascadia Trails Plan was submitted on October 26, 2005, to modify the original Trails and Open Space Map in Exhibit E of the 1999 Development Agreement.
13. A second modified minor amendment layout was submitted on January 10, 2006. The revised layout included realignment of Allee's between Parcels K₁ and K₂, between Parcels M₂ and M₃, and between Parcels D₁, E and L.
14. A third modified minor amendment layout was submitted on February 14, 2006. The revised layout included an increase in the park area north of the elementary school and the identification of a park on the southwest side of the central wetland, adjacent to Parcel M₅.
15. A Park, Trail, and Improvements Schedule for Cascadia Phase 1A map was submitted on February 14, 2006. This trail and park plan provides more specific conceptual detail for park facilities proposed in Parcels J (J-North Park), K₁ (Overlook Park and 198th Street Park), K₂ (Center Park), L (North School Park and Drainage Channel), L₁ (Pea Patch), M₁ (Wetland Park and Knoll Park), at the elementary school (Elementary School Field), on the northwest corner of Cascadia Boulevard East and Canyonfalls Boulevard East (Botanical Park and Amphitheatre), and on the northwest and southwest corners of the intersection of Cascadia Boulevard East and 198th Avenue East (Pavilion Park and R.O.W.) and along Cascadia Boulevard East between 198th Avenue East and Canyonfalls Boulevard East (Overlook R.O.W.). On this park and trails map, Parcel M₅ has been

absorbed into Parcel M1. An additional park is shown in Parcel M3 but no conceptual detail was provided for it. Phase 1A is the portion of Phase 1 located west of 198th Avenue East and north of the rectangular exception parcel.

16. A Local Feeder Road Plan for Phase 1A was submitted on February 15, 2006.
17. A revised Park, Trail, and Improvements Schedule for Cascadia Phase 1A plan, dated February 20, 2006, was submitted on February 21, 2006. This trail and park plan provides net acreages for the Wetland Park and Pavilion Park exclusive of storm pond area. The plan also indicates when initial grading and seeding of the park spaces is proposed and when the detailed improvements are proposed to be completed.
18. The Planning and Land Services Department has received no unfavorable comments from the reviewing local, County, or State agencies. Tacoma Water, the Wastewater Utility Division of Pierce County Public Works and Utilities, Pierce County Fire Prevention Bureau, and Washington State Departments of Ecology and Transportation have expressed no concerns. Concerns of the City of Bonney Lake, the Traffic Division of Pierce County Public Works and Utilities and the Development Engineering and Resource Management Sections of Pierce County Planning and Land Services are discussed under the section on findings for minor amendment approval and in recommended conditions of approval.
19. No opposition to the proposal has been received from neighbors of the subject site.
20. Pierce County's approval (issuance) of this decision pertains only to the County's regulatory jurisdiction and thus compliance with County regulations does not necessarily ensure compliance with other federal or state laws.

CONCLUSIONS:

PIERCE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

19A.30.110 New Fully Contained Communities and Employment Based Planned Communities.

- B. **LU-EBPC Objective 40.** Encourage development of new self-sufficient planned communities that address the full-range of needs of the residents, including housing, jobs, services, and recreation. Employment Based Planned Communities (EBPC) may develop within an Urban Growth Area. While an EBPC is located inside rather than outside of an Urban Growth Area, it must meet the substantive requirements for a New Fully Contained Community established by RCW 36.70A.350(1).
 1. EBPC development must meet the requirements for MPCs set forth in Objective 42. (PCC 19A.30.130 A.)
 2. By allowing EBPCs, the County is not committing to provide levels of public services and facilities which would serve the development. Any extension of services and facilities must be in accord with other provisions of the Comprehensive Plan.

3. The proponent will be required to submit an infrastructure and public facilities plan, including an analysis of financing options that conform to the proposed phasing plan and assure concurrency; and
4. EBPCs must be developed with an Employment Center in the first component of development. Residential development will not be accepted as the exclusive use in the initial phases of an EBPC. Over the course of project development, the EBPC shall maintain an appropriate mix of jobs, services, recreation, and housing as established by the initial approval.
5. Establish an EBPC land use classification to allow for EBPC developments approved pursuant to the planned unit development or planned development district permit process.

19A.30.130 Master Planned Communities.

LU-MPC Objective 42. Master Planned Communities (MPC) developments are encouraged within an Urban Growth Area as a way to achieve well-designed, compact urban development with a balance of uses, more efficient use of public facilities, and greater open space.

- A. Undeveloped or underdeveloped property of at least 320 acres within an Urban Growth Area should be considered for MPC development.
- B. MPC developments should be allowed provided that any approval shall include a phasing plan to ensure that the various segments of the development are served by adequate public facilities and services.
- C. MPC developments should consider including the following:
 1. A appropriate mix of housing, services, and recreation;
 2. Neighborhoods with a variety of housing options, including affordable housing for a range of income levels, consistent with a jobs-housing balance;
 3. A phasing plan to assure orderly urban growth and ability to respond to market demands for economic development and housing;
 4. An infrastructure and public facilities plan, including an analysis of a range of financing options where appropriate, that conform to the proposed phasing plan;
 5. Site planning that encourages transit use and non-motorized transportation, and a transportation demand management plan;
 6. Open space to promote both active and passive recreation, and centers for community activities and assembly;
 7. Measures to protect critical areas and conserve resource lands.
- D. An MPC development should be reviewed and evaluated by the Director of the Planning and Land Services Department at least every five years until buildout. The review should address compliance with the conditions of approval. The review may also assess whether the development is well designed, contains a balance of uses, efficiently uses public facilities and services, and provides adequate open space.
- E. A Master Planned Community shall be permitted only as a planned community pursuant to the planned unit development or planned development district permit process.

1. Once a MPC map designation has been approved through an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, proposed land use activities within the MPC must conform to the requirements and conditions of the adoption of the Plan amendment to designate the MPC and final approval of the MPC permit, land use activities proposed in the interval shall be subject to the development regulations applicable to the previous designation.

