

CITY OF CAMAS STAFF REPORT

Legislative History:		
Subject:	Webberley/Hagensen Annexation (ANNEX19-01) 10% Notice of Intent	
Proceeding Type:	PRESENTATION	
Date:	November 18 th , 2019	
From:	Robert Maul, Planning Manager	
То:	City Council	

Legislative History:			
٠	First Presentation:	November 18 th , 2019	
•	Second presentation/Action:	TBD	

Background:

On September 22nd, 2019 the City of Camas received a ten percent petition to annex two properties within the city limits. The annexation area is comprised of two parcels owned by Brett Webberley (parcel number 178140-000), and Mark Hagensen (parcel number 178241-000). The parcels are 26.12 acres and 5.76 acres in size respectively for a total of 31.88 acres (see figure 1). The initiating parties represent both parcels of land which has a total assessed value of \$1,123,330, or 100% of the total assessed value of the defined area. The notice is valid and satisfies the requirements of RCW 35A.14.120.

Figure 1: Proposed Annexation Area



City Boundary:

As proposed, the annexation area does directly adjoin the city limit boundary to the north and south. East of the site is unincorporated Clark County land that is not within the City of Camas Urban Growth Boundary. Immediately to the west of the proposed annexation area is approximately 20 acres of land comprised of 9 separate parcels. These parcels are <u>not</u> included in the annexation proposal and would effective become a hole within the city limits if the two subject properties are annexed (see figure 2). The applicant did say in their narrative that they are willing to work on annexing the properties to the west to prevent a "donut hole."



Figure 2: Land not included in the annexation request.

Process:

As per RCW 35.13.125, the City Council is required to meet with the initiating parties and will discuss the following:

- 1. Whether the City will accept, reject, or geographically modify the proposed annexation;
- 2. Whether it will require the simultaneous adoption of a proposed zoning regulation, if such a proposal has been prepared and filed (as provided for in RCW 35A.14.330, and RCW 35A.14.340); and
- **3.** Whether it will require the assumption of all or any portion of existing City indebtedness by the area to be annexed.

If the Council were to accept the proposed annexation (with or without modifications) the next step in the process is for the initiating party to collect signatures from property owners representing at least 60% of the assessed value of the area to be annexed. If a valid petition is submitted, then the City Council may hold a public hearing to consider the request.

Staff has several concerns about annexing this area at this time. First, the area proposed for annexation is just east of the North Shore subarea study area, which is only just beginning. It is possible that through the public outreach portion of the subarea plan the boundaries may expand to include this area. Additionally, once annexed the site would be able to develop into low density residential which is what the comprehensive plan calls for. All of the traffic generated from this site would funnel through the SR-500/Everett corridor, or easterly through Crown Road, both of which are experiencing increased capacity in peak hour trip volumes. Lastly, the City currently has a robust supply of land for housing already within the city limits. The urban growth boundary and comprehensive plan is for a 20 year build out, so there isn't a need to annex right away.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the City Council <u>reject</u> the notice of intent.

Options:

Option	Results
• <i>Reject the Notice of Intent</i>	The annexation process ends and the subject property would remain in unincorporated Clark County. The initiating parties would draft a petition and begin gathering signatures.
• Accept the Notice as submitted	
 Accept the Notice but modify the boundaries. 	The initiating parties would draft a revised petition and begin gathering signatures.