REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION
CITY FILE # SUB 17-03

APPLICANT/APPLICANTS:

Owners & Residents of Mountain Glen Subdivision listed below:

| Jeremy & Stephanie Baenen - Lot 1 | Lonnie Hays – Lot 2 |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 20004 N.E. 48 th Circle | 20108 N.E. 48 th Circle |
| Vancouver, WA 98682 | Vancouver, WA 98682 |
| (360)281-9998 | (360) 883-6884 |
| Email: Jeremy.baenen@gmail.com | Email: shaloon2@comcast.net |
| | |
| Signature | Signature |
| Margarit Hilfiker – Lot 3 | Paul and Gayle Freeman – Lot 4 |
| 20200 N.E. 48 th Circle | 20312 N.E. 48 th Circle |
| Vancouver, WA 98682 | Vancouver, WA 98682 |
| (360)253-5222 | (360) 882-8295 |
| Email; swissmargarit@gmail.com | Email: PaulJ Freeman@msn.com |
| Margid Hilliber | Haul Frieman |
| Signature | Signature |
| | 5,8,1444.5 |
| Danny and Marie Jones – Lot 5 | Tyler & Ginger Shoemaker – Lot 6 |
| 19909 N.E. 48 th Circle | 19915 N.E. 48 th Circle |
| Vancouver, WA 98682 | Vancouver, WA 98682 |
| (360)892-6419 | (360) 509-220-6712 |
| Email: dannynomad55@gmail.com | Email: tyjing@msn.com |
| (Danse Q 1500 | |
| Signature | Signature |
| Signatary | Signature |
| Jason Kearney - Lot 7 | Jeffery & Trisha Seifert – Lot 8 |
| 20007 N.E. 48 th Circle | 20101 N.E. 48 th Circle |
| Vancouver, WA 98682 | Vancouver, WA 98682 |
| (360)892-4713 | (360) 448-3191 |
| Email: jfk368@msn.com | Email-jeffs@pinnacledig.com |
| | $\langle III \Lambda$ |
| Signature | Signature |
| 0 | , U , Signature |

Robert & Suzanne Hall Trustee – Lot 9 20111 N.E. 48th Circle

Vancouver, WA 98682 (360) 836-8133

Email: suzannehall39@comcast.net

Signature

Kelli Randolph - Lot 11 20315 N.E. 48th Circle

Vancouver, WA 98682

882-3689 (360)

Email: kelli.Randolph@fnf.com

Signature

Michael & Krista Lindhorst - Lot 10

20205 N.E. 48th Circle Vancouver, WA 98682

(360)891-5356

Email: mwandl@msn.com

William & Shirley Huyette – Lot 12

Signature

20406 N.E. 48th Circle Vancouver, WA 98682

(360)

892-8378 Email: huyette@premierinv.biz

Signature

The above named Parties respectfully submit a "Request for Reconsideration" as delineated in the Notice of Decision issued by the City of Camas on March 23rd, 2018 referencing case number SUB 17-03/Applicant – Green Mountain Land, LLC.

The aspects of the decision being appealed are as follows:

1. The City of Camas errored in recommending to the Hearing Examiner the location of the access road serving Phase 3. The entry road parcel is not owned by the applicants (owned by Camvest GM LLC – Mr. Lon Combs) and an easement was not granted to the applicant until 2-9-2018 for the consideration of \$60,000.00.

The entrance parcel was not a part of the original PRD nor could the applicant insure the City of Camas that the parcel/easement would be available – thus the delay and rescheduling of the original hearing date.

No evidence was submitted at the public hearing that the property owner has agreed to the improvements and that subsequent dedication to the City of Camas will occur.

The City of Camas; by agreeing to accept ownership of the easement or land parcel by survey, includes the area as part of Phase 3 and can condition that acceptance upon conditions that reduce the impact to surrounding properties such as noise and light attenuating masonry/concrete walls.

2. The Hearing Examiner errored in item "E" decision paragraphs 23 & 25 noted on page 15. The Hearing Examiner relied on information stated in paragraph k. on pages 4 and 5. WDOT does not have sole jurisdiction of the intersection of N.E. 58th Street (SR500/NE 199A). The planning process, while discussed between the parties, is not complete and Clark County has not agreed that a "Round About" is the preferred method of bringing the intersection to acceptable levels of service. The Hearing Examiner should delay the approval of Phase 3 (Case # SUB 17-03) until a

plan, approved by jurisdictional parties is accepted/approved with firm construction dates and financing.

- 3. The Hearing Examiner errored in accepting paragraph 61. on page 18 relating to the Fire Marshall comments. Indeed, accommodation for fire prevention with the use of fire sprinklers may be adequate except in the case of a fire of external origin but cross circulation in the event of emergency services was ignored. The plat indicates many cul-de-sacs' greater than the 400-foot cul-de-sac length stated in Camas code 17.19.040 Infrastructure Standards and completely ignores a primary second access.
- 4. The Hearing Examiner errored in accepting paragraph 7, page 11 of discussion. Good planning practices do not place public roads on two sides of residential lots and that is effectively what is occurring with this proposal. The impact upon the residents of lots 5 through 11 of Mountain Glen Subdivision will be severe. The curvilinear plan for the road and the grade will cause light intrusion into the back of the homes as well as severe noise impacts that are not in existence today. The fact is, no re-development of lots 5-11 of Mountain Glen will occur not like a large vacant parcel. Deference should be given to that fact and the Hearing Examiner should require appropriate mitigation.

Clearly understand, the owners/residents of Mountain Glen are not opposing the development of land, only asking that concern for compatibility and that impacts be mitigated as effectively as possible.

5. The Hearing Examiner errored in not requiring the property lines adjoining lot 12 of Mountain Glen Subdivision to be fenced with chain link fencing – paragraph 7a. pages 11 and 12. Most of the fencing can be accomplished by the Applicants/Proponents including the fencing requirement in the covenants of the project with the balance of the fencing to be completed as the trail section is completed – by either the Developer or Clark County. The comment that "no substantial evidence in the record that the future residents of this development are any more or less likely to engage in nuisance or illegal activities than other people" is muted by the fact the Hearing Examiner is requiring fencing of critical areas to prevent trespass.

The Parties above named submit the "Request For Reconsideration" as referred/required by CMC 18.55.235.

Some of the applicants were unable to place their signatures because they are out of town with their chidren on Spring Break this week.