Comment: The proposed revisions in this minor amendment are consistent with the above policies with the possible exception of Section 19A.30.130.C.2. which mandates "...a variety of housing options, including affordable housing for a range of income levels,..." As discussed in greater detail below, the revisions to Exhibit D of the 1999 Development Agreement do away with the requirement that a certain percentage of housing be multi-family or moderately-high density housing of undetermined type, i.e., "golf villas". The applicant interprets the Development Agreement and Hearing Examiner's decision to allow them the flexibility to not develop a multi-family component or other housing options, e.g., small-lot detached single-family, apartments over ground level commercial, etc., other than traditional moderate to low density single-family detached homes in Phase 1. The Department disagrees. The rationale for the County position is discussed below. A condition of approval will be added stating that a certain percentage of moderate to high density housing and different housing types is required in Phase 1. With that condition, the proposed minor amendment would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan policies.

DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS-ZONING

18A.75.080 Planned Unit Development.

- A. **Purpose.** A Planned Unit Development (PUD) is intended to be a flexible zoning concept. Depending on the type of PUD, it will provide the Examiner a chance to encourage development of a variety of housing types; allow for non-residential development; create and/or preserve usable open space; provide recreational opportunity and aesthetic enjoyment to residents; preserve, to the maximum extent possible, the natural characteristics of the land; encourage creativity in design; provide predictability for the development of a project; and provide for maximum efficiency in the layout of streets, utility networks, and other public improvements, as appropriate.
- B. **Classifications of Planned Unit Development.** PUDs shall be classified as one of six types: Employment Based Planned Community, Master Planned Community, Master Planned Resort, New Fully Contained Community, Essential Public Facility-Rural Airport, or Essential Public Facility-State Corrections Overlay.
- C. **Definitions.**
 1. Employment Based Planned Community (EBPC). Employment Based Planned Community means a planned unit development within an established Urban Growth Area which contains a mix of jobs, services, recreation, housing types, and densities.
- G. **Uses Permitted within a PUD.**
 1. **Minimum Project Area Required.**
 - a. **NFCC/EBPC/MPC.** 320 acres.
 2. **Uses Permitted.**

- a. **NFCC/EBPC.** Any residential and non-residential use allowed in the following zones: MUC, CC, AC, UNC, MUD, HRD, MSF, and EC.
- H. **Land Use Standards.**
 - 1. **Basic Residential Density.**
 - a. **NFCC/EBPC/MPC.** Residential densities may vary between two and twenty-five units per acre as long as the overall average residential density is between four and ten units per acre.
 - 2. **Employment Use Requirements - EBPC/NFCC.** At a minimum, 10 percent of the total gross acreage of a EBPC or NFCC project shall be developed as an employment center. Such a center may be planned as one contiguous development or may be divided into several centers located in various portions of the PUD project site, and may include land dedicated to the commercial and civic components in the 10 percent calculation. Based on the approved EBPC or NFCC conceptual plan, the residential development shall be approved at a rate proportional to the area designated to employment.
- I. **Zoning Code Standards.**
 - 1. **NFCC/EBPC/MPC/MPR/EPF-SC.** As part of the approval the Examiner shall prescribe bulk requirements and landscaping including but not limited to required yards, height, parking, buffers and screens. As provided in the Pierce County Subdivision Code, Title 16, binding site plans in lieu of subdivisions may be utilized in a project for all commercial and industrial uses.
- N. **PUD Applications/Agreements.** The applicant shall submit as part of the application, a proposed Project Development Agreement that shall at a minimum include:
 - 1. **NFCC/EBPC/MPC/MPR/EPF-SC Content.**
 - a. A plan for the property that includes overall development criteria and standards that establish the development policy for the total project. The criteria and standards will generally address land use types and densities; design features (land use, roads, stormwater, parks and open space); and concepts for affordable housing and phasing and financing of public services and infrastructure.
 - b. Conceptual Plan. A land use plan designed to meet the criteria and standards established in 18A.75.080 N.1.a. The detailed land use plan will identify:
 - (1) The location and density of residential development;
 - (2) The location and type of commercial component;
 - (3) The location and type of open space, recreational facilities, stormwater facilities, public facilities such as schools and libraries, and transportation systems including auto, pedestrian, bicycle, equestrian, transit;
 - (4) A phasing plan and the expected build-out period for the project and its phases;
 - (5) The mechanisms to assure affordable housing is provided for a broad range of income levels;
 - (6) The acreage and range of uses authorized for any non-residential development within the PUD; and
 - (7) The minimum and maximum number of residential units for the PUD.
- O. **PUD Approval - Findings Required.** The action by the Examiner to approve a PUD application, with or without modifications, shall be based upon the following findings:

1. **General Findings.**
 - a. The proposal is consistent with the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan and the principles and standards set forth in any applicable Community Plan.
 - b. Exceptions from the standards are warranted by the design and amenities incorporated in the project development agreement. The system of ownership and means of developing, preserving, and maintaining open space is suitable.
 - c. SEPA has been complied with.
 - d. Proven ability to finance the needed capital facilities.
 - e. There are adequate provisions for the preservation of open space. The preservation of open space should be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan policies.
 - f. School impacts should be addressed.
 - g. An inventory of the critical areas on and adjacent to the PUD has been completed pursuant to Title 18E and development in environmentally constrained lands or required buffers are avoided wherever possible.

2. **EBPC/MPC/NFCC Findings.**
 - a. Transit-oriented site planning and traffic demand management programs can be implemented.
 - b. Buffers will be provided between the project and adjacent urban development.
 - c. Affordable housing will be provided within the project for a broad range of income levels.
 - d. The Examiner shall review and evaluate each residential phase for consistency for the achieving overall density as approved in the conceptual plan.
 - e. The Examiner shall review and evaluate each employment phase for consistency for achieving overall intensity as approved in the conceptual plan.
 - f. EBPC and NFCC projects meet the requirements of RCW 36.70A.350.

