Lauren Hollenbeck

From:	Lauren Hollenbeck
Sent:	Tuesday, May 17, 2022 1:14 PM
То:	David Toyer; Barty Brynestad Jr. AHBL; Curleigh (Jim) Carothers; 'Bjorn Brynestad'
Cc:	Robert Maul; Anita Ashton
Subject:	RE: Camas Business Center Staff Report

Bjorn, See responses below from Planning and Engineering,



Lauren Hollenbeck Senior Planner Desk 360-817-7253 Cell 360-314-7537 www.cityofcamas.us | <u>lhollenbeck@cityofcamas.us</u>

From: Bjorn Brynestad <Bjorn@panattoni.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 8:59 AM
To: Lauren Hollenbeck <LHollenbeck@cityofcamas.us>
Cc: David Toyer <david@toyerstrategic.com>; Robert Maul <RMaul@cityofcamas.us>; Anita Ashton
<AAshton@cityofcamas.us>; Barty Brynestad Jr. AHBL <bbrynestad@ahbl.com>; Curleigh (Jim) Carothers
<jcarothers@cityofcamas.us>
Subject: RE: Camas Business Center Staff Report

Lauren,

Our comprehensive list of questions is below. We would like to have some sort of clarification, if possible, before our meeting tonight.

- 1. On page 7 of 37, it notes that we have a building height of 60ft and we are meeting the minimum of 200 ft front yard setback. However our building height is 52 feet and it would be required to have a 260 ft front yard setback. We have requested a deviation to reduce the front yard setback to 200 ft, this is not mentioned. What is noted is the density and dimensional requirements, which includes the maximum building height of 60-feet. It does not state that your building height is 60-ft. For clarification in respect to the front yard setback, staff finds the proposed deviation request per the applicant's narrative to reduce the front yard setback to a minimum of 200-ft. per code is acceptable due to the berms and landscape buffers provided at the property lines.
- 2. On page 9 of 37, it notes that we are conditioned to have a maximum retaining wall height of 6 ft, but we are requesting 10 ft. This wasn't previously brought up as a concern by the city and we need this height in certain locations for the road, etc. Code indicates higher walls are allowed per Director approval. Is staff recommending denial of our request? No, staff is not recommending denial of your request. Retaining walls need to comply with CMC 18.17.060, which states "retaining walls shall not exceed six feet, <u>unless otherwise approved by the director</u>." The director has indicated support. Staff will recommend a revised the condition to include "unless otherwise approved by the director".
- 3. On page 10 of 37, our driveways are being identified as intersections and left turn lanes requested. Please explain (Barty will also be reaching out to Curly). A driveway is synonymous with a private road, per CMC 18.03.040 and is subject to CDSM Table 2 of the CDSM and is therefore an intersection. Staff will revise the condition to eliminate the left-turn pocket from Road A to Building C.

- 4. On page 10 & 11 of 37 you mention minimum centerline radius for the intersections as 300' for Road A/Lake Road and 200' for Road A/Road B. Can you explain what this dimension means for intersections? All intersections are standard 90 degree intersections with 35' curb radii. The curb radii for the intersections are 35-foot minimum. As stated 'minimum centerline radius' refers to the 'horizontal centerline curve radius', which is 200-feet for Roads A and B. NW Lake Road is an existing road, thus the 300-foot 'horizontal centerline curve radius' from NW Lake Road onto future Road A would not apply.
- 5. On page 10 of 37, The conditions request a left turn lane at Road A and NW Camas Meadows Drive. No condition, just discussion. This is a new request that hasn't come up before. There is insufficient right of way at the driving range. Does this incorrectly identify NW Camas Meadows Dr? There is not a condition for a left-turn lane at this location. Per the discussion, the city engineer supports the deviation from CDSM for the left-turn lane at Road A and Camas Meadows Drive.
- On page 18 of 37, clarify that we can put storm drainage and critical areas in an easement instead of a tract. The storm facility can be placed in the same easement, along with the wetlands, instead of a tract. Staff will recommend a revised condition.
 CMC 16 51 240 A also allows for a protective easement for the critical area. Staff will recommend a revised

CMC 16.51.240.A also allows for a protective easement for the critical area. Staff will recommend a revised condition.

