# Exhibit 3 APPEAL18-02 & SEPA18-05



### **MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Joe Turner, Hearings Examiner

FROM: James Carothers, City Engineer and SEPA Applicant

DATE: 5/16/18

**SUBJECT**: Rebuttal to Appeal 18-02 Camas Meadows Drive/Larkspur Street SEPA 18-05

### **Project Overview**

This proposed project will widen the existing Larkspur Street from the intersection of NW Lake Road northward to the recently installed Camas Meadows Drive Improvements, providing connectivity to Camas Meadows Drive to the northwest and Parker Street and Brady Road to the south. The existing roadway is approximately 36 feet in the vicinity of NW Lake Road but quickly narrows to 20 feet wide for the majority of the alignment. The road has a curb and an 8-foot wide sidewalk on the east side.

The proposed street improvements include the following:

- Replace the existing substandard roadway.
- Widen the road to urban arterial standards.
- Construct a traffic circle at the intersection with NE 61<sup>st</sup> Circle.
- Construct a turnaround at the north end of the project.
- Construct curb and gutter on the west side of the street along with new sidewalk and bike lane, and widened sidewalks on the east side of the street to 10 feet.
- Extend the existing stormwater system from the north to convey additional stormwater from the NW Larkspur Street Improvements.
- Install street lighting on the west side.
- Relocate the signal pole on NW corner of Larkspur and Lake Road

This project requires additional right of way to be acquired from six different property owners. A strip of land approximately 10 feet in width will need to be acquired from each adjacent property owner on the west side to increase the right-of-way to 70 feet throughout the project.

The project requires an easement for a cut on the appellant's property and ample room to match in the appellant's circular driveway. This requirement on the appellant's property is depicted in plan and section views in Exhibit 4. Easements for similar reasons are needed from the appellant's neighbor to the north and south.

## Appeal Rebuttal

This appeal, without additional discussion, merely notes "soils, topography, unique physical features, erosion, scenic resources and aesthetics." The City is therefore not in a position to meaningfully address the alleged deficiencies in the determination but believes that the application is supportable by the plans and reports which were submitted. The City will have representatives available at the SEPA hearing to provide additional information if needed.

The substantial majority of the appeal relates to the scope of the property rights which the City is requesting through eminent domain proceedings which are not part of the SEPA process. The scope of the property rights will be determined by the court. The City Attorney will be present at the hearing to provide additional information concerning this matter, but the references relating to the designation of the area as a "temporary construction easement" or a "take" are not relevant for purposes of the appeal.

#### Corrections

City staff finds that there is erroneous information submitted by the appellant. On Page 3, paragraph 2, the appellant states, "Otak also prepared an alternative design using retaining walls and relocating the existing shop building, instead of the exorbitant cut and excavation discussed above. A copy of this retaining wall design is annexed hereto as Exhibit 3..." While the title block on Exhibit 2, Page 6 of 8, and referenced in the text as Exhibit 3, contains the City of Camas and Otak logos, neither the City of Camas staff, Otak nor any other representative of the City proposed or produced this drawing. The driveway access shown in this exhibit is an incursion upon the neighbor's property. The City is not and has never proposed to move the appellant's structure on the north portion of the property. The City maintains that there is no need to change its location as part of the project.

Exhibit 2, Page 4 of 8 does not accurately depict the easement area on the appellant's property that is required for the project. See Exhibit 5 for the correct easement area on which the City-authorized appraisal, offer to the appellant and eminent domain action are based.