P. **Development Agreement Approval Procedures.**

1. **Procedure for Approval.** The following process shall apply to the review and approval of a PUD project development agreement pursuant to this subsection:
 - a. The review and approval of a proposed project development agreement (and subdivision proposal if submitted) by the Examiner after staff review, public notice, and public hearing. The Examiner shall use the guidelines set forth in this Section and other appropriate sections of the Code in the review and approval of the proposed development agreement.
 - b. The final development agreement shall be prepared by the applicant incorporating the changes and/or conditions to the proposed development agreement adopted by the Examiner. The final development agreement may be approved and adopted in stages/phases.
 - c. The final development agreement shall be approved after the Director finds it conforms with the guidelines included in the approved proposed

- development agreement. Approval of the final development agreement shall be pursuant to all concurrency and adequacy requirements.
2. **Subdivisions.** When it is the intention of an applicant to subdivide or re-subdivide all or portions of property within a proposed PUD project, application for approval of a preliminary subdivision may be filed and considered concurrently with an application for approval of a proposed development agreement.
 3. **Final Development Agreement - Time Limitation.** Within five years from the date of approval of a proposed development agreement by the Examiner, the applicant shall submit a final development plan (or a Binding Site Plan in the case of the RA-PUD) for the project, or a stage/phase thereof for approval unless a different time frame is otherwise provided for in the proposed development agreement. When deemed reasonable and appropriate, the Examiner may grant an extension of one year for such submittal. If at the date of expiration of the time period provided herein a final development agreement has not been filed for approval or at any time after a final plan has been approved it appears that the project or phase thereof is not progressing in a reasonable and consistent manner or the project has been abandoned, action may be initiated pursuant to Section 18A.85.060 of this Code to revoke the PUD project approval.
 4. **Final Development Agreement - Changes.** A final development agreement, including land use plan elements or conditions of approval, may be amended or modified at the request of the applicant or the applicant's successor in interest. The Director may administratively approve minor modifications to a Final Development Agreement. Minor modifications may include changes in density, provided the total number of dwelling units approved shall not exceed 10 percent of the maximum number approved in that approved final development agreement for the project (or the phase) and provided that the net residential density is not altered; and also provided such changes do not significantly increase impacts on transportation, significantly reduce buffers or open space, or significantly increase impacts on the environment. Modifications that do not qualify as minor shall be subject to applications, notices, hearings, and appeals in the same manner as the original application. The County may vary or specify additional criteria for determining whether proposed modifications are major or minor through the final development agreement.
 5. **Parties Bound by PUD Project Development Agreement.** Once the Final Development Agreement is approved by the Director and signed by the property owner, all persons and parties, their successors, and heirs who own or have any interest in the real property within the proposed PUD project are bound by the final development agreement.
- Q. **Procedures.** Procedures for application modification, review and amendment as well as permit extensions and relinquishment are outlined in Chapter 18A.85. For additional information about application requirements, see Chapter 18.40; for public hearing and appeal procedures, see Chapter 1.22; for the review process, see Chapter 18.60; for public notice, see Chapter 18.80; for fees, see Chapter 2.05; and for compliance, see Chapter 18.140.

Comment: The applicant has proposed changes to the overall proposal, and Phase 1 specifically. The changes will alter the following exhibits to the 1999 Development Agreement: 1) Exhibit "B", the Overall Conceptual Plan; 2) Exhibit "C", the Phase 1

Conceptual Plan; 3) Exhibit "D", Phase 1 Land Use Table; 4) Exhibit "E", Trails and Open Space Map; and 5) Exhibit "I", Phase 1 Use Description, Table and Map. The "Cascadia Employment Based Planned Community Development Agreement" was entered into by Pierce County and the applicant, Cascadia Development Corporation, on September 8, 1999. The Development Agreement was a requirement of Condition No. 62 of the June 18, 1999, approval of the Cascadia EBPC Planned Unit Development proposal by the Pierce County Hearing Examiner.

18A.85.040 Amendments.

- A. **Purpose.** The purpose of this Section is to define types of amendments to Preliminary Plats or Use Permits and to identify procedures for those actions.
- C. **Amendment Standards - Use Permits.** This Section is to provide the method for amending an approval or conditions imposed through a Use Permit or Preliminary Plat issued by the Examiner.
 - 1. **Minor Amendment.** The following procedures shall be required for all minor amendments.
 - a. Requests for minor amendments shall be in writing from the property owner or the owner's authorized agent.
 - b. Minor amendment applications may be routed to any county division or any agency with jurisdiction. This distribution shall be at the discretion of the Department.
 - c. A copy of all applications and any Department recommendation for minor amendments shall be routed to the Examiner. The Examiner shall determine if the proposal is consistent with the original decision.
 - d. Minor amendments may be approved or modified with conditions for approval by the Director provided all of the following requirements are met:
 - (1) The Examiner does not object to the minor amendment approval.

Comments: A draft copy of this decision has been forwarded to the Pierce County Hearing Examiner for review. The Hearing Examiner, in a March 1, 2006, letter, determined that the proposal is consistent with the original decision and meets the criteria of a minor amendment.

- (2) Any proposal that results in a change of use must be permitted outright in the current zone classification.

Comments: The proposal will not result in a change in the commitment to provide for the employment uses identified in Exhibit D to the 1999 Development Agreement, i.e., an equestrian center, neighborhood (commercial) center, marketing center, business park, and golf resort, including a hotel and conference center. The amount of acreage and square footage of total building area, i.e., 119.2 acres and 1,049,762 square feet, respectively. The acreage devoted to the golf course and related open space has increased 15.6 acres to 219.1.

Section 4.1.5.B.1. of the 1999 Development Agreement required an "approximately" 11 acre neighborhood park for "picnicking, playground, informal playfield and passive recreation facilities". Section 4.1.5.B.2. of the 1999 Development Agreement required

"approximately" 10 acres of park and playfields associated with the elementary school.

