

Lauren Hollenbeck

From: Randall B. Printz [<mailto:randy.printz@landerholm.com>]
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2015 8:12 PM
To: Steve Wall
Cc: Robert Maul; Curleigh (Jim) Carothers; Wes Heigh
Subject: RE:

Thanks Steve. Robert raised a couple of issues last Friday I believe with Kurt Stonex, so I want to address these in addition to the sewer issue; the latter of which I will address under separate cover. These are in no particular order, but should be made a part of the record in addition to the other supplemental responses we have provided to the City.

Trails (easements or tracts.)

We will put the trails in tracts and dedicate them to the City since they are on the City's trails plan for public use.

Lots 73-76.

The question here is what will be developed adjacent to these lots on the other side of the sidewalk. I suggest the following as a condition of approval to address this issue: At the time of preliminary plat approval for that portion of Pod B1 that is adjacent to lots 73-76 in Phase 1D of Pod C, the type and orientation of the residential units to be constructed in Pod B1 shall be considered, in order to assure such units are generally compatible with the units on lots 73-76 in Phase D1 of Pod C.

Maximum lot size

The PRD table provides minimum and maximum lot sizes for each of the Pod types within the PRD. Phase 1 proposes some lots that are in excess of the maximum lot size (9,000 sq. ft.) provided for in the PRD table. There is nothing in the PRD code that would require such a maximum lot size and the Applicant arbitrarily chose a maximum lot size in the original development of the PRD, prior to the design of the preliminary plat for phase 1. Generally, maximum lot sizes are imposed in urban jurisdictions to assure that density targets are met. In this case, the Green Mountain PRD contains a wide array of densities. Even with some lots that exceed the proposed maximum lot size, the project meets the City's density targets. Since there is no requirement for the PRD to have a maximum lot size and because the PRD meets the City's density targets, the Applicant has removed the maximum lot size from the PRD standards. The attached table should be made a part of the record and eliminates the maximum lot size from the PRD standards.

Thanks guys. Let me know if any questions

From: Steve Wall [<mailto:SWall@cityofcamas.us>]
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2015 4:08 PM
To: Randall B. Printz
Cc: Robert Maul; Curleigh (Jim) Carothers; Wes Heigh
Subject: RE:

Hey Randy – Sorry, been at work today but haven't even been in my office until just now. I believe Robert has let you know that we're still plugging away on things and reviewing and commenting internally on a draft. Would definitely agree that it would be ideal to get you something to review prior to the staff report being issued, I'm just not sure we're going to be in that position with the hearing date schedule we've got. I would certainly give you the option of sending me a few thoughts on what you envisioned, but you may be better served waiting to see what we've drafted and then responding. In regards to sewer, I think we have a pretty good feel for where you guys stand on going south so hopefully we won't be too far apart.

Robert will probably be keeping you up to date on status as we roll into tomorrow.

Steve

Steve Wall, P.E.
Public Works Director

Ph: 360-817-7899
Cell: 360-624-2763
Email: swall@cityofcamas.us



From: Randall B. Printz [<mailto:randy.printz@landerholm.com>]
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2015 7:28 AM
To: Robert Maul; Steve Wall
Cc: 'stacey@cascadiadevelopmentpartners.com' (stacey@cascadiadevelopmentpartners.com)
Subject:

Good morning. I hope you are both well. I know you are scrambling to finish Staff Report. Steve, if you could give me a call this morning, I would like to see if we can develop some language for the conditions of approval for sewer. I don't think it will be that difficult and I have given it some thought. I want to be sure that we allow for the design and mechanism's we are working through with the DA, but I also need to have some way to preserve our argument that we have a right to take everything to the south in the unlikely event that we don't end up with a deal. I have some language in mind, but would like to talk to you first.