- 7. On page 21 of 37, clarify that this not limiting our use of walls in other parts of the development (we have other walls on the western property line) That is not limiting the use of walls. In fact, there is no condition that references the limitation of the use of walls.
- 8. On page 24 of 37 under F, clarify that more than one phase can be constructed at a time. Correct. Also, there is no condition regarding phasing.
- 9. On Page 7 or 37, it does not specifically state that we meet the 30% max building coverage. We made a request to calculate the max coverage based on the whole project (including the wetlands), rather than calculating based on each lot. We need to request confirmation that we meet the standard. Yes, this standard is met as stated in the last paragraph under Section B, Density and Dimensions. Lot coverage applies to the project in totality.
- 10. On Page 26 of 37, we need to clarify the location of the additional Berm. The condition says Southwest and West property line. It seems appropriate only along the Southwest portion along Lake Road. Site grades on the west side would prohibit any berm. This is a condition of approval recommended by the Design Review Committee to address massing and scale of Building A from Lake Road and the condition remains as is.
- 11. On Page 31 of 37 condition 13, we need to request that the building permit be released with the civil site permit, not after civil site completion. General Condition #13 allows the Director to approve release of building permits ahead of civil site completion.
- 12. On Page 32 of 37 condition 34, we need to ask why we cannot grade in this area. This area is not existing buffer, and it will be restored as mitigated buffer after grading of the area is complete. I believe you mean Condition 31? Please refer to the finding on page 4. The clearing and grading plans show the stormwater pond within the proposed wetland mitigation area. The wetland mitigation area cannot be located on the stormwater pond slopes.
- 13. On Page 33 of 37 condition 35b, we need to ask why 129 more planter islands are required. Do adjacent trees within the landscape buffers not count towards the parking area tree requirement? An additional 129 planter islands are not required. Based on the 775 stalls, a total of 129 planter islands are required.

Thank you,



Bjorn Brynestad | Development Manager Panattoni Development Company, Inc. 1821 Dock St. Suite 100 | Tacoma, WA 98402 Office: 206.838.1730 | Cell: 253-444-8478 Blorn@panattoni.com

From: Lauren Hollenbeck <LHollenbeck@cityofcamas.us>
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2022 4:20 PM
To: Bjorn Brynestad <BJorn@panattoni.com>
Cc: David Toyer <david@toyerstrategic.com>; Robert Maul <RMaul@cityofcamas.us>; Anita Ashton
<AAshton@cityofcamas.us>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Camas Business Center Staff Report

Yes, please.



Lauren Hollenbeck

Senior Planner Desk 360-817-7253 Cell 360-314-7537 www.cityofcamas.us | <u>lhollenbeck@cityofcamas.us</u>

From: Bjorn Brynestad <Bjorn@panattoni.com>
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2022 4:19 PM
To: Lauren Hollenbeck <LHollenbeck@cityofcamas.us>
Cc: David Toyer <david@toyerstrategic.com>; Robert Maul <RMaul@cityofcamas.us>; Anita Ashton
<AAshton@cityofcamas.us>
Subject: RE: Camas Business Center Staff Report

Lauren,

Would it be helpful if we just sent over a list of questions we wanted clarification?



Bjorn Brynestad | Development Manager Panattoni Development Company, Inc. 1821 Dock St. Suite 100 | Tacoma, WA 98402 Office: 206.838.1730 | Cell: 253-444-8478 BJorn@panattoni.com

From: Lauren Hollenbeck <LHollenbeck@cityofcamas.us>
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2022 4:15 PM
To: Bjorn Brynestad <BJorn@panattoni.com>
Cc: David Toyer <david@toyerstrategic.com>; Robert Maul <RMaul@cityofcamas.us>; Anita Ashton
<AAshton@cityofcamas.us>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Camas Business Center Staff Report

Bjorn,

Staff does not have the capacity to meet to review the staff report tomorrow. It you have any concerns or questions, please email to us and we'll try to address before the public hearing tomorrow night. Respectfully,



Lauren Hollenbeck Senior Planner Desk 360-817-7253 Cell 360-314-7537 www.cityofcamas.us | <u>lhollenbeck@cityofcamas.us</u>

From: Bjorn Brynestad <<u>BJorn@panattoni.com</u>> Sent: Monday, May 16, 2022 3:56 PM To: Lauren Hollenbeck <<u>LHollenbeck@cityofcamas.us</u>> Cc: David Toyer <<u>david@toyerstrategic.com</u>> Subject: Camas Business Center Staff Report

WARNING: This message originated outside the City of Camas Mail system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are expecting the content. If you are unsure, click the Phish Alert button to redirect the email for ITD review.

Lauren,

Can we review the staff report tomorrow via zoom?

Thanks,



Bjorn Brynestad | Development Manager Panattoni Development Company, Inc. 1821 Dock St. Suite 100 | Tacoma, WA 98402 Office: 206.838.1730 | Cell: 253-444-8478 BJorn@panattoni.com

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.