Two park facilities have been proposed to abut the elementary school on the north and south of the elementary school and its joint use playfields. The park, trail, and landscape plan dated February 20, 2006, states that 4.2 acres of the 14.4 acres of the school will be devoted to multi-purpose playfields. In addition, the school grounds will include approximately one-half acre of structured playground area. The northern park, i.e., North School Park, totals 4.6 acres and is conceptually proposed to include two multi-purpose ball fields, a tot lot, parking lot, trails, and other improvements. The 6.6 acre park to the south of the school, i.e., Botanical Park and Amphitheatre, is conceptually proposed to include a small amphitheatre for community gatherings, a botanical garden, over 3 acres of open lawn for informal play, and other improvements. The revised park, trail and landscape plan will provide approximately 9.3 acres of structured playfields and playgrounds and an additional 3 acres of informal play lawn in the botanical park to the south. The combination of the recreational areas on the site of the elementary school, and the lawn/playfield areas proposed in the North School Park and the Botanical Park and Amphitheatre comply with requirements for approximately 10 acres of area for active field sports.

The Development Agreement requires a separate full service park of approximately 11 acres. The original Phase 1 conceptual plan envisioned that this park would be located at the northern end of Phase 1. The applicant has proposed to meet this requirement by proposing a number of sizable park facilities throughout Phase 1A, as shown on the Cascadia Park, Trail, and Landscape Improvements Schedule – Phase 1A plan, dated February 20, 2006. The original 11 acre park space was envisioned to serve multiple users, not just the needs of team sports, as was the focus of the 10 acres of recreational area associated with the school. Therefore, accommodating this acreage in multiple locations meets the intent of the original condition.

The combination of the Wetland Park (4.2 acres-Parcel M₁), non play lawn portion of the Botanical Park and Amphitheatre (3.6 acres), Center Park (2 acres-Parcel K₂), and the Pea Patch (2.4 acres-Parcel L₁) total 12.2 acres and will accommodate a range of active and passive recreational activities in closer proximity to the future residents than the original 11 acre park. In addition to these park facilities, the Park, Trail, and Landscape Improvements Schedule – Phase 1A plan identifies the following additional park spaces: J -North Park (0.31 acre-Parcel J), Overlook Park (0.47 acres-Parcel K₁), 198th Street Park (1.36 acres-Parcel K₁), Pavilion Park (3.3 acres-Parcel N), Knoll Park (undefined size and makeup-Parcel M₁), and a park of undefined size or make-up in Parcel M₃.

The exact size and character of the above referenced park areas will be determined at the time specific preliminary plat or other residential development applications are submitted adjacent to them. The acreage devoted to the required Phase 1 elementary school has been reduced but the Sumner School District has determined that the reduced acreage is sufficient for their needs. The revised Cascadia Trails Plan, dated October 2005, as refined by the Cascadia Park, Trail, and Landscape Improvements Schedule – Phase 1A plan, dated February 20, 2006, will ensure that active and passive recreational park facilities are provided within closer proximity to the new residents than was proposed in the original conceptual plan.

This application identifies a location for the fire station, as required per Condition No. 82 of the 1999 POD approval. A location for an electrical substation to serve Phase 1 and three potential locations for the marketing center have also been identified.

Exhibit D of the 1999 Development Agreement establishes that the applicant will provide a range of urban single-family densities, based on specific lot sizes, for a range of 1 to 6.3 dwelling units per gross acre. The applicant also proposed large-lot residences with a density of 0.82 dwelling units per gross acre, but without specified lot sizes. The applicant also identified two types of housing along the proposed golf course "estates" and "villas", with gross densities of 1.6 and 7.5 dwelling units, respectively. In addition, Exhibit "D" identified multi-family densities of 7.9 dwelling units per gross acre. Exhibits C and D set aside 36 acres of Phase 1 for multi-family development and 8 acres for the "golf villas", which have a similar gross density to the multi-family area but does not have a designated housing type to obtain 7.5 dwelling units per acre.

The current minor amendment proposal would provide single-family detached dwelling units at a range of 1-10 dwelling units per gross acre throughout the 805.3 acres of single-family parcels identified on the revised Phase 1 Land Use Table in Exhibit "D" and the revised Phase 1 conceptual Plan. The current proposal sets aside 15.5 acres to the west of the proposed Neighborhood Center for multi-family and duplex development at a range of 8-14 dwelling units per gross acre. The 1999 Development Agreement sets aside both acreage i.e., 36 acres, and a specific number of dwelling units, i.e., 286, for multi-family development. This is in addition to 60 dwelling units of moderately high density "golf villas". The minor amendment proposal sets aside only acreage, i.e., 19.4 acres of Parcel I1. The minor amendment, through the revised Phase 1 Land Use Table in Exhibit D, does not specifically ensure that there will be a multi-family or high density residential component to Phase 1. The issue of whether the 1999 PUD decision and implementing Development Agreement mandate that there be a mix of housing types, densities, and opportunities is discussed in greater detail under Finding No. 3 below.

- (3) A change to a condition of approval does not modify the intent of the original condition.

Comments: The proposal to modify the size and location of various development parcels based on detailed topographic information, road and storm drainage designs, changes in the housing market, changes in the design and focus of commercial and multi-family development, desires/needs of school, fire district, and commercial center and golf resort users, and a relocation of Canyonfalls Boulevard East - the north-south arterial does not necessarily modify the intent of the 1999 PUD approval. The EBPC approval allows for a certain degree of flexibility over the life of a large, detailed, complex project to create a new community. The following is a discussion of the specific changes requested and whether they modify the intent of the Hearing Examiner's decision or the Development Agreement.

