

From: Joe Turner, Hearings Examiner
Sent: Friday, January 20, 2017 1:22 PM
To: Community Development Email
Subject: Comments on Camas Municipal Code Title 16 SEPA Determination (SEPA17-01)

The attached are my comments on the proposed amendments to Title 16. My comments are only intended to clarify the Code language and avoid the need for interpretations/construction in the future.

16.07.020.A exempts multi-family residential “up to 24 units –Consistent with maximum density in multifamily zones.” – Density is usually based on units per acre, so I’m confused by the comment that it’s “Consistent with maximum density in multifamily zones.”

16.07.020.A also exempts Agricultural structures up to 30,000 sf, but the comment says max allowed is 40K. Why not exempt max?

16.07.020 includes a new Section C, but there is nothing in that section.

16.13.060 SEPA appeal – last sentence might be more clear if it said, “[appeal must be filed] “within fourteen 14 days of the date the decision was issued.”

16.31.140.D could be rephrased to be more clear.

Current - D. Where the director determines that an archaeological site has been identified and ~~is--DAHP and the tribes concur~~ is not likely to be significant, the application may proceed through the remainder of the development review process.

Revised - D. Where the director determines that an identified archaeological site ~~is~~ not likely to be significant and ~~DAHP and the tribes concur~~, the application may proceed through the remainder of the development review process.

16.31.160 could be rephrased to be more clear.

The submittal to the tribes must include city staff contact information. The report must also inform the tribes that any comments on the development must be received by the Director within fourteen days from the date that notification was mailed or electronic mail ("email").

16.51.210.C(3) could be rephrased to be more clear. (Also a typo, “nonimiasive”)

Required fencing/thorny shrubs. The director may approve the ~~determine that~~ planting of densely spaced, noninvasive ~~nonimiasive~~, thorny shrubs to restrict access ~~may be installed~~, rather than fencing if it would better protect the critical area and buffer functions _

16.53.040.C seems to repeat/potentially conflict with 16.51.210.C – both allow/require fencing and marking, but allow/require different types.

16.53.040.C(2) – Only the residents and their guests will see signs on private lots > why not signs on every lot? Proposed change would only require signs every 100 feet, which would be every other lot on 50-foot wide lots. That way all residents see the signs, not just the occasional resident. Otherwise why signs?

16.41.040.A(1) was amended to apply to “development *activity*.” Is “development activity” defined? I believe “Development” is defined (although not in Section 16). Adding the term “activity” would be construed to mean something else, different from “development.” If that is the intent, fine. But you want to avoid unintended changes.