

Sarah Fox

From: Jamie Howsley <jamie.howsley@jordanramis.com>
Sent: Monday, March 02, 2015 3:53 PM
To: Sarah Fox
Cc: Jamie Howsley
Subject: RE: Lot Coverage Code Amendment Request

Thanks Sarah. We will get all of these addressed by the end of the week.

JAMES D. HOWSLEY | Attorney
Jordan Ramis PC | Attorneys at Law
WA Direct: 360-567-3913
OR Direct: 503-598-5592
OR Main: 503-598-7070

From: Sarah Fox [<mailto:SFox@cityofcamas.us>]
Sent: Monday, March 02, 2015 3:51 PM
To: Jamie Howsley
Subject: RE: Lot Coverage Code Amendment Request
Importance: High

Jamie,
We have not yet received a SEPA application (checklist and fee of \$700).

The following are a few of my initial thoughts on your application narrative.

It is not clear as to what sections of code you are proposing to amend. Throughout the letter (dated February 5th) mentions other code sections that you would like to change beyond Table 2, however there is no clear list of code citations, or proposed amended text, particularly at section "A" of your narrative on page 1.

Throughout the letter, it is suggested that "*porches, outdoor rooms and transitional spaces*" are not included in the zoning code. I should note that these features, albeit not the exact terminology, are already in the code, along with other exemptions from setbacks and lot coverage standards that follow Table 2 (Refer to CMC18.09.130, 140, and 180).

The city does not include front porches, patios, or other features of a home that are not under a roof in lot coverage calculations. I would argue that the code *encourages* residential lots to have yard space, rather than "*discouraging transitional spaces*". How is the applicant proposing to ensure that additional lot coverage allowances would only be used for "*transitional spaces*" and not a larger garage? Would the proposed definition changes be consistent with these other sections of code, which provide variations?

There is considerable discussion in the letter regarding one-story homes and perceived limits on the square footage to be no larger than 2,700 square feet. In the annual comprehensive plan report, the city reported that over 70 percent of new homes being built in the city were over 3,000 square feet. There has been considerable discussion before council on the need for smaller homes to provide more variety for first time home buyers and empty nesters. The application might want to demonstrate the need for more homes that exceed 3,000 sq. ft., or how this code change will promote more single-story home building. Also, will the Lake Hills subdivision include single story homes?

In sum, the application must include the specific sections of code (numbers) that are proposed to be amended, the proposed text amendments, a demonstration of the need for an amendment, and an analysis of the potential impacts to the other R-10 zoned properties in the city.

Please phone me if you would like to discuss further or have questions.

Thanks,
Sarah

From: Jamie Howsley [<mailto:jamie.howsley@jordanramis.com>]
Sent: Monday, March 02, 2015 1:03 PM
To: Robert Maul; Sarah Fox
Cc: Jamie Howsley
Subject: Lot Coverage Code Amendment Request

Hey Robert and Sarah,

Just wanted to quickly touch base with you on this. We are preparing some exhibits as well to help illustrate the issue and also have some additional thoughts. Is there anything else you need from us at this point?

Best,

Jamie

JAMES D. HOWSLEY | Attorney
Jordan Ramis PC | Attorneys at Law
WA Direct: 360-567-3913
OR Direct: 503-598-5592
OR Main: 503-598-7070

Portland OR | Vancouver WA | Bend OR
www.jordanramis.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: Please do not read, copy, or disseminate this communication unless you are the intended addressee. This e-mail may contain confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the addressee. If you have received this in error, please notify me via return e-mail.

TAX ADVICE NOTICE: IRS Circular 230 requires us to advise you that if this communication or any attachment contains any tax advice, the advice is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding tax-related penalties or (ii) promoting, marketing, or recommending any transaction, plan, or arrangement. A taxpayer may rely on professional advice to avoid tax-related penalties only if the advice is reflected in a comprehensive tax opinion that conforms to stringent requirements. Please contact us if you have any questions about this requirement, or would like to discuss preparation of an opinion that conforms to these IRS rules.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to