Canyonfalls Boulevard Realignment

The applicant proposes to relocate/convert Canyonfalls Boulevard East from providing off-site access to the northwest to an arterial providing only internal circulation for the northern

portion of Phase 1 and future Phase 2. The overall conceptual plan for Cascadia, shown in Exhibit B of the 1999 Development Agreement proposed two future northern accesses out of the overall Cascadia EBPC, i.e.: 1) an arterial connection (Canyonfalls Boulevard) through Phase 1 and down a steep, wooded, natural open space to a lower plateau at the north end of the EBPC; and 2) an arterial connection (Cascadia Boulevard) that extends through Phase 1 and through the major employment parcels of Phase 2 to the northwest corner of the EBPC. The elimination of the off-site Canyonfalls Boulevard East connection to the north has been reviewed by the Traffic Division of Pierce County Public Works and Utilities and the Development Engineering Section of Planning and Land Services. County staff concurs with the applicant that retaining this northern linkage was not desirable or feasible given: 1) the 230 foot high slope between the upper plateau of Cascadia Phase 1 and the lower plateau shared by a residential parcel in Cascadia Phase 2 and the Falling Water residential development to the north; 2) the approved large plat of Falling Water along Cascadia's northern and northwestern boundary was developed without mandating a connection with the Cascadia road network; and 3) Pierce County Public Works and Utilities is in the process of a "Rhodes Lake Road Corridor Study" which is looking at a new County roadway along the northern edge of Cascadia, which would link to the Cascadia road network in the general location of the off-site connection at the northwest corner of the EBPC.

Given the constraints to developing the original Canyonfalls Boulevard alignment, staff supports the concept of the roadway being converted into a looped arterial that is internal to the EBPC properties and will serve the northern portion of Phase 1 and the northern most portion of Phases 2, i.e., Parcels A-C. This conceptual loop is shown on the revised Phase 1 Conceptual Plan. Its specific alignment will be established when development applications for the affected parcels in Phase 1 and Phase 2 are applied for. The County is reserving the right to require that 131st Street East, currently proposed as just an emergency vehicle access corridor, be converted into a northern connection should it be needed to address future traffic needs in Phases 2 and 3. The future platting design for Parcel E₁ will need to accommodate an extension of 131st Street East as a future arterial.

Housing Mix

Cascadia Phase 1 is authorized to develop a maximum of 1,719 residential units. Exhibit D of the 1999 Development Agreement establishes that the applicant will provide a range of urban single-family densities, based on specific lot sizes, for a range of 1 to 6.3 dwelling units per gross acre. The applicant also proposed large-lot residences with a density of 0.82 dwelling units per gross acre, but without specified lot sizes. The applicant also identified two types of housing along the proposed golf course "estates" and "villas", with gross densities of 1.6 and 7.5 dwelling units, respectively. In addition, Exhibit D identified multi-family densities of 7.9 dwelling units per gross acre. Exhibits C and D set aside 36 acres of Phase 1 for multi-family development and 8 acres for the "golf villas", which have a similar gross density to the multi-family area but does not have a designated housing type to obtain 7.5 dwelling units per acre. The current minor amendment proposal would provide single-family detached dwelling units at a range of 1-10 dwelling units per gross acre throughout the 805.3 acres of single-family parcels identified on the revised Phase 1 Land Use Table in Exhibit D and the revised Phase 1 conceptual Plan. The current proposal sets aside 15.5 acres to the west of the proposed Neighborhood Center for multi-family and duplex

development at a range of 8-14 dwelling units per gross acre. The acreage devoted to residential uses would be decreased from 837.1 to 824.7 acres;

The applicant interprets the Development Agreement and Hearing Examiner's decision to allow them the flexibility to not develop a multi-family component or other housing options, e.g., small-lot detached single-family apartments over ground level commercial, etc., other than traditional moderate to low density single-family detached homes in Phase 1.

The June 18, 1999, decision of the Pierce County Hearing Examiner approving the Cascadia EBPC PUD includes several findings dealing with the need to provide housing options of varying affordability as the community develops, i.e., Finding Nos. 11, 13c, 23, 24, 71, and 84c (last paragraph). Finding No. 11 refers to Section 19A.30.130.C.2. (LU 42.3.2) which mandates "...a variety of housing options, including affordable housing for a range of income levels,...". Finding No. 24 specifically refers to providing a multi-family component within Phase 1. Finding No. 23 allows for flexibility in the location of uses and the densities of use but does not state that a broad use type is not required to be accommodated. The other conditions refer to the intent of the community to provide for a range of housing opportunities and affordabilities. Condition No. 129 requires a balance of uses as the community, including Phase 1, develops.

The September 8, 1999, Cascadia EBPC Development Agreement includes clear direction in terms of housing choice and affordability. Section 1.1 requires a range of housing types and densities that will be flexible to market needs and desires and provide a range of pricing choices throughout the Cascadia EBPC. This section also states that the "exact" residential densities and the amount and pattern of development should be allowed to vary over time in response to the market, so long as those changes are consistent with the EBPC concept and the Development Agreement. Section 1.2 ties the applicant to the specific land use breakdown summarized in Exhibit D, unless modified through a minor amendment process such as this. Section 1.2.1 allows "...actual amounts and densities of development within each parcel [of Phase 1] could vary somewhat in response to market conditions,..." so long as the maximum number of allowable dwelling units, i.e., 1,719, was not increased. Section 1.6 states that the "...amount, pattern, and density..." of development is a blueprint that is intended to be "...flexible, forming the basic concept against which each specific application for development will be considered." The initial paragraph of the Affordable Housing Plan, Exhibit G, states that the initial phases of Cascadia will be "predominately" single-family.