Robert, I know you had a couple of additional questions. I know your draft is not yet final, but if you could even just email me this morning your draft proposed conditions of approval, that would be really helpful. Obviously, the City can choose to propose any conditions of approval that it deems appropriate; however, it has been my experience, and I believe yours as well, that if we can agree on the language of those conditions prior to the staff report being issued, it will save a lot of potential angst at the hearing. This is particularly true where you have a lay body like a PC, rather than a hearings examiner. If you could give me a call when you get in to discuss this, that would be great. Thanks guys.

Randall B. Printz | Attorney



805 Broadway Street, Suite 1000
P.O. Box 1086
Vancouver, WA 98666-1086
T: 360-696-3312 | T: 503-283-3393 | F: 360-696-2122
www.landerholm.com

This e-mail message (including attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). It contains confidential, proprietary or legally protected information which is the property of Landerholm, P.S. or its clients. Any unauthorized disclosure or use of the contents of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, notify the sender immediately and destroy all copies of the original message.

Green Mountain PRD PODs A-G and corresponding Camas Zones

	A POD	B POD	C POD
DENSITY	MF-24	MF-18	MF-10
Max. du/gross ac	24	18	10
Min. du/gross ac	6	6	6
STANDARD LOTS			
Min. lot SF	1,800 1,000 [a]	2,100 1,000[a]	3,000 [a]
Min. lot width	20	20	30
Min. lot depth	60 50	60 50	70
Max. Floor Area per du	No Max	No Max	No Max
SETBACKS			
Min. front/at garage	10/18 None	10 6/3@OS/18	15/18 10/18
Min. side	3 [1]	3 [1] [d]	3 [1] [d]
Min. side Flanking Street	15 None [e]	15 10 [d]	15 10 [d]
Min. rear (garage @alley)	10 None [e]	10 [b][c]	10 [b][c]
LOT COVERAGE, Max.	75% None [c]	65% None	55%
BUILDING HEIGHT, Max.	45[2] 60	45 [2]	35 [2]

a. Single Family Detached homes to be permitted. For SFD in A POD apply B Pod setbacks.

b. 10 foot rear yard for front access garage.

c. Minimum rear yard for alley accessed garage is either 4' or 18'.

d. Minimum side yard at alley is 5'.

e. Franchise utilities to be located in front or side yard easements abutting right of way.

1. The non-attached side of a dwelling unit shall be three feet, otherwise a zero-lot line is assumed.
2. Maximum building height: three stories and a basement but not to exceed maximum building height.

Density Transfer Lots	D POD	E POD	F POD	G POD
DENSITY	R-5	R-6	R-7.5	R-20
Max. du/gross ac.	8.7	7.2	5.8	2.1
DENSITY TRANSFER LOTS				
Min. lot size (sq. ft.)	3,500 <u>[a]</u>	4,200	5250	14,000
Min. lot width	40	50	60	90
Min. lot depth	80	80	80	100
LOT COVERAGE, Max.	45%	40%	40%	30%
BUILDING HEIGHT, MAX. (ft.)	35	35	35	35
SETBACKS based on avg. lot size	Up to 4,999 sq. ft.	5,000 to 7,499 sq. ft.	7,500 to <u>14,999</u> sq. ft.	15,000 to <u>60,000</u> sq. ft.
Min. front/at garage	15 <u>10/18</u>	20 <u>15/18</u>	20	30
Min. side and corner lot rear yard (ft.)	5 <u>4</u>	5	5	15
Min. side yard flanking a street	15 <u>10[d]</u>	20 <u>15[d]</u>	20 <u>15</u>	30
Min. rear (garage @alley)	20 <u>15[b][c]</u>	25 <u>20[b][c]</u>	25 <u>20[b][c]</u>	30
Min. lot frontage on a cul-de- sac or curve (ft.)	25	30	30	40

a. Single Family detached homes to be permitted.

b. 10 foot rear yard for front access garage.

c. Minimum rear yard for alley accessed garage is either 4' or 18'.

d. Minimum side yard at alley is 5'.

NOTE: POD lot sizes are not subject to lot size averaging.