Staff reads the language of the Hearing Examiner's decision and the Development Agreement to state that the developer of Cascadia should be permitted to vary from the acreage, density, and square footage requirements set forth in Exhibit D of the Development Agreement and discussed in Finding No. 24 of the Hearing Examiner's decision can vary in accordance with market demands and desires so long as they are still consistent with the overall blueprint and concepts upon which the Cascadia EBPC was approved. Given that, staff agrees with the applicant that they are not required to set aside the minimum of 16.6% of the total allowable Phase 1 dwelling units as multi-family or the 3.5% of the total dwelling units for "golf villas", which could be multi-family or

small lot single-family housing, at a gross density of 7.9 dwelling units per gross acre set forth in Exhibit D to the Development Agreement - Phase 1 Land Use Table. Staff is supportive of the revised layout for the neighborhood center and the multi-family parcels and feels that this will allow for a more dense, pedestrian-oriented commercial/residential center of activity for Phase 1. The issue is whether the applicant should be required to provide a variety of housing types and choices within Phase 1, not just over the entire time as detailed plans for Phase 2 and 3 are developed and approved. Staff finds that not providing for a mix housing opportunities, in addition to typical urban density single-family subdivisions, would violate the intent of the Hearing Examiner's 1999 decision to approve the Cascadia EBPC.

Phase 1 of Cascadia was designed, and approved, to provide a mix of residential, commercial, employment, civic, and recreation uses and to operate as a mixed use community, rather than a large residential development. To that end, staff finds that a certain percentage of the 1,719 dwelling units need to be developed to provide housing choices that will allow for diversity of incomes, lifestyles, and market-driven affordability. Staff is open to considering the following housing types, i.e., as meeting the same intent as the "multi-family" discussed in Finding No. 24 of the Hearing Examiner's decision and Exhibit D of the Development Agreement: multiple-level multi-family units (garden apartment styles), townhouses (ground-level multi-family), apartments above ground level commercial, small-lot single-family detached, zero-lot-line single-family (either detached units or a duplex structure with the lot line on the common wall separating the units), or duplexes. To be equivalent to the intent of "multi-family" in the decision and Development Agreement, any single-family detached, zero-lot-line single-family or duplex units would need to comply with a net density of a minimum of 8 dwelling units per net acre or have average lot sizes of less than 4,000 square feet, whichever is more dense.

Since the Department and the applicant cannot agree as to the degree of flexibility or the range of housing types and opportunities that were specifically required as part of Phase 1, we have agreed to bring this matter before the Hearing Examiner for resolution as part of the initial 5th Year Review required per Section 6.14 of the Development Agreement. The applicant submitted an application for the initial 5th Year Review but it has not been processed pending the conclusion of this Minor Amendment process. The 5th Year Review report will be issued by the Department and a hearing held on the report no later than 60 days from the issuance of this decision.

Allee' Realignment

A major component of the 1999 PUD approval of the Cascadia EBPC, and in particular Phase 1, was the preservation of wide (150-foot) wooded, lineal open spaces, i.e., allee's. Allee's were designed to serve multiple purposes, i.e., habitat corridors between natural areas of the site, to separate large residential developments into smaller components, create an off-street pedestrian network and served to separate the large residential blocks into smaller components, and provided for pedestrian, bicycle, and/or equestrian movement within the community. As logging has occurred within the boundaries of Cascadia care was taken by the applicant and Pierce County to preserve the tree canopy within these corridors, and along the perimeter of the overall development. Staff and the applicant have discussed that, as development is proposed along the preserved allee' corridors, topographic changes necessary on adjacent properties to allow development may make preservation of the

originally preserved corridor impractical. To address the need to look at the allee's on a case-by-case basis as development occurs, while retaining the habitat, pedestrian circulation, and recreational function of these corridors, Pierce County has agreed to consider evaluating alternative locations for portions of the allee's as development is proposed adjacent to them. For the purpose of this minor amendment, the applicant has preserved the allee locations containing mature canopy vegetation that was preserved during the commercial logging of the site. Staff has agreed to permit the applicant to shift the original location of allee's that are located in young, uniform forest stands to mesh with their preferred development pattern. These realigned allee's still retain their habitat and recreational/circulation potential and interconnectivity with the remainder of the allee system.

- (4) The perimeter boundaries of the original site shall not be extended by more than 5 percent of the original lot area.

Comments: The proposed revisions to Phase 1 of Cascadia will take place within the boundaries of the original EBPC approved per the 1999 PUD approval. The internal boundaries of Phase 1 are also not proposed to expand into areas previously proposed for Phases 2 and 3.

- (5) The proposal does not increase the overall residential density of a site.

Comments: The cap of 1,719 dwelling units in Phase 1 will remain with the minor amendment. The applicant has indicated an intention to develop Phase 1 with a more dense platting pattern than envisioned in the original 1999 approval. Since the physical size of Phase 1 was originally proposed to accommodate 2.05 dwelling units per acre, including the multi-family and "golf villa" components, there will be a significant number of development parcels within the area designated as Phase 1 that will remain undeveloped at the build-out of Phase 1. Lands not necessary to build out 1,719 homes will be absorbed into future Phases of Cascadia. These future Phases will be required to go through new environmental and land use approvals to be allowed to be developed.

- (6) The proposal does not change or modify housing types.

Comments: Refer to discussion of housing mix in Finding No. 3 above.

- (7) The proposal does not reduce designated open space.

Comments: This proposal will increase the amount of parks and open space, primarily in the vicinity of the golf course, by 15.6 acres.

- (8) The proposal does not add more than 25 percent gross square footage of structures to the site.

Comments: This proposal will not increase the amount of commercial, industrial, civic, or residential structures and/or total size of structures.

- (9) The proposal does not increase the overall impervious surface on the site by more than 25 percent.

Comments: This proposal will not increase the amount of overall commercial, industrial, civic, or residential impervious cover.

- (10) Any additions or expansions approved through minor amendments that cumulatively exceed the requirements in this Section shall be reviewed as a major amendment.

Comments: Since this is the first minor amendment, the thresholds for a major amendment have not been reached.

DECISION: The Minor Amendment to the Cascadia Employment-Based Planned Community Planned Unit Development (PUD): Cascadia - Phase 1, is hereby **approved**, subject to compliance with the following conditions:

1. The original Exhibit "C" (Phase 1 Conceptual Plan) and Exhibit "E" (Trails and Open Space Map) have been replaced with the following revised documents: Exhibit "C" - Phase 1 Conceptual Plan, revised January 12, 2006; and Exhibit "E" - Trails and Open Space Map, revised October 2005 and January 10, 2006. Original Exhibit "B" (Overall Conceptual Plan) has not been revised but the description and types of uses for Phase 1 have been modified by the revised Exhibit "B".
2. The original Exhibit "D" (Phase 1 Land Use Table) has been replaced with a Phase 1 Land Use Table, with a revision date of August 11, 2005, with the exception that the issue of whether it needs to be revised to mandate a certain percentage of multi-family in Phase 1 of Cascadia. During the public hearing on the first 5th Year Review, to be heard by the Pierce County Hearing Examiner within 60 days of the date of this order, the Pierce County Hearing Examiner shall review the mixture of housing types and densities that have been provided in the four initial preliminary plats and/or in proposals for the balance of Phase 1. The Examiner will specifically be asked to determine whether the applicant is required to construct, in Phase 1, a certain number of multi-family dwelling units (ground-level and/or multiple level) and/or high density single-family detached, zero-lot line single-family, or duplex dwelling units. The approval of this minor amendment for the Cascadia EBPC PUD does not constitute the Planning and Land Services Department's approval of any plan that does not include multi-family or high density residential dwelling units of other types in Phase 1 as discussed in the above order.
3. The concept of providing Canyon Falls Boulevard as a looped road in lieu of a proposed access to the north is acceptable. This road layout is conceptual in nature, and is subject

to change. Further refinement of the design will be required as development within Parcels D, D1, E, and L progresses.

4. Development proposed within Parcel E1 of Phase 1 shall not preclude the use of 131st Street East as a future northerly connection should it be needed as a result of the future traffic needs for Phases 2 and 3 of Cascadia. Development proposals in Parcel E1 shall be designed to preserve right-of-way for a future extension of 131st Street East from the outer boundary of the Cascadia EBPC to Canyonfalls Boulevard East. This right-of-way shall be designed to accommodate an arterial roadway, unless Pierce County determines that a lower classification roadway is acceptable. The construction of any extension of 131st Street East shall not be required during Phase 1, unless a future revision to the Traffic Mitigation Plan deems it necessary.
5. The exact location and configuration of allee's/buffers shall be determined during the design review of parcel specific development applications, preliminary plats, and building permits. No site development permits or vegetation removal shall be permitted on parcels abutting allee's/buffers until the location and configuration of the permanent allee/buffer has been determined by Pierce County Planning and Land Services, unless such site development activity is deemed by Pierce County Planning and Land Services to not preclude reconfiguring the allee/buffer outside the location determined by the revised Phase 1 Cascadia Trails Plan, dated October 2005, as refined by the Cascadia Park, Trail, and Landscape Improvements Schedule – Phase 1A plan, dated February 20, 2006.

In accordance with Pierce County Code, 1.22., Appeals of Administrative Decisions to the Examiner, any person aggrieved, or affected by any decision of an administrative official may file a notice of appeal. A notice of appeal, together with the appropriate appeal fee, shall be filed within 14 days of the date of an Administrative Official's decision, at the Public Services Building, Planning and Land Services Development Center, 2401 So. 35th, Tacoma, Washington.

David Rosenkranz, Assistant Director

for: Chuck Kleeberg, Director
Planning and Land Services Department

TRANSMITTED TO:

OWNER/APPLICANT: Cascadia Development Corporation
Attn: Tom Uren, P.E., Vice President & Director of Engineering
500 – 108th Avenue N.E., Suite 1620
Bellevue, WA 98004

ATTORNEY: William T. Lynn
Gordon, Thomas, Honeywell, et al
P.O. Box 1157
Tacoma, WA 98401

Parties of Record:

Lowe Enterprises Northwest, Inc.	600 University St.,	
Michael J. Brooks, Project Mgr.	Suite 2820	Seattle WA 98101
Glenn Amster	1420 Fifth Ave, Suite 4100	Seattle WA 98101-2338
Steven Brown	7525 Pioneer #202	Gig Harbor WA 98335
Joseph Quinn	6217 Mt. Tacoma Dr. SW	Lakewood WA 98499
Anne Spangler	PO Box 40113	Olympia WA 98504
Sharon Gain	7728 190 th Ave. East	Bonney Lake WA 98390
Vijay Kulkarni	2401 S 35 th St., #150	Tacoma WA 98409
Seth Boettcher	PO Box 7380	Bonney Lake WA 98390
Karl Anderson	1123 Port of Tacoma Rd.	Tacoma WA 98421
Jeff Lyon	1201 Pacific Ave. #801	Tacoma WA 98402
Gary Campbell	11601 188 th Ave. Ct.	Bonney Lake WA 98390
Matt Vincent	12904 198 th Ave. E.	Sumner WA 98390
Kenneth & Sharon Gain	7728 190 th Ave. E.	Bonney Lake WA 98390
Bill Heath	818 Bonney Ave.	Sumner WA 98390
Pam Johnson	10610 230 th Ave. E.	Buckley WA 98321
Earl and Marikay Cumpston	15909 198 th Ave. E.	Sumner WA 98390
Charlie and Pamela Johnson	10610 230 th Ave.	Buckley WA 98321
Doug Britschgi	PO Box 820	Orting WA 98360
Diane Rhoades	PO Box 1613	Orting WA 98360
Paul Miller	917 Pacific Ave. #417	Tacoma WA 98402
Stan Florez	8001 Locust Ave. E.	Bonney Lake WA 98390
Ray Schuler	PO Box 2015	Tacoma WA 98401
Carl Halsan	PO Box 1447	Gig Harbor WA 98335
Patrick Kuo	500 108 th Ave. NE #1620	Bellevue WA 98004
Dan Packer	18421 Old Buckley Hwy.	Sumner WA 98390
Charles Decker	16119 S. Prairie Creek Rd E.	Orting WA 98360
Shuming Yan	5720 Capital Blvd.	Tumwater WA 98504
Rory Grindley	2401 S. 35 th St., #150	Tacoma WA 98409
Gerald Schmitz	5417 234 th Ave. E.	Buckley WA 98321
Matthew Sweeney	6312 19 th St. W.	Tacoma WA 98466
Tom Smayda	139 NE 61 st	Seattle WA 98115
Larry Beard	130 2 nd Ave. S.	Edmonds WA 98020
Joe Scorcio	2207 N. Washington St.	Tacoma WA 98406
Art and Maureen Palacek	7720 190 th Ave. E.	Bonney Lake WA 98390
James and Jane Waldkom	19610 166 th St. E.	Sumner WA 98390
Donna Sater	19708 Rhodes Lake Rd. E.	Sumner WA 98390
John P. McDonald	18421 Old Buckley Hwy. #F	Bonney Lake WA 98390
Jim Crippen	2601 S. 35 th St., #200	Tacoma WA 98409
Craig Flamme	PO Box 7380	Bonney Lake WA 98390
Nellie Ausbun	11816 200 th Ave. E.	Sumner WA 98390
Tim Thompson	2200 Wells Fargo	Tacoma WA 98401
Dawn Naylor	5720 Capital Blvd.	Tumwater WA 98502

Richard Filkins	PO Box 47440	Olympia WA 98504
Patrick Healy	3868 Center St.	Tacoma WA 98409
Orly Waller	5262 Beach Dr SW	Seattle WA 98136
Bud Rehberg	3802 232 nd St.	Spanaway WA 98387

Parties of Record – continued:

Forest Sutmiller	5720 Capital Blvd.	Tumwater WA 98502
Linda Walchli	615 2 nd Ave. #200	Seattle WA 98104
Don Rolston	15818 Pioneer Way E.	Orting WA 98360
John Thomas	1202 Wood Ave.	Sumner WA 98390
Steven and Monica Rodrigues	16709 230 th St. E.	Graham WA 98338
Mike Rutkosky	19116 160 th St. E.	Sumner WA 98390
Tom Pankalla	PO Box 519	Orting WA 98360
Charlotte Kontos	22305 96 th St. E.	Buckley WA 98321
Rob Tucker	PO Box 11000	Tacoma WA 98411
Bob Duffy, DOE	PO Box 47775	Olympia WA 98504-7775
Craig Riley, DOH	1500 W. 4 th Ave., #305	Spokane WA 99204
Mary J. Urback	12417 12 th St. East	Edgewood WA 98372
Bruce C. Mitchell	P.O. Box 99151	Seattle WA 98199
Greg Pyle	23639 – 126 th Avenue SE	Kent WA 98031

Pierce County Building Division
Pierce County Development Engineering (Paul Barber)
Pierce County Resource Management (Carla Vincent)
Pierce County Public Works and Utilities - Traffic Division
Pierce County Public Works and Utilities - Surface Water Management
City of Bonney Lake (Stephen Ladd)
City of Orting
Pierce County Fire Prevention Bureau
Pierce County Hearing Examiner
Pierce County Parks and Recreation
Pierce County Council
Pierce County Fire Protection District #24
Sumner School District
Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department
Washington State Department of Ecology
Washington State Department of Transportation

REJ:sl

Cascadia Ph 1 Minor Amend WO-RJ.doc

The acreage devoted to residential uses would be decreased from 837.1 to 824.7 acres.

- 4) Relocate the multi-family area from the northeast corner of the Canyonfalls Boulevard East/Cascadia Boulevard East (the east-west arterial) intersection to the northwest corner of the intersection. Residential uses in the upper stories of the buildings in the abutting Neighborhood Center may also be provided.
- 5) Increase the size of golf course and related open space parcels from 203.5 to 219.1 acres and provide for an alternate location for the golf resort hotel and conference center closer to the bluff to provide for better views.
- 6) Relocate the neighborhood commercial center from the northwest corner of the Canyonfalls Boulevard East/Cascadia Boulevard East intersection to a location further to the west beyond the park and school.
- 7) Relocate the marketing center from the intersection of 198th Avenue East and Cascadia Boulevard East to one of three proposed locations along Cascadia Boulevard East.
- 8) Relocate the elementary school and abutting park from the south side of the Canyonfalls Boulevard East/Cascadia Boulevard East intersection to the northwest.
- 9) Expand and convert the open space areas on the northwest and southwest corners of the 198th Avenue East/Cascadia Boulevard East intersection into 13.5 acres of formal park space.
- 10) Locate the required fire station on the northeast corner of the Canyonfalls Boulevard East/Cascadia Boulevard East intersection.

The site is located at the southern end of the Bonney Lake Plateau, south of 128th Street East and accessed via 198th Avenue East, in Sec. 16, the E 1/2 of Sec. 17, the NE 1/4 of Sec. 20, Sec. 21 and 22, the NW 1/4 of Sec. 23, and the NE 1/4 of Sec. 27, T19N, R5E, W.M., in Council District No. 1.

On **April 5, 2006**, the Pierce County Planning and Land Services Department took action to approve this application subject to conditions. The decision on an application for Site Plan Review approval shall be final and conclusive unless an Appeal to the Hearing Examiner is timely filed.

Appeal: In accordance with Pierce County Code, 1.22., Appeals of Administrative Decisions to the Examiner, any person aggrieved, or affected by any decision of an administrative official may file a notice of appeal. A notice of appeal, together with the appropriate appeal fee, shall be filed within 14 days of the date of an Administrative Official's decision, at the Public Services Building, Planning and Land Services Development Center, 2401 So. 35th, Tacoma, Washington.

TRANSMITTED THIS 5TH DAY OF APRIL, 2006.

TO: All Surrounding Property Owners

REJ:sl